

**FILED**

4/24/2020  
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

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

Joachim Tape,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 20-714 (UNA)
	)	
	)	
Howard County 911 Caller <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff’s Civil Complaint filed *pro se* and his application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

*Pro se* litigants 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 complaints to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer, mount a defense, and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). It also assists the court in determining whether it has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Plaintiff resides in Columbia, Maryland. His cryptically worded complaint against four unnamed 911 callers in Howard County, Maryland, a Pastor, Cricket Wireless, and other entities lacks a jurisdictional basis and intelligible factual allegations. Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: April 24, 2020

s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge