

Plaintiff, a District of Columbia resident, has submitted a “Civil Complaint in Chancery” against a business in the District of Columbia. Plaintiff seeks \$45,000.50 in monetary damages. In the one-page complaint, plaintiff states that the business violated “plaintiff’s religious rights” and that the defendant-owner did not rebut a claim notice allegedly mailed in June 2013 about “the discriminatory practices by [the business’s] agent . . . toward the plaintiff abrogating his aboriginal rights.”

Plaintiff invokes 42 U.S.C. § 1983, but that statute authorizes a private cause of action against individuals who violate constitutional rights while acting under the authority of a state or the District of Columbia. Nothing in the sparsely worded complaint suggests that the named private defendants are subject to liability under § 1983. Regardless, plaintiff has not stated any facts to support his legal conclusions and, thus, has not provided adequate notice of a claim. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (A complaint “that offers labels and conclusions . . . [or] naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement” does not suffice to satisfy Rule 8’s pleading requirement) (citations, internal quotation marks and alterations omitted). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: February 18, 2015


United States District Judge