

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 00-7219

September Term, 2000

97cv00847

Filed On: July 26, 2001 [613052]

Richard Afolabi-Brown,
Appellant

v.

Chrysler Corporation,
Appellee

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

BEFORE: Sentelle, Rogers, and Tatel, 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. The court has determined that the issues presented occasion no need for an opinion. See Fed. R. App. P. 36; D.C. Cir. Rule 36(b). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's orders entered June 12, 2000 and July 28, 2000 be affirmed. This appeal is not the appropriate forum for addressing appellant's allegations regarding the behavior of his attorney. Appellant's remedy, if any, appears to be a claim against his attorney. See Peters v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 996 F.2d 1483, 1487 n.3 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (class counsel's failure to provide notice of settlement to class member not cause to disturb settlement; class member's redress should instead come from negligent counsel); Petty v. Timken Corp., 849 F.2d 130, 133 (4th Cir. 1988) (voluntary acceptance of settlement cannot be attacked on basis of inadequate representation; dispute is between attorney and client).

The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after disposition 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