

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

JEFFREY STUART KILGORE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-00498 (UNA)
	)	
SATOSHI NAKAMOTO, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed a civil complaint (“Compl.”), ECF No. 1, and an application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), ECF No. 2. The court grants plaintiff’s IFP application and, for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this matter without prejudice.

Plaintiff, a resident of the District of Columbia, sues “Bitcoin,” and ostensibly, two of its developers. *See* Compl. at 1–2, 4. The allegations are vague and spare. Plaintiff states, without any context, that “the company,” presumably Bitcoin, “was designed together and the owner agreed to 50/50 profit sharing.” *See* Compl. at 4. He demands approximately \$15 billion in “dividends since 2018.” *See id.* He does not identify a single cause of action, nor does he cite to any legal authority. No other information or details are provided.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Federal Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668–71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate

defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Here, neither the court nor the defendants have received adequate notice of plaintiff's intended claims. Plaintiff's allegations are ambiguous, at best, but a complaint's "allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted). Because plaintiff has failed to state a discernible claim, and has also failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction in this court, this case is dismissed without prejudice. A separate order of dismissal accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: April 8, 2025

Tanya S. Chutkan

TANYA S. CHUTKAN
United States District Judge