

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jan 9, 2017

Case: 1:17-cv-00056 (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2017)

Case: 1:17-cv-00056

01-09-2017

SHARON BRIDGEWATER, Plaintiff, v. LORETTA ELIZABETH LYNCH, et al., Defendants.

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 1/11/2017

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck) **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *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(a) 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).

The Court has reviewed the complaint and finds that it fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a). The plaintiff manages to name 575 defendants in this action, *see generally* Compl. at 1-114, yet fails to articulate a viable claim against any one of them. Absent a statement of cognizable claims showing the plaintiff's entitlement the relief she demands, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately. DATE: January 9, 2017

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_

United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jan 9, 2017

Case: 1:17-cv-00056 (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2017)

Case: 1:17-cv-00056

01-09-2017

SHARON BRIDGEWATER, Plaintiff, v. LORETTA ELIZABETH LYNCH, et al., Defendants.

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 1/11/2017

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck) **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *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(a) 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).

The Court has reviewed the complaint and finds that it fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a). The plaintiff manages to name 575 defendants in this action, *see generally* Compl. at 1-114, yet fails to articulate a viable claim against any one of them. Absent a statement of cognizable claims showing the plaintiff's entitlement the relief she demands, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately. DATE: January 9, 2017

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_

United States District Judge