United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 16-7145

September Term, 2016

1:16-cv-02138-UNA

Filed On: April 14, 2017

Saleem El-Amin,

Appellant

V.

April Downs, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Millett and Wilkins, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg, Senior

Circuit Judge

JUDGMENT

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. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion for summary reversal, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the motion for summary reversal be denied and the district court's October 25, 2016 order be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed the complaint because it failed to allege sufficient facts to state a plausible claim for relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009); DuBerry v. District of Columbia, 824 F.3d 1046, 1051 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (Section 1983 plaintiff must allege the violation of a federal right). Moreover, amendment of the complaint would have been futile because appellant has not presented any facts that could correct the complaint's defects. Cf. Hettinga v. United States, 677 F.3d 471, 480 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (motion to amend may be denied as futile if the proposed claim would not survive a motion to dismiss).

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 16-7145

September Term, 2016

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Ken Meadows Deputy Clerk