

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

**No. 24-5271**

**September Term, 2024**

**1:24-cv-02367-UNA**

**Filed On: April 28, 2025**

Shasta Casey Howell-McCallum, also known  
as Shasta Casey Howell,

Appellant

v.

United States of America,

Appellee

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

**BEFORE:** Henderson, Millett, and Walker, 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 October 31, 2024 order be affirmed on the ground that appellant’s complaint did not meet the minimum pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). See Chambers v. Burwell, 824 F.3d 141, 143 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (stating that this court “may affirm the district court on any ground supported by the record”). 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.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (alteration in original) (citation omitted).

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 24-5271**

**September Term, 2024**

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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:**  
Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Daniel J. Reidy  
Deputy Clerk