

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 17-5243

September Term, 2017

1:17-cv-01744-UNA

Filed On: March 9, 2018

Michael E. Bargo, Jr.,

Appellant

v.

United States of America, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Rogers and Griffith, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg,
Senior Circuit Judge

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 October 11, 2017, be affirmed. Appellant alleges the federal government’s practices regarding mandatory spending have diluted the value of his vote. Appellant has not shown how the harm he is alleging differs in any way from the effect on every other citizen. As the district court correctly concluded, appellant is “raising only a generally available grievance about government . . . and seeking relief that no more directly and tangibly benefits him than it does the public at large.” Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 573-74 (1992).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Ken Meadows
Deputy Clerk