

FILED

JUL 23 2012

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROBERT D. NEAL, Plaintiff, v. THOMAS R. KANE, Defendant.

Civil Action No. 12 1212

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of 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 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 doctrine of res judicata applies. Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

N

3

Plaintiff is a prisoner who currently is incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in Terre Haute, Indiana. He alleges to have “suffered mightily at the hands of this Defendant,” Compl. ¶ 8, the Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, who has breached a settlement agreement, *see id.* at 7. Missing from the Complaint are any allegations with respect to the nature or content of the settlement agreement. Nor does the Complaint specify the “bad acts,” *id.*, that defendant allegedly has committed.

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:

7/16/12