## United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 14-5087

September Term, 2014

1:14-cv-00507-UNA

**Filed On:** April 30, 2015

Raheem Muhammad,

**Appellant** 

٧.

Kim Dine, United States Capitol Police, et al.,

**Appellees** 

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

**BEFORE:** Griffith, Kavanaugh, and Wilkins\*, Circuit Judges

## JUDGMENT

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. <u>See</u> 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 March 26, 2014 be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing appellant's complaint and civil action without prejudice for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). See, e.g., Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

## **Per Curiam**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup> Judge Wilkins would remand the case for reconsideration of the dismissal of appellant's complaint and civil action in light of the statute of limitations concerns raised in appellant's motion concerning the filing date, granted in the dismissal order, and his filing of a motion to amend his original complaint. See Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 672, 674 (D.C. Cir. 2004).