

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 12-7120

September Term, 2012

1:12-cv-01259-UNA

Filed On: March 15, 2013

Abdul Wakil Amiri,

Appellant

v.

Gelman Management Company,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Garland, Chief Judge; Henderson 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 and appendix 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 orders filed July 31, 2012, and October 17, 2012, be affirmed. On de novo review, we affirm the dismissal of the complaint on the ground that it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See EEOC v. St. Francis Xavier Parochial Sch., 117 F.3d 621, 624 (D.C. Cir. 1997). Appellant's complaint did not allege sufficient facts to support an inference that he was a victim of discrimination. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009); Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007). In light of the dismissal of appellant's federal claims, the district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his defamation claim. See Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988). Finally, appellant has not shown that the district court erred in denying his motion for reconsideration.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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