

FILED

SEP 26 2013

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

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

CLARENCE D. JOHNSON,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 HENRICO POLICE DEPT.,)
)
 Defendant.)

Civil Action No. **13-1477**

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).

Plaintiff lists a number of claims against the defendant identified as “Henrico Police Dept,” yet his complaint utterly fails to articulate any factual allegations to support any one claim. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a) because it contains neither contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court’s jurisdiction depends nor a short and plain statement of the claim showing that plaintiff is entitled to relief. Accordingly, the complaint and this civil action will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.


United States District Judge

DATE: 9/19/2013