

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

RONALD HANLEY HAMPTON,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. H-07-4092
	§	
CITY OF HOUSTON, <i>et al.</i> ,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER

The plaintiff, Ronald Hanley Hampton, has filed a lengthy complaint against a number of defendants, spanning decades of events. The plaintiff seeks \$100 billion in damages. The final two paragraphs state as follows:

Check-n-balance: it is not crt or feds; then who or what?
Nature repairs, man & COH is greedier than nature can repair.
In 1991 Ron went with nature, nonstructural fpm & Neils logic/thinking of no-1-cares. Ron put COH flood, global fld, war, fed-deficit-fraud predictions all in legal-depts, court, SDC, FDC, mayor & elected officials for 18 yrs. Fed motto: not-on-my-watch, serve-n-protect, code of honor is a fed-lie; all 30 of Rons witnesses are COH feds; 4defendants are COH headquartered. Is there global-fed, global-warming? Glacier National-Parks-ice is 1/2 gone = 1/2 polar-ice is gone in last 18years = on Jr watch = Iraq2, \$10tril deficit, COH got rebuilt + SDC got a new courthouse = dismiss. Witnesses named later but 1st get a case # then certified-mail will be sent.

Cause-of-Action: For 18yrs, 1991-2007, COH + Co fraud & violate the planet & all of Rons fed-state constitutional rights, individual-rights(IR), tax laws & fed-public law 90-448, sec 1302 "A Unified National Program for Floodplain Management"= **FPM** = **4Es** = education, economic,


environment and esthetics. FPM is directly related to Rons constitution-rights, IR, tax laws, 4Es & Earth. City of the future knows how to trash-up the planet. [see C]

Hampton is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. A review of the complaint reveals a confusing, unintelligible document containing rambling allegations concerning a series of events that have occurred since 1991. Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that “[a] pleading that states a claim for relief must contain: (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction . . . ; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought” While a plaintiff is not required to set out in detail all the facts upon which he bases his claim, the Federal Rules do require a short and plain statement of the claim being asserted so as to give the defendants fair notice of the claim and the grounds on which it rests. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1964 (2007); *Erickson v. Pardus*, 127 S. Ct. 2197 (2007).

Even reading Hampton’s complaint in the liberal manner afforded to *pro se* pleadings, it is unintelligible. The complaint is dismissed, with leave to amend no later than **March 25, 2008**, to set out a short and plain statement of the claim showing that Hampton is entitled to the relief he seeks.

Failure to do so may lead to dismissal with prejudice.

SIGNED on February 26, 2008, at Houston, Texas.



Lee H. Rosenthal
United States District Judge