

**FILED**

NOV 30 2009

Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts

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

**ANOKI PINON SULTAN,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**BUSINESS BUREAU,**

**Defendant.**

Civil Action No. **09 2273**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**


This matter comes before the Court on consideration of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* complaint. For the reasons explained below, the Court will grant the application and will dismiss the complaint.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings 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(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

124

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

As drafted, the Court cannot discern plaintiff's claim or claims. Amidst the pleading's many biblical references, the Court cannot discern plaintiff's claim or claims against the named defendant. In addition, the complaint neither states a basis for this Court's jurisdiction nor includes a short and plain statement showing her entitlement to relief. For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed for its failure to comply with Rule 8(a). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.



United States District Judge

DATE: 11/18/09