

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
CEDRIC H.E. GRAVES, II,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 20-01313 (UNA)
	)	
STATE OF OREGON,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on review of this *pro se* plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her civil complaint.

The Court has reviewed the plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff's claims pertain to his arrest in 2011 and, it appears, his current supervision. Missing from his complaint is a statement establishing this Court's subject matter jurisdiction, a viable legal claim, or a demand for relief. The complaint fails to meet the pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a).

The Court will grant the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint and this civil action without prejudice. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: June 8, 2020

/s/

EMMET G. SULLIVAN  
United States District Judge