

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

CURTIS L. DOWNING,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-02253 (UNA)
v.	)	
	)	
STEVE SISOLAK, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Currently before the court is plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), ECF No. 2. For the reasons explained herein, the court will grant plaintiff's IFP application and dismiss this matter without prejudice.

*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 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) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). The instant complaint falls into this category. Here, plaintiff, a Nevada state prisoner, has lodged a 443-page rambling complaint

against approximately 84 defendants, all Nevada officials and former officials, including, Governors, Secretaries of State, Attorneys General, and District Attorneys, as well as Nevada Senators, Assembly Persons, and Judges. The complaint is neither short nor plain and fails to provide adequate notice of a claim. *See Jiggetts v. District of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff'd sub nom. Cooper v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017) (a complaint that is “rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material will patently fail [Rule 8(a)’s] standard,” as will one containing “an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)).

As discussed, neither the court nor defendants can reasonably be expected to identify plaintiff’s claims, and the complaint also fails to set forth allegations with respect to this court’s jurisdiction over plaintiff’s entitlement to relief, if any. Consequently, it will be dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

DATE: October 18, 2022

\_\_\_\_ s/s \_\_\_\_\_  
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge