

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2381>

Case: 1:17-cv-00056

01-09-2017

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

Red flags, copy-with-cite, case summaries, annotated statutes and more.

[Compare with Lexis](#)

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