UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)

)

)

)

OMAR ALEJANDRO MEDINA, Plaintiff, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Defendant.

Civil Action No. 22-0341 (UNA)

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).

Plaintiff's alleges violations of his constitutional rights, discusses a recent visit to a hospital emergency room, and touches on any number of topics. Nowhere does plaintiff state a basis for this Court's jurisdiction or a short and plain statement of claim. Furthermore, plaintiff articulates no basis for an award of \$85 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: March 9, 2022

/s/ AMIT P. MEHTA United States District Judge