

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5423**September Term, 2025****1:25-cv-02754-UNA****Filed On:** June 10, 2026

Timothy R. Petrozzi,

Appellant

v.

Muriel Bowser, Mayor, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Pillard, Rao, and Childs, 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 brief filed by appellant and the supplements thereto. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, the motion to appoint counsel, the motion to supplement the record, and appellant's declaration, it is

ORDERED that the motion to appoint counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to supplement the record be denied. Appellant has not shown that supplementation of the record on appeal is appropriate under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10(e)(2)(C) or that it "would establish beyond any doubt the proper resolution of the pending issues" or otherwise would be "in the interests of justice," Colbert v. Potter, 471 F.3d 158, 165-66 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (citations omitted). It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order entered October 23, 2025 be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that the complaint failed to meet the minimal pleading standard set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). Appellant's complaint did not set forth "a short and plain statement of the claim

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5423**September Term, 2025**

showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” which is required in order to “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted). It is

FURTHER ORDERED, on the court’s own motion, that the Clerk not accept from appellant any further submissions in this case, except for one petition pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 40 and Circuit Rule 40, pending further order of the court.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk