

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 14-5142

September Term, 2014

1:14-cv-00642-UNA

Filed On: March 6, 2015

David E. Hill,

Appellant

v.

Rudolph Contreras, District Judge, in his
official and Individual capacity, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Griffith and Kavanaugh, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg,
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, supplement, and Rule 28(j) letters 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 order filed May 21, 2014 be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion, see *Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1996), in denying reconsideration of the dismissal of appellant's complaint.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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