

FILED

AUG 01 2019

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

NIYOM SOUVANNASOT,

Plaintiff,

PRESIDENT OF TOYOTA MOTOR SALES,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 19-1769 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that a complaint contain “‘a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,’ in order to ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests[.]’” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Further, a complaint must “contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570). A claim is facially plausible “when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). Although a *pro se* complaint is “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted), it too, “must plead ‘factual matter’ that permits the court to infer ‘more than the mere possibility of misconduct,’” *Atherton v. District of Columbia Office of the Mayor*, 567 F.3d 672, 681-82 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678-79). As drafted, the complaint fails to meet these goals.

It appears that plaintiff purchased an extended warranty for his 2008 Toyota Corolla. He alleges that mechanics made 17 unsuccessful attempts to repair the car, which the plaintiff traded in for a 2014

Honda Civic. The plaintiff asks this Court to help him file a lawsuit against the mechanics and Toyota Motor Sales. This the Court cannot do. And from the meager factual allegations in the complaint, the Court cannot discern what claim(s) the plaintiff intends to bring against each named defendant, or what the basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction might be.

The Court will grant the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss his complaint without prejudice. An Order is issued separately.

DATE: July 30, 2019


United States District Judge