

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO**

Civil Action No. 14-cv-02117-BNB

HAILU BEKELE ROBI,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATE OFFICE HQ,

Defendant.

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE
AN AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, Hailu Bekele Robi, currently resides in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiff initiated this action by filing *pro se* a Complaint and was granted leave to proceed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 on August 7, 2014. The Court must construe the Complaint liberally because Plaintiff is not represented by an attorney. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). The Court, however, should not act as a *pro se* litigant's advocate. *See Hall*, 935 F.2d at 1110. For the following reasons, the Court will direct Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint.

Generally, Plaintiff's Complaint contains only copies of what appear to be federal statutes. The only claim Plaintiff asserts against Microsoft is that it stole his intellectual property through the use of the internet bonding system and that the storage of such information in the Microsoft internal storage is theft.

The Court finds that the Complaint does not comply with the pleading

requirements of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The twin purposes of a complaint are to give the opposing parties fair notice of the basis for the claims against them so that they may respond and to allow the court to conclude that the allegations, if proven, show that the is entitled to relief. See *Monument Builders of Greater Kansas City, Inc. v. American Cemetery Ass'n of Kansas*, 891 F.2d 1473, 1480 (10th Cir. 1989). The requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 are designed to meet these purposes. See *TV Communications Network, Inc. v. ESPN, Inc.*, 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991), *aff'd*, 964 F.2d 1022 (10th Cir. 1992).

Specifically, Rule 8(a) provides that a complaint “must contain: (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction, . . . (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for the relief sought” The philosophy of Rule 8(a) is reinforced by Rule 8(d)(1), which provides that “[e]ach allegation must be simple, concise, and direct.” Taken together, Rules 8(a) and (d)(1) underscore the emphasis placed on clarity and brevity by the federal pleading rules. Prolix pleadings violate the requirements of Rule 8.

Plaintiff fails to set forth the basis for jurisdiction and what relief he is requesting. In the Jurisdiction section of the form, Plaintiff has written, “Boulder” and “Colorado Springs.” In the Request for Relief section, Plaintiff refers to what appears to be federal statutes. Plaintiff also fails to state why the information that allegedly was stolen should be considered intellectual property and how Microsoft has used the information to his detriment.

A decision to dismiss a complaint pursuant to Rule 8 is within the trial court’s sound discretion. See *Atkins v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*, 967 F.2d 1197, 1203 (8th Cir. 1992); *Gillibeau v. City of Richmond*, 417 F.2d 426, 431 (9th Cir. 1969). The Court,

however, will give Plaintiff an opportunity to cure the deficiencies in the Complaint by submitting an Amended Complaint that meets the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.

To state a claim in federal court Plaintiff must explain (1) what a defendant did to him; (2) when the defendant did it; (3) how the defendant's action harmed him; and (4) what specific legal right the defendant violated. *Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff file an Amended Complaint that complies with the above directives, **within thirty days from the date of this Order**. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall obtain the Court-approved Complaint form, along with the applicable instructions at www.cod.uscourts.gov, to be used in filing the Amended Complaint. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff fails to file an Amended Complaint that complies with this Order within the time allowed, the Court may dismiss this action without further notice for the reasons discussed above.

DATED August 11, 2014, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge