

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

KENT ALLEN, JR.,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-01350 (UNA)
	)	
PARAG AGRAWAL <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
<i>Defendants.</i>	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint , Dkt. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), Dkt. 2. The Court will grant the IFP 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.

Plaintiff Kent Allen, Jr., a resident of Miami, Florida, Compl. at 1, sues the CEO of Twitter, who is located in San Francisco, California, *see id.* at 2, 4; Notice at 1, Dkt. 5, and recording artist, Deja Trimble, who is located in either New York, New York; *see* Compl. at 2, or Los Angeles, California, *see* Not. at 1. Preliminarily, the Complaint and IFP Application both fail to comply with Federal Rule 10(a) and D.C. Local Rule 5.1(g), because neither are captioned for this Court, or for that matter, any other. *See* Compl. at 1; IFP Application at 1.


*Pro se* litigants must comply with the 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 and 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). “A confused and rambling narrative of charges and conclusions . . . does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8.” *Cheeks v. Fort Myer Constr. Corp.*, 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Plaintiff alleges that some or all of the Defendants committed unspecified fraud and invaded his privacy. *See* Compl. at 4. He maintains that they “caused damages by not communicating about business names and ideas of Twitter when [plaintiff] left from Florida to Detroit.” *Se id.* He contends that he continually attempted to contact Defendants to no avail. *See id.* He alleges that, after he filed “previous complaints,” Defendants damaged his “corporate reputation” by using “public communication medi[a]” to discuss his “living situation.” Though plaintiff has filed a civil complaint, he cites only to the Federal Criminal Code. *See id.* at 7. He demands \$1,250,000 in damages. *Id.* at 4, 7.

Put simply, the Complaint consists of a random collection of statements without clarity or particularity. Plaintiff provides no factual context or information to connect the two named Defendants or to make out any discernible claim, nor does he establish any basis for subject matter jurisdiction or venue. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

June 21, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Dabney L. Friedrich". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH  
United States District Judge