

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5248

September Term, 2023

1:23-cv-02140-UNA

Filed On: February 16, 2024

David Allen Wilson,

Appellant

v.

United States Department of Justice, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Katsas, Rao, and Garcia, 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). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion to appoint counsel, it is

ORDERED that the motion to appoint counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's October 27, 2023 order be affirmed. The district court did not err by dismissing the case without prejudice for failure to comply with the pleading standards of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), which requires "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," see Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 669-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004), and for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5248

September Term, 2023

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

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: */s/*
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk