

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 10-5374

September Term 2010

1:10-cv-01918-UNA

Filed On: February 22, 2011

Joseph Slovynec,

Appellant

v.

District of Columbia Department of
Employment Services,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Sentelle, Chief Judge, and Ginsburg and Griffith, 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 filed by appellant. It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order filed November 8, 2010, be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the complaint with prejudice because 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). The district court correctly concluded that the complaint, as well as appellant's motion for reconsideration of the dismissal, failed to give the defendant "fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 550 (2007) (internal quotation marks and ellipsis omitted).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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