

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

PRINCESS MARIA SPENCER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 23-3236 (UNA)
	)	
CITY OF ROCKFORD (DISTRICT ATTORNEY)	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on review of *pro se* Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her civil complaint. The Court GRANTS the application and, for the reasons stated below, DISMISSES the Complaint and this civil action without prejudice.

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than are applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even *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 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).

According to Plaintiff, “house thieves . . . stole the title/deed” to property she owned in Rockford, Illinois, Compl. at 1, and sold the property for an amount less than its actual value, *see id.* These individuals allegedly “used forged/fake documents to have [Plaintiff] removed” from the property. *Id.* at 2. In addition, these individuals allegedly “stole a vehicle.” *Id.* at 1. Plaintiff has demanded “restitution of 7 million dollars for repairs [to the property], to replace [the] vehicle and [for] miscellaneous things,” as well as the “Deed/Title” to the property. *Id.* at 2.

As drafted, the Complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8. The Complaint does not state a valid basis for this Court’s jurisdiction. An alleged dispute over ownership of real property in Illinois between residents of Illinois neither presents a federal question nor establishes diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Furthermore, so few facts are alleged that the named defendant would not have adequate notice of the legal claims against it.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: November 9, 2023

ANA C. REYES  
United States District Judge