

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION

PETER MICHAEL SLOAN AKA PETER  
SHATNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: **B:17-CV-332-T-27AAS**

WILLIAM SHATNER, CHERRY  
HEPBURN, PUTAM & HEPBURN, PAUL  
CAMUSO, THE SHATNER PROJECT,  
IMBDPRO, TWITTER, and  
AMAZON.COM,

Defendants.

ORDER

This cause is before the Court *sua sponte*. Plaintiff filed a *pro se* Complaint in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, Hillsborough County, Florida (Dkt. 2), which was removed to this Court (Dkt. 1). The Complaint names eight defendants and includes “ET AL” in the case caption. (Dkt. 2). The Complaint is a rambling recitation of various alleged meetings, letters, articles, radio transcripts, and internet posts. But for listing “LIBEL; DEFAMATION; TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE; SLANDER” on the bottom of each page, Plaintiff fails to state any identifiable cause of action against each named defendant. Plaintiff’s Complaint, even liberally construed, fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and fails to assert any discernible basis for the relief sought against the named defendants.<sup>1</sup> *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972). The complaint

---

<sup>1</sup>A *pro se* litigant is subject to the same law and rules of court as a litigant who is represented by counsel, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the Middle District of Florida. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989).

must contain, among other things, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Although, a plaintiff is not required to set forth an intricately detailed description of the asserted basis for relief, it is required that the pleadings “give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957).

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Complaint is **DISMISSED**. No later than **February 28, 2017**, Plaintiff may file an amended complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure of Plaintiff to do so shall result in dismissal of this action without further notice from the Court. Defendant William Shatner’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 5) is **DENIED as moot**.<sup>2</sup>

**DONE AND ORDERED** this 14<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2017.

  
**JAMES D. WHITTEMORE**  
United States District Judge

Copies to:  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
Counsel of Record

---

<sup>2</sup> In the future, counsel is directed to comply with Local Rule 3.01 (a) which requires any motion to be included "in a single document not more than twenty-five (25) pages."