

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

TONI IRONS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-02348 (UNA)
v.	)	
	)	
MURIEL BOWSER,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**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.

Plaintiff's complaint contains broad allegations of government corruption that are difficult to follow and fail to make out a cognizable claim. She sues the Mayor of the District of Columbia, alleging that the Mayor has "attacked her family," somehow "threatened her inheritance" from a phone company, denied her public services, and has "attempted to murder" her. The relief sought is not specified.

*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). When a pleading “contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments [,]” it does not fulfill the requirements of Rule 8. *Jiggetts v. D.C.*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Cooper v. D.C.*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017). “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 within this category. As presented, neither the court nor defendant 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, this case is dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

DATE: October 13, 2022

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