

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

McKeeman v. Randy, et al.

Civil Action No. 26-1332 (UNA) (D.D.C. June 3, 2026) · No. 26-1332 (UNA) · Decided June 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismisses the pro se complaint without prejudice. The court finds that the complaint lacks factual allegations supporting a legal claim, a statement establishing subject-matter jurisdiction, and a demand for relief, contrary to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Christopher R. Cooper
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	June 3, 2026
DOCKET	26-1332 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and her pro se complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A pro se complaint is held to a less stringent standard than a pleading drafted by a lawyer, but it must still comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and satisfy Rule 8(a)'s pleading requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion

TOPICS

- pleadings
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the pro se complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a).
- Whether the complaint adequately stated grounds for the court's subject matter jurisdiction.

3. Whether the complaint included a demand for the relief sought.

HOLDINGS

1. Although pro se pleadings are held to a less stringent standard, a pro se litigant must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Rule 8(a)'s requirement of a short and plain statement of jurisdictional grounds, a claim showing entitlement to relief, and a demand for judgment.
2. Dismissal without prejudice was warranted because the complaint lacked factual allegations supporting a legal claim, a statement establishing subject matter jurisdiction, and a demand for relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It “does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no substantive factual allegations concerning the underlying dispute. Plaintiff's complaint lacked factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim, a statement demonstrating subject matter jurisdiction, and a demand for relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application but dismissed the complaint without prejudice because it lacked factual allegations supporting a legal claim, a statement establishing subject matter jurisdiction, and a demand for relief.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
- Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- 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 RITA FAYE McKEEMAN,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 26-1332 (UNA))) RANDY, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the court on plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, and pro se complaint, ECF No. 1.

The Court grants the application and dismisses the complaint without prejudice. The Court holds a pro se complaint to a “less stringent standard[]” than is applied to a pleading drafted by a lawyer. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Still, a pro se litigant 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). It “does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quotations omitted).

The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer, mount an adequate defense, and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. See *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). 1 The Court dismisses the complaint for the simple reason that there are no factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim. see Compl. at 4.

Nor is there a statement demonstrating that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claim plaintiff intends to bring. See *id.* at 3. Missing, too, is a demand for relief. See *id.* at 4. As drafted, the complaint falls well short of Rule 8’s minimal pleading standard, and the Court will dismiss it without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: June 3, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER United States District Judge 2