

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

SHAUN RUSHING,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 22-199 (UNA)
)	
U.S. ARMY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed a “Lawsuit,” ECF No. 1, and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 3. 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 is a resident of Grand Rapids, Michigan, who has sued the U.S. Army for “110 Billion dollars.” In the one-page pleading, Plaintiff concludes that the Army discriminated against him when it denied him “the chance to enlist,” but he has alleged no facts to support a claim and a basis for federal court jurisdiction. Consequently, this action will be dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

/s/ _____
AMIT P. MEHTA
United States District Judge

Date: March 8, 2022