

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 13 2008

MOLLY DWYER, ACTING CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

PATRICK HUGH MORRISON,  
  
Plaintiff - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; et al.,  
  
Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-35488

D.C. No. CV-05-01387-DCA

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Donald C. Ashmanskas, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 26, 2008\*\*

Before: BEEZER, FERNANDEZ and McKEOWN, Circuit Judges.

Patrick Hugh Morrison appeals pro se from the district court's order  
dismissing without prejudice his action for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent  
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

8(a). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for abuse of discretion, *United States v. Barrera-Moreno*, 951 F.2d 1089, 1091 (9th Cir. 1991), and we affirm.

A complaint must contain a “short and plain statement” of the basis for jurisdiction and the claims for relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Morrison’s complaint contains a confusing array of vague and undeveloped allegations and does not allege sufficient facts or jurisdictional basis for any federal claim for relief. The district court, therefore, did not abuse its discretion by dismissing the action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). *See McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996).

The district court also did not abuse its discretion by denying his motion for clarification.

Morrison’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

Morrison’s motion to show cause is denied.

Appellees’ motion to appear is granted. The Clerk shall file appellees’ response brief, lodged on May 9, 2007.

**AFFIRMED.**