

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 17-7148

September Term, 2017

1:17-cv-01957-UNA

Filed On: April 5, 2018

L. Ruther,

Appellant

v.

State of Michigan and Michigan Bar
Association,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Henderson and Tatel, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg, Senior Circuit
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 and supplement 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 stay the order,” it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s October 4, 2017 order be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing appellant’s case without prejudice on the ground that the complaint did not meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). See Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). Appellant’s complaint did not contain a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction or of the claim showing that he is entitled to relief. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the “motion to stay the order” be denied.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 17-7148

September Term, 2017

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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