

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
TENTH CIRCUIT

November 17, 2006

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

JUNGLE DEMOCRACY; KAMAL
K.K. ROY,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

USA GOVERNMENT AT
WASHINGTON DC & AT DENVER;
GOD/S ALL OVER THE US,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-1281
District of Colorado
(D.C. No. 06-CV-676-ZLW)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **MURPHY, SEYMOUR, and McCONNELL**, Circuit Judges.

Appellant Jungle Democracy, a/k/a Kamal K. K. Roy, a/k/a Joseph Geronimo, Jr. filed a 115-page complaint, a 144-page amended complaint, and a 40-page second amended complaint against over sixty defendants, including

*After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). This case is therefore submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, *res judicata*, and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

among many others President Bush, God as U.S.-based divine benefactor, several government agencies, The New York Times, and Kentucky Fried Chicken. In addition to pages of rambling discourse, the complaint contains numerous illegible handwritten remarks. The district court dismissed the complaint because it failed to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. We affirm.

Rule 8 requires that the parties file “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). A pleading also must be specific enough to “give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the ground upon which it rests.” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957). In this case, no discernible claim is apparent from the complaint, and it does not give fair notice to the defendants regarding the grounds upon which the plaintiff’s claims rest. We also strongly suspect at least one defendant was not properly served.

Jungle Democracy’s appeal is as unintelligible as its complaint and also states no grounds for relief. We agree with the district court that Jungle Democracy’s complaint fails to meet the “short and plain” requirements of Rule 8(a). Because Jungle Democracy failed to raise any nonfrivolous argument in support of its appeal, *see McIntosh v. U.S. Parole Comm’n*, 115 F.3d 809, 812 (10th Cir. 1997), we also deny his Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis.

The Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis is
DENIED, and the appeal is **DISMISSED**.

Entered for the Court,

Michael W. McConnell
Circuit Judge