

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

---

**No. 19-7130**

**September Term, 2019**

**1:19-cv-01274-UNA**

**Filed On:** February 28, 2020

L. Ruther,

Appellant

v.

Kentucky, et al.,

Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Srinivasan, Chief Judge, Henderson, Circuit Judge, 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). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion to produce documents, it is

**ORDERED** that the motion to produce documents be denied. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court's August 24, 2019 order be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying leave to file his motion for stay in a closed case. See Berry v. District of Columbia, 833 F.2d 1031, 1037 n.24 (D.C. Cir. 1987).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

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

**No. 19-7130**

**September Term, 2019**

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/*

Daniel J. Reidy  
Deputy Clerk