

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Roy Hartman v. Tanshanna Golden, et al.

Hartman · No. CIV-26-831-D · Decided April 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma dismissed Roy Hartman’s pro se complaint without prejudice for failing to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. The court found that the complaint did not provide sufficient facts showing entitlement to relief or allege a jurisdictional basis, and permitted Hartman to file an amended complaint within 14 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Timothy D. DeGiusti
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	April 17, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-26-831-D
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court reviewed Plaintiff's pro se complaint for compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the complaint for compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and construed the pro se pleading liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Roy Hartman v. Tanshanna Golden, et al.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- fourteenth amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)'s requirements for stating the grounds for jurisdiction, a claim showing entitlement to relief, and the relief sought.
2. Whether a pro se litigant is excused from complying with Rule 8.

HOLDINGS

1. Pro se litigants are not excused from Rule 8's requirements, although their pleadings must be liberally construed.
2. The complaint failed to comply with Rule 8 because it alleged no facts showing entitlement to relief and failed to allege a jurisdictional basis.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 8 requires a complaint to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction...; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought.”” (1)

“Although a pro se complaint must be liberally construed, “the court cannot take on the responsibility of serving as the litigant’s attorney in constructing arguments and searching the record.”” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roy Hartman's complaint contained a single allegation that Defendants violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights. It did not plead facts supporting a claim for relief or identify a basis for federal jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint alleging only that Defendants violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights. The district court dismissed the complaint without prejudice for failure to plead facts showing entitlement to relief and failure to allege a jurisdictional basis, while allowing Plaintiff 14 days to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA ROY HARTMAN,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. CIV-26-831-D) TANSHANNA GOLDEN, et al.,)) Defendants.) ORDER Before the Court is Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint [Doc. No. 1]. Upon review, the Court finds that the Complaint does not comply with Federal Rule of

Civil Procedure 8. Rule 8 requires a complaint to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction...; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought.” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 8(a). Pro se litigants are not excused from Rule 8’s requirements. See *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991) (“[A] pro se plaintiff requires no special legal training to recount the facts surrounding his alleged injury, and he must provide such facts if the court is to determine whether he makes out a claim on which relief can be granted.”).

Although a pro se complaint must be liberally construed, “the court cannot take on the responsibility of serving as the litigant’s attorney in constructing arguments and searching the record.” *Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer*, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005). Plaintiff’s Complaint consists of one allegation— “Defendants violated fourteenth amendment rights.” [Doc.

No. 1]. Plaintiff fails to plead any facts that show he is entitled to relief. Further, Plaintiff fails to allege a jurisdictional basis for his complaint. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint [Doc. No. 1] is DISMISSED without prejudice. Within 14 days from the issuance of this Order, Plaintiff may file an amended complaint that complies with Rule 8(a).

If no pleading 1s filed within 14 days, this action will be dismissed without prejudice as to a future filing and without further notice. IT IS SO ORDERED this 17" day of April, 2026. \ ~ Nd Ost
TIMOTHY D. DeGIUSTI Chief United States District Judge