

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

OCT 13 2021

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

FRANCISCO MONTES, JR.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 21-02578 (UNA)
	)	
THOMAS D. PALELLA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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 the relief the pleader seeks. The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claims being asserted such that they can prepare a responsive answer, prepare an adequate defense, and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

As drafted, plaintiff's *pro se* complaint fails to comply with the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). There are far too few facts alleged to state a viable legal claim, or to establish a basis for this Court's jurisdiction. The vague demand that "Plaintiff would like Antitrust with Temporary Restraining Order established for himself and for mentioned children in request for forma pauperis," Compl. at 1, falls far short of a cogent demand for relief. Therefore, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice and deny as moot plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order. Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* will be granted. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: October 13, 2021

/s/  
JAMES E. BOASBERG  
United States District Judge