

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

SAMSON WOUBETU,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 23-0947 (UNA)
	)	
METRO PCS/T-MOBILE,	)	
	)	
<i>Defendant.</i>	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* complaint. The Court grants the application and, for the reasons discussed below, the dismisses the complaint.

A *pro se* litigant’s pleading is held to less stringent standards than would be applied to a formal pleading drafted by lawyer. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even *pro se* litigants, however, must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court’s jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense, and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

According to plaintiff, defendant is responsible for deletion of email messages and accepts his monthly payments while refusing to assist him “with technical problem and also 611 telephone customer services.” Compl. at 1. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with the minimum pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a) and, therefore, must be dismissed. The complaint alleges very few facts, and notably, is silent as to a basis for this Court’s jurisdiction and any form of relief. A separate order will issue.

DATE: April 12, 2023

/s/  
TANYA S. CHUTKAN  
United States District Judge