FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OCT 2 1 2009 Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts

Jerome Julius Brown ,)
Plaintiff,))))
v.)
Mental Health & Mental Hygiene et al.,)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No.

09 1988

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The plaintiff has filed a *pro se* complaint and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff, who gives a Maryland address and telephone number, has filed a complaint against a defendants with Maryland addresses. The complaint appears to consist of only one page and does not allege any facts indicating a cause of action or relief sought from the named defendants. The complaint is accompanied by more than forty pages of other papers having no obvious relationship to the document identified as the complaint. The complaint contains phrases that are decipherable, such as "Title 18 U.S.C. section 1001," "baby boy brown certificate of death," and of a "HUD deed of trust," but as a whole, the complaint is incoherent and nonsensical.

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).

As drafted, the Complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a). It would not be possible for any defendant to discern an allegation of injury or wrongdoing. Moreover, the Court cannot discern a basis for its jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: / 0/ 5/09

United States District Judge