

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7074**September Term, 2020****1:20-cv-01598-UNA****Filed On:** January 4, 2021

Louis A. Banks and DB, Minor,

Appellants

v.

District of Columbia, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Pillard and Rao, 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 on 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 June 29, 2020 order dismissing appellant's complaint, and the district court's July 29, 2020 order denying appellant's motions to reopen the case and amend the complaint, be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that the complaint failed to meet the minimum pleading standards of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant's motion to reopen the case and to amend the complaint. See Peyton v. DiMario, 287 F.3d 1121, 1125 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (district court's denial of motion for relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) reviewed for abuse of discretion); Hettinga v. United States, 677 F.3d 471, 480 (district court did not abuse discretion in denying motion to amend complaint where amendment would have been futile).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7074

September Term, 2020

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk