

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-7029

September Term, 2023

1:23-cv-03478-UNA

Filed On: June 26, 2024

Inez Qtaish,

Appellant

v.

Steven J. Malman and Phillip L Radmer,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Wilkins, Childs, and Pan, 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 entered December 13, 2023, be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed appellant’s complaint for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). Appellant’s complaint did not set forth “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” which is required in order to “give the defendant[] fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Jones v. Kirchner*, 835 F.3d 74, 79 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (citing *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk