

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-7049

September Term, 2013

FILED ON: JANUARY 22, 2014

WADE ROBERTSON,
APPELLANT

v.

WILLIAM C. CARTINHOOR, JR., ET AL.,
APPELLEES

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
(No. 1:11-cv-01919)

Before: GARLAND, *Chief Judge*, HENDERSON, *Circuit Judge*, and EDWARDS, *Senior
Circuit Judge*

J U D G M E N T

This case 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). The court has accorded the issues full consideration and determined they do not warrant a published opinion. *See* D.C. Cir. Rule 36(d).

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the contested actions of the District Court are hereby affirmed. Robertson's recusal motion was properly denied for the reasons given by the District Court. *Robertson v. Cartinhour, Jr.*, No. 11-cv-01919 (D.D.C. March 16, 2012), *reprinted in* Joint Appendix 1528. And, as set forth in Parts III-VI of the District Court's opinion, Robertson's complaint was properly dismissed because it fails to state a viable legal claim upon which relief could be granted. *Robertson v. Cartinhour, Jr.*, 867 F. Supp. 2d 37, 53-60 (D.D.C. 2012).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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 rehearing en banc. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 41; D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Jennifer M. Clark
Deputy Clerk