

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jesus A. Wayne, Jr. v. William McPhee

Wayne · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01551 (UNA) · Decided June 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the pro se plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses the complaint without prejudice. The court concludes that the complaint fails to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) because it does not provide a discernible claim, basis for jurisdiction, or requested relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tanya S. Chutkan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	June 16, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01551 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Plaintiff's pro se complaint and application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the action without prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion

TOPICS

- pleadings
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)'s requirements for a short and plain statement of the grounds for jurisdiction and of a claim showing entitlement to relief.
- Whether dismissal was required because the complaint failed to establish the court's subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8(a) because it did not provide a short and plain statement identifying the grounds for jurisdiction or a claim showing that Plaintiff was entitled to relief.
2. The action was subject to dismissal because Plaintiff failed to establish the court's subject matter jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Federal Rule 8(a) of requires a complaint to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." (at 2)

"Here, as presented, neither the Court nor the Defendant can reasonably be expected to identify Plaintiff's claims or entitlement to relief, if any, nor has Plaintiff established this Court's subject matter jurisdiction" (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sued a single individual whom he purportedly described as the "Chief Justice of the World." The complaint alleged only "racketeering with locked-up for William McPhee abandon by William McPhee" at an address in Washington, D.C., and stated that Plaintiff sought no relief. The court concluded that neither it nor the defendant could reasonably identify Plaintiff's claims or entitlement to relief and that Plaintiff had not established subject matter jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against William McPhee and an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the in forma pauperis application but dismissed the complaint without prejudice because it failed to provide an intelligible claim or establish subject matter jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239–40 (D.D.C. 1987)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009)
- Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668–71 (D.C. Cir. 2004)
- Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JESUS A. WAYNE, JR.,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01551 (UNA))) WILLIAM MCPHEE,)) Defendant.) MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's pro se Complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP"), ECF No. 2.

The Court grants Plaintiff's IFP Application, and for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this matter without prejudice. Plaintiff sues a single individual, William McPhee, who is purportedly the "Chief Justice of the World." See Compl. at 1–2. Plaintiff alleges only [sic] "racketeering with locked-up for William McPhee abandon by William McPhee at 500 Pennsylvania Ave. S.E.

Washington, D.C. 20003 on Tuesday May 5, 2026." Id. at 4. He does not demand relief, stating "no relief...no lawsuit." See id. Pro se litigants must comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure. See *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239–40 (D.D.C. 1987). Federal Rule 8(a) of requires a complaint to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 8(a); see *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668–71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D.

497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). Here, as presented, neither the Court nor the Defendant can reasonably be expected to identify Plaintiff's claims or entitlement to relief, if any, nor has Plaintiff established this Court's subject matter jurisdiction, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Consequently, this case is dismissed without prejudice. A separate Order will issue contemporaneously.

Date: June 16, 2026 Tanya S. Chutkan TANYA S. CHUTKAN United States District Judge