

FILED

OCT - 1 2020

**Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts**

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

CONSUELO JORDAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff, ¹)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 20-2205 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

The Court has reviewed 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, however, 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

¹ Although the names of two plaintiffs appear in the caption of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), only Consuelo Jordan signed the pleading and submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court deems Consuelo Jordan the sole plaintiff. She is proceeding *pro se*, and cannot represent the interests of Carolyn Jordan. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1654.

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).

This complaint begins as if it brought employment discrimination claims against plaintiff's former employer, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia. *See generally* Compl. at 3-4 (page numbers designated by CM/ECF). The following pages present, in rambling and disjointed form, claims pertaining to the misuse of a District of Columbia government seal, discrimination based on age and race, threats to rape and kill plaintiff, and denial of plaintiff's demand for pension benefits, among others. What the complaint lacks, however, is a short and plain statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to the relief she demands, an award of \$138 million. For this reason, the complaint fails to meet the pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a) and must be dismissed.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: September 30, 2020

/s/
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS
United States District Judge