

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 04-7030

September Term, 2004

03cv02267

Emil Teodorescu,
April 27, 2005 [891132]
Appellant

Filed On:

v.

San Francisco City Hall and New York City Hall,
Appellees

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

BEFORE: Sentelle, Garland, and Roberts, Circuit Judges

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 brief 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 January 9, 2004 be affirmed. The court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant's Rule 60(b) motion, see, e.g., Browder v. Director, Illinois Dep't of Corrections, 434 U.S. 257, 263 n.7 (1978), as the motion did not produce a viable federal claim. See, e.g., Confederate Memorial Association, Inc. v. Hines, 995 F.2d 295, 299 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (holding that district court did not abuse its discretion in denying leave to amend complaint, as "the law does not require the doing of vain things" and "appellants have yet to demonstrate that they can offer an amendment effective of a valid claim for relief").

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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