

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED
OCT 24 2018

Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts

JOHN KEITH HEBERT.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 18-2332 (UNA)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

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 without prejudice.

The Court is mindful that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than are applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). However, even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See 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); *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claims 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).

According to plaintiff, the United States Attorney General, the United States Department of Justice, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the United Nations Security Council, and Pope Francis are committing treason and violating plaintiff's constitutional rights. For the physical, mental and financial harms defendants are causing, plaintiff demands damages of \$111,100,000,000, among other relief. However, based on the Court's review, the complaint fails to allege facts to demonstrate this Court's jurisdiction, and to show he is entitled to any of the relief he demands. Therefore, the Court dismisses the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: October 23, 2018


United States District Judge