



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