

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Anthony Brian Mallgren v. United States of America

Mallgren · No. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01011 (UNA) · Decided June 1, 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 because its allegations are unclear, conclusory, and insufficient to establish subject-matter jurisdiction.

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 1, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01011 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On initial review of a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis, the court granted the application but dismissed the complaint without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial review of a pro se complaint for compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and for the existence of subject matter jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Anthony Brian Mallgren v. United States of America

TOPICS

- pleadings
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), 8(d)(1), and 10(b).
2. Whether the complaint adequately established the district court's subject matter jurisdiction.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed without prejudice on initial review.

HOLDINGS

1. A pro se complaint must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and a complaint consisting of unclear, conclusory, confused, and rambling allegations that fails to provide fair notice does not satisfy Rule 8.
2. A complaint that fails to establish the court's subject matter jurisdiction is subject to dismissal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.”

“A confused and rambling narrative of charges and conclusions . . . does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a New York resident, sued the United States based on broad allegations concerning an allegedly lost patent application, government and state institutions, Medicare and Medicaid, education, social services, and alleged violations of human rights. He also sought repeal of the Eleventh Amendment and a declaration that the prohibition of medically assisted suicide is unconstitutional. The court found that the allegations were confused, conclusory, and insufficient to identify a cognizable claim or establish jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against the United States and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the in forma pauperis application, conducted its initial review, and dismissed the complaint without prejudice because it failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and did not adequately establish subject matter jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239–40 (D.D.C. 1987)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009)
- Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668–71 (D.C. Cir. 2004)
- Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977)

- Jiggetts v. District of Columbia, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), aff'd sub nom. Cooper v. District of Columbia, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017)
- Cheeks v. Fort Myer Construction Corp., 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-columbia/2026/anthony-brian-mallgren-v-united-states-of-america-e1iajkat>