

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

EUGENE F. LYNCH, et al.

Defendants.

RODNEY F. STICH

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM REHNQUIST, et al

Defendants.

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICHARD THOURNBURGH, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-2940

(Stanley Sporkin)

FILED

JAN 17 1990

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 89-2941

Civil Action No. 89-2973

(N)

11

RODNEY F. STICH,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-2974 *file in*

RODNEY F. STICH,
Plaintiff,
v.
RICHARD THORNBURGH, et al.
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-3350

ORDER

Upon consideration of the plaintiff's complaints in the above-captioned actions, and for the reasons stated in the accompanying opinion, it is hereby

ORDERED that the above captioned cases are dismissed without prejudice.

DATE:

11/6/97

Stanley Sporkin
Stanley Sporkin
United States District Court

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JAN 17 1990

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

EUGENE F. LYNCH, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-2940
(Stanley Sporkin) *W. M.*

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM REHNQUIST, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-2941

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICHARD THORNBURGH,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 89-2973

RODNEY F. STICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 89-2974

RODNEY F. STICH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 89-3350
)	
RICHARD THORNBURGH, <u>et al.</u>)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The above captioned cases are hereby consolidated for consideration by the Court.

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, is a serial litigator who has instituted a plethora of similar or even identical cases over the past fifteen years. See e.g. Stich v. United States Department of Justice, et al., No. 86-2523 (D.D.C. March 27, 1987); aff'd No. 87-5262 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 4, 1988); Stich v. United States of America et al., No. 89-2060 (D.D.C. Sep. 27, 1989). The complaints uniformly allege a wide-ranging three- pronged government conspiracy relating to air-traffic safety, combined with efforts to penalize and harrass plaintiff for his efforts as a Federal Aviation Administration employee attempting to bring the "safety conspiracies" to the public's attention.

As best as can be understood, the first stage of the alleged conspiracy commenced in 1963. At that time, plaintiff allegedly uncovered fraud and misconduct in connection with federal air

safety laws. This misconduct was ongoing through 1974 at which point the second stage of the conspiracy began. This phase apparently involved a judicial cover-up of the previously discovered air-safety violations that extended upwards to the highest reaches of the judicial community. The third stage, aimed directly at silencing plaintiff, was allegedly the outgrowth of a "sham" divorce action filed against the plaintiff, the result of which has been the loss of plaintiff's property, freedom, and health.

Each of the above-captioned cases centers around this purported conspiracy. Save for differences between the individual government officials named as defendants, and in the type of relief sought the lawsuits all are founded upon the same conspiracy theory. The complaints are uniformly verbose, unclear, and imprecise. None of the complaints, the shortest of which is 66 pages, discusses any specifics of the fraud or misconduct uncovered by plaintiff. Furthermore, no actions of the alleged conspirators, except for the filing of the "sham" divorce action are delineated. Rather, the bulk of each complaint is a rambling diatribe against the numerous government officials, government agencies, and private citizens who at some point since 1963 have come into contact with plaintiff in some ways regarding this perceived conspiracy.

Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure mandates that a complaint "shall contain... a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief..."


This rule is designed "to give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer, prepare an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata is applicable." Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977) (citing 2A Moore, Federal Practice para. 8.13; 5 Wright & Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure section 1217). All pleadings shall be construed so as to do substantial justice. Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 8(f).

The Court is mindful that plaintiff is proceeding pro se. A pro se complaint, however, is "subject to dismissal if the pleading party fails reasonably to inform the adverse party of the asserted cause of action." Brown, 75 F.R.D. at 499. Plaintiffs' complaints fail to meet this standard due to their size, lack of precise allegations, and general overall confusion. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the above-captioned actions for failure to comply with Rule 8(a).

A separate order shall accompany this opinion.

DATE:

1/16/90




Stanley Sporckin
United States District Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Motion for Summary Affirmance has been sent to appellant pro se by first-class, United States mail, postage prepaid this second day of April 1990, addressed as follows:

Rodney Stich
Post Office Box 5
Alamo, CA 94507


WILLIAM J. DEMPSTER
Assistant United States Attorney
Room 4112
Judiciary Center Building
555 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 272-9204