UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CARL WAYNE STEWART, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant.	)	Civil Action No. 12-2036 (RC)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff brought this action under the Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), *see* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-80, against the United States for "negligence, abuse of the patient [and] endangerment of Health by employees acting within the scope of their employment," Compl. [ECF No. 1] at 1 (page number designated by the Court), when he sought treatment at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in the District of Columbia. Because the complaint failed to set forth sufficient factual allegations in support of his claims, the Court issued an Order on October 15, 2013 [ECF No. 18] for plaintiff to file a more definite statement describing: (1) the nature of his medical problems, (2) the treatment plaintiff received, (3) the identities of the individuals who provided or administered his treatment, (4) the dates on which he sought and obtained treatment, (5) the alternative treatment he believes should have been provided, (6) the manner in which the treatment he received was deficient, and (7) the harm he sustained as a result of the allegedly inadequate treatment. The Court advised plaintiff that his failure to file a more definite statement addressing these seven factors would result in dismissal of this action.

Plaintiff's response merely refers to his original complaint, asserting that the "Nature of the medical problem, ID of the tortfeasor, harm done [and] Standard of care, all was in the original filings." Response to the 10-15-13 order, for a more definite Statement [ECF No. 19] at 2. His response is otherwise unintelligible and in no way addresses the seven factors listed in the Court's October 15, 2013 Order. [1] Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint and this civil action. An Order is issued separately.

DATE: November 18, 2013

/s/
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS
United States District Judge

[1] Plaintiff's October 22, 2013 "Letter to the Judge Appeal to the Courts Conscious and prudential Grounds" [ECF No. 20] likewise fails to address the seven factors set forth in the October 15, 2013 Order.