

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
PINE BLUFF DIVISION

NANCY KING

PLAINTIFF

v.

No. 5:15-cv-299-DPM


VIVA BEVERAGES

DEFENDANT

ORDER

Ms. King didn't respond to Viva Beverages' motion to dismiss. But the motion lacks any merit. The company asks the Court to dismiss King's suit because she used the wrong *pro se* form—because, after paying \$400 to file suit, she made an ADA claim with a Title VII form. That doesn't matter. *Pro se* folks don't have to plead "with legal nicety." *Topchian v. JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A.*, 760 F.3d 843, 849 (8th Cir. 2014). They must give the other side fair notice of claims. The company's motion is premised on the fact that King did so. Requiring her to find and file another form at this point would slow down the case without good reason. FED. R. CIV. P. 1. Motion, No 10, denied.

So Ordered.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
D.P. Marshall Jr.  
United States District Judge

27 April 2016