

**FILED**

**JUN - 7 2012**

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

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

LEONA COSBY, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
PEOPLE'S CANCEL OF THE COURT, )  
)  
Defendant. )

Civil Action No. **12 0926**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

The Court has reviewed the 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 defendant 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).

(2)

In its entirety, the complaint states:

The people in this area have been doing things to me that are not good standard hitting me in the face and head, taking things from me, money, clothes, [harassing] just about even night. I was unable to go in to there [sic] stores with my cart. I was told not to come back in the store. Some is in the room behind the bathroom taking picture wild [sic] using the bathroom. I was also cut my body.

Compl. Plaintiff demands “one Trillion” dollars. *Id.* What few factual allegations the plaintiff includes in her pleading are far too vague to establish an entitlement to the monetary damages she demands. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a), and it will be dismissed.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.



\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge

DATE: 5/31/12