

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

STEPHANIE LADONNA LUCAS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 21-2965 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

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 St. Paul, Minnesota, sues the United States. She alleges that the events giving rise to this action took place “[a]t my place of residence and workplaces” on “10/29/82-continuing.” Compl. at 4, Sec. III. Beyond that, Plaintiff refers to Exhibit A for a statement of the claims, but the exhibit consists of a long list of “Prohibited Practices and Abuses” containing no cogent facts. A complaint 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). The instant complaint suffers from the foregoing defects and therefore will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 24, 2021

/s/
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY
United States District Judge