

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS April 3, 2013
TENTH CIRCUIT Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

RON GATEWOOD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VETERANS AFFAIRS; PSL/et-all;
VETERAN AFFAIRS; VA
HOSPITAL ENROLLMENT ADM.;
DR. BRIAN REISS; DEPT OF
LABOR AND EMPLMENT (sic);
DR. ROBERT KAWASSAKI; HOLLY
HEALTHCARE SYS.; CCIA
INSURANCE; PENNICOL
INSURANCE; WORKERS COMP.;
PSL/HOSPITAL; HOLLY HEALTH
OCCP; KAISER PERMANETE (sic);
DR. COUILLE; DR. J. TASH
BERTON; DR. LOEFFER; DR. ED
BAKER; DR. GRABOWSKI,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-1037

(D.C. No. 1:12-CV-03118-LTB)

(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **BRISCOE**, Chief Judge, and **ANDERSON** and **TYMKOVICH**, Circuit Judges.

*This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

Ron Gatewood, proceeding *pro se*, appeals an order dismissing his amended complaint. After Mr. Gatewood filed his initial complaint, Magistrate Judge Boland entered an order finding that his complaint was unintelligible and failed to meet the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Mr. Gatewood was directed to file an amended complaint that set forth a short and plain statement of his claims showing that he is entitled to relief, that identified the proper basis of jurisdiction for his claims, and that named proper defendants. The court's order provided Mr. Gatewood with clear and specific guidance and authorities to enable him to amend his complaint appropriately.

Despite these directives, Mr. Gatewood's amended complaint was no more coherent than his first one. The court accordingly dismissed his action and denied Mr. Gatewood *in forma pauperis* status on appeal, having determined that any appeal from the court's order would not be taken in good faith.

After paying the full filing fee, Mr. Gatewood has appealed the district court's dismissal. Unfortunately, his appellate brief is equally incomprehensible. Because the district court explained to Mr. Gatewood what a proper pleading should contain, we do not reiterate those requirements.

We therefore AFFIRM the dismissal of this matter.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Stephen H. Anderson
Circuit Judge