EMRIT v. RICE Doc. 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-00192 (UNA)
CONDOLEEZZA RICE, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	
)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Currently before the court is plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), ECF No. 2. For the reasons explained herein, the court will grant plaintiff's IFP application and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff, who lives in Sarasota, Florida, sues former U.S. Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, and current U.S. Secretary of State, Antony Blinken. The complaint is mostly incomprehensible, containing a hodgepodge of vague and unconnected allegations. Indeed, plaintiff repeatedly describes his own claims as "disjointed." He predominantly alleges that he was "racially profiled during the administration of George W. Bush" "as Arabic/Muslim when [he] is clearly an African-American related to Captain of [the] Battle of Gettysburg," and that his fiancée, who is Ukrainian, is entitled to a "visa or political asylum." The remainder of the complaint consists of *non-sequiturs* and anecdotes. He demands monetary damages and equitable relief under a litany of federal and international law, though he fails to make out a cognizable claim under any authority cited.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure. 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. Igbal, 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 and 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). When a pleading "contains an untidy assortment

of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold

conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments [,]" it does not fulfill the requirements of

Rule 8. Jiggetts v. D.C., 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), aff'd sub nom. Cooper v. D.C., No.

17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017). "A confused and rambling narrative of

charges and conclusions . . . does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8." Cheeks v. Fort

Myer Constr. Corp., 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014) (citation and internal quotation marks

omitted). The instant complaint falls within this category. As presented—and as acknowledged

by plaintiff himself—neither the court nor the defendants can reasonably be expected to identify

his claims.

For all of these reasons, this case is dismissed without prejudice. A separate order

accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: March 1, 2023

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS

United States District Judge