

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,)
Plaintiff,)
V.)
COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF)
OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 20-1804 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's "Civil Liberties Complaint" and concludes that it fails to meet the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). Many factual allegations are made, yet no identifiable legal claim emerges. Further, plaintiff demands no particular form of relief. Therefore, the Court will grant plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: July 6, 2020

/s/ JAMES E. BOASBERG United States District Judge