

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, RICHMOND DIVISION

Almudhafer v. Spotsylvania Volunteer Rescue Squad, et al.

Almudhafer · No. 3:25CV1057 (RCY) · Decided January 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia grants Samir Almudhafer’s application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court dismisses the proposed complaint for failing to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, but permits the action to proceed temporarily and orders the plaintiff to show cause by filing an amended complaint explaining why the action should not be dismissed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Roderick C. Young
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division
DECIDED	January 7, 2026
DOCKET	3:25CV1057 (RCY)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and screened his proposed complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the court must screen an in forma pauperis complaint and dismiss it if, among other things, it fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. A complaint must contain enough facts to state a claim that is plausible on its face and must comply with Rule 8.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Samir Almudhafer v. Spotsylvania Volunteer Rescue Squad, et al.

TOPICS

pleadings

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Federal courts

Pleading standards

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis should be granted based on the financial information submitted.
2. Whether the proposed complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8's requirement of a short, plain, concise, and direct statement of the claims.
3. Whether the action should be dismissed immediately or whether Plaintiff should be given an opportunity to file an amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted Plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis based on the financial information in his application.
2. The complaint violated Rule 8 because it did not provide a short, plain, concise, and direct statement showing that Plaintiff was entitled to relief.
3. Although the complaint was dismissed for violating Rule 8, the court declined to dismiss the action in its entirety at that time and ordered Plaintiff to show cause by filing an amended complaint addressing the identified deficiencies.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Plaintiff's Complaint contains no "short and plain statement," nor is it "concise and direct."" (II. ANALYSIS)

"Instead, Plaintiff will be ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE why this action should not be dismissed by filing an Amended Complaint addressing the deficiencies noted." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Samir Almudhafer, proceeding pro se, submitted a 126-page proposed complaint with his application to proceed in forma pauperis. The complaint's pages appeared shuffled and out of order and contained convoluted, redundant narratives and intersecting legal and doctrinal conclusions. The court concluded that identifying viable claims would require it to articulate essential elements and devise arguments on Plaintiff's behalf.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff submitted an application to proceed without prepaying fees or costs along with a 126-page proposed complaint. The court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis but found that the complaint violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because it was not short, plain, concise, or direct. Rather than dismissing the action

immediately, the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause by filing an amended complaint addressing the deficiencies.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Bing v. Brivo Sys., LLC, 959 F.3d 605, 618 (4th Cir. 2020)
- Britt v. Dejoy, 45 F.4th 790, 795-96 (4th Cir. 2022)
- Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Powhatan Cnty. Sch. Bd. v. Skinger, No. 3:24-CV-874 (REP), 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104564, at *19-24 (E.D. Va. June 2, 2025)
- Holsey v. Collins, 90 F.R.D. 122, 124, 129 (D. Md. 1981)