

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5040

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-03753-UNA

Filed On: July 17, 2023

Loretta Jean Alford,

Appellant

v.

Jeffrey Koses, Chairman, Committee for
Purchase/AbilityOne, et al.,

Appellees

BEFORE: Millett and Pillard, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, Senior Circuit
Judge

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing, it is

ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk

~~HA~~ AI

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5040

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-03753-UNA

Filed On: July 25, 2023 [2009533]

Loretta Jean Alford,

Appellant

v.

Jeffrey Koses, Chairman, Committee for
Purchase/AbilityOne, et al.,

Appellees

MANDATE

In accordance with the judgment of June 16, 2023, and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41, this constitutes the formal mandate of this court.

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk

[Link to the judgment filed June 16, 2023](#)

A2

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5040

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-03753-UNA

Filed On: June 16, 2023

Loretta Jean Alford,

Appellant

v.

Jeffrey Koses, Chairman, Committee for
Purchase/AbilityOne, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Millett and Pillard, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, 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 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 February 7, 2023, order be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed appellant's case without prejudice 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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

~~102~~ A3

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5040

September Term, 2022

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

103A4

23-5040

Loretta Jean Alford
15190 Brickwood Drive
Unit #103
Woodbridge, VA 22193

~~104~~ AS

United States Court of Appeals

For The District of Columbia

No 23-5040

1:22-cv-03753-UNA

Filed on June 16, 2023

Loretta Jean Alford

Appellant

v.

Jeffrey Koses, Chairman, Committee for

Purchase/Abilityone, et. al.,

Appellees

Petition for Rehearing

Loretta Jean Alford

Pro se representation

15190 Brickwood Dr., #103

Woodbridge, VA 22193

~~LOS~~ AL

I, the Appellant, Loretta Jean Alford, files for a petition for rehearing and that in the District's court's judgment, one or more of the following situations exist:

1. A material factual or legal matter of law was overlooked in the decision.

STATEMENT

Javits-Wagner-O-Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8502(i))

At the District level Appellant provided a copy of the Javits-Wagner-O-Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8502(i), specifically, Administrative Support Services – **“The Administrator of General Services Administrator should provide to the Committee, on a reimbursable basis, administrative support services the Committee request”**. None of the corrective actions were processed by the General Services Administrator. The Committee for Purchase/Abilityone took upon themselves to process corrective actions in violation of the Javits-Wagner-O-Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8502(i).

Therefore, I demand to be reinstated with all backpay. Jurisdiction has already been established.

(This law and the actions taken against Appellant has already been submitted in the case file and somehow was overlooked).

Law (Exhibit E, pages E8-10, specifically page 10);

Corrective Actions (Exhibit E pages 128-142) and Exhibit pages E159-160).

Certificate of Compliance

I, Loretta Jean Alford confirm compliance with Time New Roman and a 14point typeset with 250 words.

Loretta J Alford

Loretta Jean Alford

June ~~24~~, 2023
24, 2023

Date



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PRINCE WILLIAM
3363 POST OFFICE RD
WOODBRIIDGE, VA 22193-9996
(800) 275-8777

06/24/2023

01:31 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
---------	-----	------------	-------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.22
-------------------------------------	---	--	--------

Washington, DC 20001

Weight: 3 lb 4.30 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 06/25/2023

Certified Mail®

\$4.15

Tracking #:

70221670000317969855

Total \$6.37

Grand Total: \$6.37

Debit Card Remit \$6.37

Card Name: VISA

Account #: XXXXXXXXXXXX9381

Approval #: 003677

Transaction #: 718

Receipt #: 057703

Debit Card Purchase: \$6.37

AID: A0000000980840 Contactless

AL: US DEBIT

Text you
to get:

8777 (2USPS)
Standard Message

U.S. Postal Service™

CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Washington, DC

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee \$4.15

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (hardcopy)	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (electronic)	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Required	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery	\$0.00

Postage \$2.22

Total Postage and Fees \$6.37

0318
35

Postmark
Here

06/24/2023

Sent to
U.S. Court of Appeals (Clerk)
333 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington DC 20004-2866

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047

See Reverse for Instructions

AIO 109

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5040

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-03753-UNA

Filed On: June 2, 2023

Loretta Jean Alford,

Appellant

v.

Jeffrey Koses, Chairman, Committee for
Purchase/AbilityOne, et al.,

Appellees

BEFORE: Millett and Pillard, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, Senior Circuit
Judge

ORDER

The court concludes, on its own motion, that oral argument will not assist the court in this case. Accordingly, the court will dispose of the appeal without oral argument on the basis of the record and the presentations in appellant's brief. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j).

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Laura M. Morgan
Deputy Clerk

All 100

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LORETTA JEAN ALFORD,

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY KOSES *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 22-3753 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This action, brought *pro se*, is before the Court on review of Plaintiff's Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights Complaint, ECF No. 1, and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint.

Complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Still, *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). It "does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). A complaint that is "rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material will patently fail [Rule 8(a)'s] standard," as will one containing "an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated." *Jiggetts v. District of Columbia*,

N30 81 A22

319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff'd sub nom. Cooper v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017) (cleaned up).

The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer, mount an adequate defense, and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *See Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). The standard also assists the court in determining whether it has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Plaintiff, a resident of Woodbridge, Virginia, has submitted a 25-page rambling complaint against twelve defendants and 525 pages of exhibits. The complaint appears to arise from events that took place in an employment setting years ago, but it fails sorely to provide adequate notice of a claim and the basis of federal court jurisdiction. Consequently, this case will be dismissed by separate order.

Date: February 7, 2023

/s/
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS
United States District Judge

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**