

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Flores v. Glover House

Flores · No. 25-04518 (UNA) · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grants Plaintiff Valerie Flores leave to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses her pro se complaint against Glover House. The court concludes that the complaint fails to provide sufficient factual allegations or fair notice of a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rudolph Contreras
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	25-04518 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se action transferred from the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York; the court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- pleading sufficiency

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Plaintiff's pro se complaint stated a claim and provided sufficient factual allegations and fair notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.
- Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 because it did not allege facts about the named defendant or otherwise provide sufficient facts to give the defendant fair notice of the claim and the grounds on which it rested; the complaint was therefore dismissed.
2. The court granted Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Although pro se complaints are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), they must comport with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987).” (2)

“Plaintiff has not alleged any facts about the named defendant, much less sufficient facts to give it “fair notice” of a claim and the grounds on which it rests.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a New York resident, alleged that an unidentified white male tenant or guest entered the apartment building lobby three times during her work shift and sought an injunction against that person and a vehicle owner. She also alleged that she was denied housing elsewhere because of an allegedly malicious and false report by a former landlord, while claiming \$75,000 for personal injury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint against Glover House in the Northern District of New York. The action was transferred to the District of Columbia, which granted Plaintiff's in forma pauperis application and dismissed the complaint for failure to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.

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. Whole Foods Mkt. Grp., 789 F.3d 146, 150 (D.C. Cir. 2015)
- Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977)
- Jones v. Kirchner, 835 F.3d 74, 79 (D.C. Cir. 2016)

OPINION

Flores v. Glover House

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VALERIE FLORES,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 25-04518 (UNA)))

GLOVER HOUSE,)

) Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

In this pro se action transferred from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York, Plaintiff, a resident of Albany, New York, sues The Glover House Apartments in Washington, D.C., asserting “target harassment by a tenant/guest & potentially an employee.” Compl., ECF No. 1 at 3. Transferred with the complaint is Plaintiff’s motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. For the following reasons, the Court grants the in forma pauperis application and dismisses the complaint. In the form Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that during her “8 hour 2nd shift” on an unspecified date, a “white male tenant or guest came down into the lobby 3 different times[.]” Compl., ECF No. 1 at 4. She describes the man’s clothing and asserts that on the third occasion “others” were in the lobby, including “an older white male wearing a shirt that said ‘Redbird.’ ” Id. Plaintiff seeks “an injunction against” Redbird, “white Lexus owner w/Maryland plates” because the Lexus was “speeding by me in that area.” Id. As for the amount in controversy, Plaintiff writes “\$75k personal injury.” Id. But in a seemingly unrelated claim, she states that she “was denied housing elsewhere over a \$40 error” she “felt was malicious & false reporting by [an old] landlord.” Id. Although pro se complaints are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), they must comport with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Under Rule 8, a complaint must contain a short and plain statement of (1) the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction, (2) the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) the relief demanded. 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) (cleaned up). Thus, the pleader must allege enough facts to permit a court “to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct.” *Brown v. Whole Foods Mkt. Grp.*, 789 F.3d 146, 150 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (cleaned up). The pleading rules ensure 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). Plaintiff has not alleged any facts about the named defendant, much less sufficient facts to give it “fair notice” of a claim and the grounds on which it rests. *Jones v. Kirchner*, 835 F.3d 74, 79 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (citation omitted). Therefore, this case will be dismissed by separate order. _____/s/_____

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS

Date: April 13, 2026 United States District Judge 2

