

**FILED**

8/19/2020  
 Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
 Court for the District of Columbia

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

|                               |   |                                |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| JIMI KAROLYN NAPOLITANO,      | ) |                                |
|                               | ) |                                |
| Plaintiff,                    | ) |                                |
|                               | ) |                                |
| v.                            | ) | Civil Action No. 20-2115 (UNA) |
|                               | ) |                                |
| JEROME POWELL <i>et al.</i> , | ) |                                |
|                               | ) |                                |
| Defendants.                   | ) |                                |

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter, brought *pro se*, is before the Court on review of plaintiff’s Complaint and application 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, 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.

The instant complaint is brought against seemingly private individuals who, save the lead defendant, are alleged to be members of an organized crime family. The rambling allegations comprising the complaint lack a cogent statement of facts, much less facts showing any entitlement to relief. More importantly, the complaint reveals no basis of federal court jurisdiction. A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

s/  
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge

Date: August 19, 2020