

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 09-7115

September Term 2009

1:09-cv-01892-UNA

Filed On: January 5, 2010

Jerome Julius Brown,

Appellant

v.

Jerry D. Miller,

Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Sentelle, Chief Judge, and Ginsburg and Brown, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief and supplement thereto filed by the appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order filed October 5, 2009, be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed appellant's complaint on the ground that it did not meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). See Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). That rule requires "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). To comply with this rule, the complaint should identify the "circumstances, occurrences, and events" that support the claim for relief. Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 556 n.3 (2007) (citation omitted). The dismissal without prejudice allows appellant to file a new complaint that meets these requirements. See Ciralsky, 355 F.3d at 671.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 09-7115

September Term 2009

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam