

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

APR 10 2013

Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts

DAVID LEE GARNER,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE)
UNITED STATES, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No.

13-466

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


1n1

3

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).

Plaintiff, who currently is incarcerated at the United States Penitentiary in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, brings this action against dozens of defendants on claims arising from his current incarceration. The Court, however, identifies neither a short and plain statement of a particular claim against a particular defendant, nor a clear statement of plaintiff's entitlement to relief. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a), and it will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 4-3-13


United States District Judge
J. Bolberg