UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)	
OMAR MEDINA ALEJANDRO,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 22-0405 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES PRESIDENT, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

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 alleges that he is "punished . . . in the shower" and that "people are verbally

groping [him]" because he had exercised his First Amendment rights. Compl. at 4. He further

alleges that his "life is in danger when people violate" his Fourth Amendment rights by

"watch[ing] and say[ing] things to [him] in the shower." *Id.* He demands an award of \$100

million. Id.

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, sets forth a short

and plain statement of an actual legal claim, nor articulates no basis for an award of \$110

million. Furthermore, "federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within

their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit,

wholly insubstantial, [or] obviously frivolous[.]" Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536–37

(1974) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

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

2