

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Banks v. Farello

Banks · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00852 (UNA) · Decided June 1, 2026

OPINION

Banks v. Farello

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LOUIS A. BANKS, et al.,)) Plaintiffs,)) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00852 (UNA) v.)) GLEN
FARELLO, et al.,)) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint, ECF No. 1, and his Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”), ECF No. 2. Upon review, the Court grants Plaintiff’s IFP Application, and for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this matter without prejudice. Plaintiff Louis A. Banks brings this matter on his own behalf and on behalf of his minor child. He sues approximately 30 defendants, consisting of state and federal agencies and officials in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. He demands equitable relief and at least \$500 million for damages arising from multiple alleged government conspiracies to retaliate against him for filing various lawsuits. 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), and here, the Complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires a pleading 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). Plaintiff’s allegations are vague and board, rather than clear and direct, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1), and the paragraphs are not limited to a single set of circumstances, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(b). When, as here, a pleading “contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments [,]” it does not fulfill the requirements of Rule 8. *Jiggetts v. Dist. of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Cooper v. Dist. of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017). Put differently, “[a] confused and rambling narrative of charges and conclusions . . . does not comply with the

requirements of Rule 8.” *Cheeks v. Fort Myer Constr. Corp.*, 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Plaintiff’s Complaint falls squarely into this category, failing to provide the Court or Defendants with adequate notice of a claim, and falling short of establishing the Court’s subject matter jurisdiction. See *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007) (“we do not require heightened fact pleading of specifics, but only enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face”); see also *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679 (2009) (“Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will . . . be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.”). Accordingly, this matter is dismissed without prejudice. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: June 1, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER

United States District Judge

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LOUIS A. BANKS, et al.,)) Plaintiffs,)) Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-00852 (UNA) v.)) GLEN
FARELLO, et al.,)) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint, ECF No. 1, and his Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”), ECF No. 2. Upon review, the Court grants Plaintiff’s IFP Application, and for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this matter without prejudice. Plaintiff Louis A. Banks brings this matter on his own behalf and on behalf of his minor child. He sues approximately 30 defendants, consisting of state and federal agencies and officials in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. He demands equitable relief and at least \$500 million for damages arising from multiple alleged government conspiracies to retaliate against him for filing various lawsuits. 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), and here, the Complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires a pleading 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). Plaintiff’s allegations are vague and broad, rather than clear and direct, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1), and the paragraphs are not limited to a single set of circumstances, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(b). When, as here, a pleading “contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold

conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments [,]" it does not fulfill the requirements of Rule 8. *Jiggetts v. Dist. of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff'd sub nom. Cooper v. Dist. of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017). Put differently, "[a] confused and rambling narrative of charges and conclusions . . . does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8." *Cheeks v. Fort Myer Constr. Corp.*, 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Plaintiff's Complaint falls squarely into this category, failing to provide the Court or Defendants with adequate notice of a claim, and falling short of establishing the Court's subject matter jurisdiction. See *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007) ("we do not require heightened fact pleading of specifics, but only enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face"); see also *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679 (2009) ("Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will . . . be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense."). Accordingly, this matter is dismissed without prejudice. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: June 1, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER

United States District Judge