

5/27/2020

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of ColumbiaUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BRUD ROSSMANN,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

LENNERT LEADER, et al.,

*Defendants.*

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-01221 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter, brought *pro se*, is before the Court on review of Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF No. 1, and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. 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) 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, launch an adequate 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 is a District of Columbia resident who purports to sue various individuals, including a Judge and a Magistrate Judge of this Court, United States Attorney General William

Barr, CIA Director Gina Haspel, FBI Director Christopher Wray, and former FBI Director James Comey. *See generally* Compl. Plaintiff also lists as defendants “Jews More Generally.” *Id.* The 329-paragraph pleading is essentially a non-conforming diatribe. *Id.* Complaints like this one, which are “excessively long, rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material will patently fail [Rule 8(a)’s] standard,” as will “a complaint that contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments.” *Jiggetts v. District of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Cooper v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Therefore, this case will be dismissed. An Order will be released contemporaneously with this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: May 27, 2020



---

CARL J. NICHOLS  
United States District Judge