

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 10-5409

September Term 2010

1:10-cv-01903-UNA

Filed On: August 3, 2011

Joan Frances M. Malone,

Appellant

v.

United States District, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Sentelle, Chief Judge, and Garland 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 filed by 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 November 5, 2010, be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed appellant's complaint as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(E)(1)(B). See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Dismissal was also proper because the complaint failed to meet the minimal pleading requirements under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), which requires "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," in order 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, 555 (2007) (internal quotation marks 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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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