

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 11-7044**

**September Term 2010**

**1:99-cv-02331-CKK**

**Filed On:** August 3, 2011

Dale Alonzo Copemann,

Appellant

v.

James C. Reddick, et al.,

Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Sentelle, Chief Judge, and Garland and Brown, 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. 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 April 19, 2011, denying appellant's motion to reopen case, be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to reopen appellant's case that had been dismissed for failure to state a claim more than eleven years earlier.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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