

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

APR -9 2015

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff,

v.

RANDOLPH, BOYD, CHERRY AND VAUGHN,

Defendant.

Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts

Civil Action No.


MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

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 alleges in vague terms that defendant committed an “unlawful deceptive act,” which has caused her to be sued by the Commonwealth’s Attorney. Compl. at 1. Her pleading neither alleges sufficient facts nor otherwise articulates a cognizable legal claim. As drafted, the complaint does not comply with Rule 8(a), and it therefore will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: *April 31, 2015*


United States District Judge