

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

ALEX ALFONSO SALAVERRIA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 21-2940 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter, brought *pro se*, is before the Court on review of Plaintiff's Complaint [Dkt. # 1] and application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Dkt. # 2]. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer, mount 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). It also assists the Court in determining whether it has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Plaintiff, a resident of Whittier, California, sues the United States, Vice President Kamala Harris, and a host of other defendants at federal, state, and local levels of government in multiple jurisdictions. *See* Compl. Caption; Compl. at 2-6 (“Parties”). In his jurisdictional statement, Plaintiff claims that “[t]his is a CIVIL ACTION brought pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 2201 and Torts Claim 42 U.S. Section § 1983.” Compl. at 2 ¶ 1. He seeks \$250 million in damages. *Id.* at 47.

Like the foregoing jurisdictional statement, the 47-page complaint is simply baffling. A pleading, such as here, that is “rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material will patently fail [Rule 8(a)’s] standard,” as will “a complaint that contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated[.]” *Jiggetts v. District of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Cooper v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 24, 2021

/s/ COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY
United States District Judge