

opportunity to file a responsive answer, prepare an adequate defense, and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. See Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957); Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

The Court is mindful 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). Nonetheless, courts may dismiss an action sua sponte under Rule 8(a)(2) where the complaint sets forth "a meandering, disorganized, prolix narrative" or is "so verbose, confused and redundant that its true substance, if any, is well disguised." Hamrick v. United Nations, 2007 WL 3054817, at *1 (D.D.C. 2007) (quoting Brown, 75 F.R.D. at 499). Hamrick's exceedingly lengthy complaint -- utterly confusing, and at times indecipherable -- easily meets these standards. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss Hamrick's current complaint without prejudice, as has been done on other occasions. See Hamrick v. United States, Civ. A. No. 08-1698 (dismissing complaint on identical grounds); Hamrick v. United Nations, 2007 WL 3054817 (same); Hamrick v. Brewer, Civ. A. No. 05-1993 (D.D.C. Oct. 20, 2005) (same). The Court will also deny all pending motions as moot.

Hamrick may refile an amended complaint that cures the deficiencies identified above. But "[i]f Mr. Hamrick files an amended complaint that merely recycles the Complaint presently before the Court it may be dismissed with prejudice." Hamrick v. United Nations, 2007 WL 3054817, at *1. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

/s/
JOHN D. BATES
United States District Judge

Date: August 24, 2010