

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

8/23/2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Court for the District of Columbia

ELLIS D. THOMAS, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
DC LAW ENFORCEMENT et al.,
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-1383 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of Plaintiff’s 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) 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 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 purports to sue “DC Law Enforcement,” Compl. Caption, as well as D.C. Superior Court and an individual in Prince William County, Virginia, Compl. at 2-3. The events giving rise to this action are alleged to have occurred in the District and Atlanta, Georgia, from “2002 – currently.” *Id.* at 4-5. Plaintiff alleges only that “over the years,” he has been assaulted by “DC MPD” and “plain clothed officers” during traffic stops and searches, “especially during the raid of [his] D.C. residence in 2006.” *Id.* at 5. He seeks compensatory and punitive damages of \$7,750,000.00. *Id.* A complaint, such as here, “that contains only vague and conclusory” assertions fails to satisfy the pleading requirements of Rule 8(a). *Hilska v. Jones*, 217 F.R.D. 16, 21 (D.D.C. 2003) (citing *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 514 (2002)). Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: August 23, 2021

s/

EMMET G. SULLIVAN
United States District Judge