

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

MAY 27 2021

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

LUTHER STAPLETON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1: 21-cv-01148 (UNA)
)	
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), by which the court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous.

The court has reviewed the plaintiff's complaint and exhibits, keeping in mind that a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant is held to a less stringent standard than that applied to a formal pleading drafted by a lawyer. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even a *pro se* litigant, however, must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237,239 (D.D.C. 1987); *see also Yellen v. U.S. Bank*, 301 F. Supp. 3d 43, 47 (D.D.C. 2018). 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).

This complaint utterly fails to meet even the minimal pleading set forth in Rule 8(a). It is illogical, incoherent, and filled with the sort of "fantastic or delusional scenarios," *Neitzke v.*

Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989), warranting dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). More, it “is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision.” *Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) *aff’d*, 455 F. App’x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (quoting *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1009 (D.C. Cir. 2009)). No defendant should “be forced to spend time and energy in attempting to decipher plaintiff’s utterly confusing and lengthy pleading.” *Hamrick v. United States*, No. 08-1698, 2009 WL 8747880, at *1 (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2009) (footnote omitted).

Consequently, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this memorandum.



TREVOR N. McFADDEN
United States District Judge

Dated: 5/27/2021