

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

ALONZO BRADLEY,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 23-0715 (UNA)
)	
KAREN PEVLAR, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before the Court is plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 3, 2023, Order (ECF No. 4) denying his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint (ECF No. 1). The Court grants the motion and finds that plaintiff makes an adequate showing of his indigence. And for the reasons discussed below, the Court dismisses the complaint without prejudice.¹

A *pro se* litigant’s pleading is held to less stringent standards than would be applied to a formal pleading 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

¹ Because plaintiff’s “Motion to Modify” (ECF No. 3) is, essentially, a duplicate of the Complaint, this motion will be denied.

determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

It appears that plaintiff, a resident of Capac, Michigan, is the guardian of a minor on whose behalf he manages the proceeds of a settlement. It further appears that plaintiff is dissatisfied with the financial institution, doing business in Tacoma, Washington, where the proceeds are deposited. He seeks authorization to deposit or invest the proceeds elsewhere. Missing are facts establishing a basis for this Court's jurisdiction and plaintiff's entitlement to the relief he demands. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a), as it fails to put defendants on notice of the claims against them. Accordingly, the Court dismisses the complaint without prejudice. A separate order will issue.

DATE: June 30, 2023

_____/s/_____
ANA C. REYES
United States District Judge