

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Brett Alan Hodson v. US Court Western District

Hodson · No. CIV-26-09-R · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma dismissed Brett Alan Hodson’s pro se amended complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2). The court also denied as moot the plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and related report and recommendation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-26-09-R
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte reviewed a pro se amended complaint and dismissed it without prejudice for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the pleading standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), requiring a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief and more than conclusory allegations or an assertion that the defendant unlawfully harmed the plaintiff.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

pleadings civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the amended complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) by providing an intelligible, short and plain statement showing that the plaintiff was entitled to relief.

2. Whether the amended complaint should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8(a)(2) because it did not provide a coherent factual basis for any cognizable claim and therefore did not adequately show that the plaintiff was entitled to relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires a pleading to contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”” (at 1)

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

““[C]onclusory allegations without supporting factual averments are insufficient to state a claim on which relief can be based.”” (at 1)

“The Amended Complaint is devoid of a coherent factual basis for any cognizable claim and therefore fails to state a claim.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The pro se plaintiff filed an amended complaint against the United States Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. The court found that the amended complaint lacked a coherent factual basis for any cognizable claim and contained insufficient factual allegations to support relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an amended complaint against the United States Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. The court reviewed the amended complaint under its inherent docket-management authority, dismissed it without prejudice for failure to state a claim, withdrew the referral of the application to proceed in forma pauperis, and denied the pending report and recommendation and IFP application as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mann v. Boatright, 477 F.3d 1140, 1148 (10th Cir. 2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)