

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-7066

September Term, 2019

1:19-cv-01161-UNA

Filed On: December 10, 2019

Sonya Owens,

Appellant

v.

Bank of America, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Griffith and Rao, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, 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 orders filed May 29, 2019, and July 24, 2019, be affirmed. Appellant has not demonstrated any error in the district court's conclusions that the complaint failed to set forth allegations against Reliance Group LLC, and that the claims related to the foreclosure and sale of her residence were barred by res judicata. See *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) ("Factual allegations [in a complaint] must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level."); *Allen v. McCurry*, 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980) ("Under res judicata, a final judgment on the merits of an action precludes the parties or their privies from relitigating issues that were or could have been raised in that action."). Likewise, appellant has not shown that the district court erred in determining that it lacked jurisdiction to review decisions of the District of Columbia Superior Court regarding her eviction. See *Lance v. Dennis*, 546 U.S. 459, 463 (2006) ("[L]ower federal courts are precluded from exercising appellate jurisdiction over final state-court judgments."). Further, because the complaint at issue in this appeal was originally filed in the district court, appellant has not demonstrated that the district court erred in concluding that her claim in this case pertaining to the notices of removal of other cases from the Superior

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-7066

September Term, 2019

Court “lack[ed] an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Finally, appellant has not shown any abuse of discretion in the district court’s denial of reconsideration. See Firestone v. Firestone, 76 F.3d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (per curiam).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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/
Michael C. McGrail
Deputy Clerk