

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
SPRINGFIELD DIVISION

CAROLINE K. NEWBLE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	NO. 15-3082
)	
STATE OF ILLINOIS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION

RICHARD MILLS, U.S. District Judge:

Plaintiff Caroline K. Newble seeks to file a Pro Se Complaint, alleging various job discrimination claims against a number of Defendants. Because the Plaintiff seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court will screen the complaint and may dismiss it before service on a defendant if it is frivolous, malicious or fails to state a claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

The Plaintiff asserts discrimination based on age, 29 U.S.C. § 621; disability, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 and/or 29 U.S.C. § 701; race, religion and gender, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e and/or 29 U.S.C. § 206, in addition to alleging retaliation. The Complaint names more than twenty Defendants.

Although the Complaint consists of five pages, it provides no details of the alleged discrimination. Attached to the Complaint are a number of exhibits totaling 78 pages. These documents include the Plaintiff's EEOC and Illinois Department of Human Rights Charges, a U.S. Office of Special Counsel Complaint and Illinois Department of Human Rights Request for Review. A number of general grievances are discussed. However, the Plaintiff does not assert how any of the Defendants discriminated her with respect to employment.

A complaint must include "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). A complaint fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). While a court must accept a plaintiff's factual allegations as true, "some factual allegations will be so sketchy or implausible that they fail to provide sufficient notice to defendants of the plaintiff's claim." *Brooks v. Ross*, 578 F.3d 574, 581 (7th Cir. 2009).

Upon reviewing the Plaintiff's filing, the Court concludes the Complaint and exhibits do not comply with Rule 8. The allegations do not provide sufficient notice of the Plaintiff's claims to any of the named Defendants. Accordingly, the Complaint will be dismissed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B). However, the Court will give the Plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint that gives proper notice of her claims.

Ergo, the Plaintiff's Complaint [d/e 1] is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

The Plaintiff may file an amended complaint by April 2, 2015. If the Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint by that date, the case will be terminated.

ENTER: March 19, 2015

FOR THE COURT:

s/Richard Mills
Richard Mills
United States District Judge