

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-7190**September Term, 2024****1:24-cv-00384-RBW****Filed On: July 23, 2025**

Audrey Clement,

Appellant

v.

Washington Post,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Millett, Pillard, and Katsas, Circuit Judges

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 briefs filed by the parties. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's December 11, 2024 order be affirmed. The district court correctly dismissed appellant's complaint for failure to state a claim because, even assuming appellee is covered under the Age Discrimination Act, appellant did not exhaust her administrative remedies, as required by the Act. See 42 U.S.C. § 6104(e)(2) ("No action [in district court] shall be brought . . . if administrative remedies have not been exhausted."). Appellant concedes her failure to exhaust, but argues that she should be excused from this requirement. However, she has shown no basis for excusing this statutory and mandatory requirement. See Ross v. Blake, 578 U.S. 632, 638-40 (2016).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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