

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SHAUN RUSHING,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Civil Action No. 22-203 (UNA)
POLK COUNTY,)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter, brought *pro se*, is before the Court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), ECF No. 2, and his complaint, ECF No. 1. 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 "Polk County" in an

unidentified State for "110 Trillion dollars." In the one-page pleading, Plaintiff alleges that he was

"wrongfully arrested on [a] marijuana charge [because] there was no marijuana in the bag that they

found on the ground and [no] marijuana risin in the bag." In addition, Plaintiff merely concludes

that Defendant discriminated against him.

Plaintiff has not stated the basis of federal court jurisdiction, which alone warrants

dismissal of the case. Regardless, the conclusory allegations simply fail to provide adequate notice

of a claim. Consequently, this action will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this

Memorandum Opinion.

AMIT P. MEHTA

United States District Judge

Date: March 18, 2022

2