


United States in court proceedings,” *Rockefeller v. Westinghouse Elec. Co.*, 274 F.Supp.2d 10, 16 (D.D.C.2003); see *Bell v. Persons Acting as United States Parole Comm’n*, No. 08-0633, 2008 WL 1700600, at *1-2 (D.D.C. Apr. 11, 2008).

Insofar as plaintiff attempts to bring civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against current and former elected officials and employees of the District of Columbia, the Court dismisses the complaint without prejudice. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that a complaint contain “‘a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,’ in order to ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests[.]’” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Although a *pro se* complaint is “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted), it too “must plead ‘factual matter’ that permits the court to infer ‘more than the mere possibility of misconduct,’” *Atherton v. District of Columbia Office of the Mayor*, 567 F.3d 672, 681-82 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)). As drafted, the complaint fails to meet these requirements. Specifically, it fails to articulate adequately “a claim under § 1983,” which requires a plaintiff to allege “the violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and [to] show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff’s common law claims.

An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: *January 30, 2015*


United States District Judge