UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Bianca A. Hughley v. Baltimore County, Maryland, et al.

Civil No. 25-2705-BAH · No. Civil No. 25-2705-BAH · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland grants Bianca A. Hughley’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court finds that her 105-page amended complaint fails to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the court’s local pleading rules, and directs her to file a concise second amended complaint within 28 days. The court denies without prejudice as premature her motion seeking defendants’ last known addresses for service and warns that failure to comply will result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brendan A. Hurson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	Civil No. 25-2705-BAH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial screening of a pro se amended civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); the court granted in forma pauperis status, required a second amended complaint, and denied without prejudice a motion seeking defendants' last known addresses for service.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court conducted the mandatory initial screening required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), while liberally construing the pro se complaint and determining whether it was frivolous, failed to state a claim, or sought relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

pleadings · motion to amend · civil procedure · section 1983 · due process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure | civil rights | constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and 8(d)(1) and Local Rule 103.1.
2. Whether the court should permit Plaintiff to file a second amended complaint rather than dismiss the action at the initial screening stage.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motion seeking defendants' last known addresses for service should be granted before the filing and screening of a compliant amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint did not comply with Rule 8 or the applicable Local Rules because it was excessively lengthy, contained irrelevant or incomprehensible allegations, and failed to identify clearly which defendants were liable for which claims.
2. The court granted Plaintiff twenty-eight days to file a second amended complaint containing brief, concise, and clear factual allegations identifying the defendant or defendants liable for each claim.
3. The motion requesting defendants' last known addresses for service was denied without prejudice as premature.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2), a complaint must include "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.""* (Analysis § II.A)

> *"The amended complaint fails to comply with the standards outlined in Rule 8 and the Local Rules."* (Analysis § II.A)

> *"The Court "is not obliged to ferret through a [c]omplaint, searching for viable claims,""* (Analysis § II.A)

> *"Plaintiff is also reminded that "[p]leadings should be no longer than nécessaty and... shall not exceed forty (40) -pages in length.""* (Analysis § II.A)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's amended complaint named Baltimore County, Seneca Bay Apartments' owner, apartment personnel, police officials, and numerous police officers and asserted constitutional, Maryland Declaration of Rights, Maryland common-law, and Maryland Consumer Debt Collection Act claims. The pleading was 105 pages long, contained more than 597 numbered paragraphs, and included allegations whose connection to the asserted claims was unclear. The court also could not determine which defendants were allegedly liable for particular counts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis and later filed an amended complaint. The amended complaint asserted fourteen counts against Baltimore County, a private apartment owner, and numerous individual defendants, but the court found it excessively long, unclear, and noncompliant with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and Local Rule 103.1. The court granted leave to file a second amended complaint within twenty-eight days and denied the service-address motion as premature.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lomax v. Ortiz-Marques, 140 S. Ct. 1721, 1723 (2020)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Weller v. Department of Social Services for City of Baltimore, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990)
- Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Plumhoff v. Central Mortgage Co., 286 F. Supp. 3d 699, 701-02, 704 (D. Md.)
- T.M. v. District of Columbia, 961 F. Supp. 2d 169, 173-74 (D.D.C.)
- Stone v. Warfield, 184 F.R.D. 333, 555 (D. Md.)
- Wynn-Bey v. Talley, Civ. No. RWT-12-3121, 2012 WL 5986967, at *2 (D. Md. Nov. 28, 2012)
- Holsey v. Collins, 90 F.R.D. 122 (D. Md.)
- Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 499 (D.D.C.)
- Young v. City of Mount Rainier, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-maryland/2025/bianca-a-hughley-v-baltimore-county-maryland-et-al-pvi1cy8i