

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-5249

September Term, 2015

1:15-cv-01185-UNA

Filed On: January 19, 2016

Robert G. Modrall,

Appellant

v.

Marie A. O'Rourke,

Appellee

Consolidated with 15-5261

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

BEFORE: Kavanaugh and Pillard, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg, Senior Judge

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 July 22, 2015, dismissing the complaint for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in so ruling. See Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668 (D.C. Cir. 2004). Rule 8 requires a "short and plain statement of the claim" that gives the defendant fair notice of the claims against her, see id. at 670 & n.9, and the underlying complaint failed to satisfy that minimum standard. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)) (Rule 8 pleading standard does not require "detailed factual allegations," but demands more than an "unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation").

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-5249

September Term, 2015

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

Ken Meadows

Deputy Clerk/LD