

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

HELGA SUAREZ CLARK,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 CARLOS CASTELLON CUEVA, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

FILED

NOV - 5 2018

Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts

Civil Action No. 18-1460 (UNA)


MEMORANDUM OPINION

The Court found that plaintiff's first amended complaint, ECF No. 10, failed to comply with the pleading standard set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). Accordingly, the Court issued an order, ECF No. 13, which allowed plaintiff to file a second amended complaint. The order instructed that the second amended complaint comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 9 and 10, comply with Local Civil Rule 5.1, and not exceed 25 pages including exhibits. Plaintiff availed herself of this opportunity, and now before the Court is her second amended complaint, ECF No. 16.

On review of the second amended complaint, the Court finds that it, too, fails to comply with Rule 8(a). While the pleading is shorter in length, it is just as confusing as the first. Neither the Court nor the defendants could determine what claim(s) plaintiff is bringing against which defendant(s). Furthermore, plaintiff attempts to circumvent the page limit by seeking to file excess pages. The Court is mindful that a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant is held to a lesser standard than would be applied to a formal pleading drafted by a lawyer. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Still, a *pro se* litigant must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Because the second amended

complaint does not meet the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a), the Court will dismiss this civil action without prejudice. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: October 23, 2018



United States District Judge