

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7011

September Term, 2019

1:19-cv-02750-UNA

Filed On: May 1, 2020

Ricardo Jose Calderon Lopez, doing
business as Starlight Consulting Services,

Appellant

v.

Unknown Individuals, Servicing the District of
Columbia Department of Health & Human
Services,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Griffith, Pillard, and Wilkins, 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 filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the order of the district court entered on January 30, 2020, be affirmed. This appeal is timely only as to the district court's order denying appellant's motion for reconsideration. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1), 4(a)(4)(A). As the party seeking to invoke Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), appellant "bears the burden of establishing that its prerequisites are satisfied." Gates v. Syrian Arab Republic, 646 F.3d 1, 5 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (internal quotations omitted). Appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion for reconsideration. See Owens v. Republic of Sudan, 864 F.3d 751, 818 (D.C. Cir. 2017). Both in the district court and on appeal, appellant has failed to identify any basis for relief under Rule 60(b).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7011

September Term, 2019

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk