

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Stephanie Mykonos v. DC Govt

Mykonos · No. Civil Action No. 26-1602 (UNA) · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants the plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismisses the pro se complaint without prejudice. The court finds that the complaint lacks factual allegations supporting an actionable claim under the District’s Human Rights Act and fails to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a).

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. 26-1602 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and her pro se complaint sua sponte.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A pro se complaint is construed under a less stringent standard than a lawyer-drafted pleading, but it must still comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and satisfy Rule 8(a)'s pleading requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Stephanie Mykonos v. DC Govt

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- health law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the pro se complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)'s requirement of a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief.
2. Whether the complaint contained sufficient factual allegations to state a viable claim under the District's Human Rights Act based on the denial of Medicaid benefits.

HOLDINGS

1. Although a pro se complaint is held to a less stringent standard, a pro se litigant must still comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
2. The complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8(a) because it contained no factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim and did not identify the connection between plaintiff's asserted protected characteristics and her eligibility for Medicaid benefits; dismissal without prejudice was therefore proper.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It "does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." (1)

"The Court dismisses the complaint for the simple reason that there are no factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim." (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint appeared to allege that the District violated the District's Human Rights Act based on pregnancy status, age, and homeless status when it denied plaintiff Medicaid benefits. The complaint did not provide factual allegations connecting pregnancy or age to plaintiff's eligibility for benefits, and it was unclear whether plaintiff was pregnant or over age forty. The court concluded that the complaint contained no factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the in forma pauperis application and dismissed the complaint without prejudice because it lacked factual allegations supporting a viable legal claim.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
- Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STEPHANIE MYKONOS,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 26-1602 (UNA))) DC GOVT,)) Defendant.)
MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the court on plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, and pro se complaint, ECF No. 1.

The Court grants the application and dismisses the complaint without prejudice. The Court holds a pro se complaint to a "less stringent standard[]" than is applied to a pleading drafted by a lawyer. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Still, a pro se litigant must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C.

1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). It "does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quotations omitted).

The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer, mount an adequate defense, and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. See *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). 1 The Court dismisses the complaint for the simple reason that there are no factual allegations supporting an actual legal claim.

Rather, the complaint appears to allege the District violated its District's Human Rights Act "on the basis of pregnancy status, age... [and] homeless status," Compl. at 1, when it denied Medicaid benefits, see *id.* While plaintiff appears to be homeless, it is not clear that she is pregnant and/or over age 40, such that she herself has a viable claim under the Act.

Nor does the complaint identify the connection between pregnancy or age to and plaintiff's eligibility for benefits. As drafted, the complaint falls well short of Rule 8's minimal pleading standard, and the Court will dismiss it without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion. DATE: June 1, 2026 /s/ CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER United States District Judge 2