

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)