

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-5203**

**September Term, 2012**

**1:12-cv-00788-UNA**

**Filed On:** October 9, 2012

Soreta Waldeck Von Bulow Cloud,  
Appellant

v.

United States Attorney and Rudolph  
Contreras, Chief, District of Columbia,  
Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Sentelle, Chief Judge, and 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 brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion to appoint counsel, it is

**ORDERED** that the motion to appoint counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court's order filed May 16, 2012, be affirmed. Appellant has identified no error in the district court's dismissal of her complaint for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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