

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.

OPINION

Wayne v. McPhee

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