

FILED

DEC 12 2012

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

CHRISTOPHER IWANICKI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Civil Action No. **12 1985**

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).

The complaint is so incoherently written that the Court cannot discern a viable claim within this court's subject matter jurisdiction or a basis for exercising personal jurisdiction over the named defendant or a clear statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.



United States District Judge

DATE:

12/7/12