

**FILED**

**FEB. 23, 2022**

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

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

_____	)	
OMAR ALEJANDRO MEDINA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 22-0263 (UNA)
	)	
BOB BONTA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint.

A *pro se* litigant’s pleadings are held to less stringent standards than the standard 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 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 judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense

and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Although difficult to follow, the thrust of plaintiff's complaint appears to be that the Attorney General of California, Rob Bonta, has failed to "liv[e] up to his duties as . . . [A]ttorney [G]eneral," and has failed to address plaintiff's complaints regarding his privacy. Among a litany of other things, plaintiff alleges that he complained to the former Attorney General and Governor of California "about [his] privacy at home," has long "endure[d] harassment in [his] home," that "[t]hings . . . got[] worse when [he] complaint about [his] 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment right," that he has "powerful enemies that want to assassinate" him and that "people . . . are opening the door to let [his] enemies in [his] home to have a shot at" him, and that "[i]t is the government's job to make sure privacy laws are enforced." Dkt. 1 at 5. As drafted, plaintiff's complaint fails to comply with the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). Plaintiff neither states a basis for this Court's jurisdiction nor sets forth a short and plain statement of claim.

Furthermore, plaintiff articulates no basis for an award of \$41 million.

The Court will, accordingly, grant the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint without prejudice.

A separate order will issue.

DATE: February 23, 2022

/s/  
RANDOLPH D. MOSS  
United States District Judge