

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KEITH RODERICK BROADNAX, et al.,	*	
	*	
Plaintiffs,	*	
	*	
v.	*	Civil Action No. RWT 15-2266
	*	
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, JR., et al.,	*	
	*	
Defendants.	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This twenty-four-page Complaint, which contains nearly two hundred pages of exhibits, was filed on August 3, 2015, together with a Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. ECF Nos. 1, 2. Both the Complaint and the *In Forma Pauperis* Motion must be dismissed, as it is impossible to discern whether the Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted¹ and no information has been provided regarding either Plaintiffs’ income or expenses. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6), *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) requires a complaint to provide a clear statement of the claim so that the defendant will know how to defend against the claim. *See Kittay v. Kornstein*, 230 F. 3d 531, 541 (2d Cir. 2000). This requirement is not met here.

Accordingly, it is this 1st day of September, 2015, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland,

ORDERED, that Plaintiffs’ Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is hereby **DENIED**; and it is further

¹ The Complaint references only a piece of property in Prince George’s County, Maryland and an unnamed “contact,” but provides no details as to their contractual dispute. ECF No. 1, at 4, 6.

ORDERED, that the Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED**; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk is hereby **DIRECTED** to provide a copy of this order to Plaintiffs; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk is hereby **DIRECTED** to close this case.

/s/
ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE