

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CHRISTOPHER EARL STRUNK, *et al.*,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT)
OF STATE, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Case No. 14-995 (RJL)

FILED
JUN 16 2014

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia


MEMORANDUM ORDER

(June 13 2014; Dkt. #1)

Pro se plaintiffs Christopher Earl Strunk and H. William Van Allen (together “plaintiffs”) filed the instant action on June 10, 2014. *See* Complaint with Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Preliminary Injunction Hearing [Dkt. #1]. Upon consideration of the facts alleged in the plaintiffs’ papers and the relevant law, the Court DENIES plaintiffs’ Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Preliminary Injunction Hearing and DISMISSES plaintiffs’ Complaint.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are clear that although “[n]o technical form is required,” pleadings must be “simple, concise, and direct.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1). The Court is mindful, of course, that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Despite this less stringent standard, however, I am unable to glean from the plaintiffs’ papers any legitimate grounds for granting the relief


they are seeking. Furthermore, the statements contained in the plaintiffs' pleadings fall well short of the "simple, concise, and direct" requirements of Rule 8(d)(1).

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Preliminary Injunction Hearing is **DENIED**, and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED.



RICHARD J. LEON
United States District Judge