

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

---

**No. 20-5246**

**September Term, 2020**

**1:20-cv-00867-UNA**

**Filed On: May 25, 2021**

Scott Sattler,

Appellant

v.

United States Department of Justice, et al.,

Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Pillard and Walker, 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, which includes a motion to appoint counsel. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

**ORDERED** that the motion for appointment of counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court's orders entered June 9, 2020, and July 21, 2020, be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court erred in dismissing the case without prejudice for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Appellant's complaint did not set forth "a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction" or "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (A complaint that offers only "labels and conclusions" that are not supported by factual allegations does not satisfy Rule 8(a)'s pleading requirements.). Additionally, appellant failed to plead facts to establish his standing to sue, and "the defect of standing is a

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

**No. 20-5246**

**September Term, 2020**

defect in subject matter jurisdiction.” Haase v. Sessions, 835 F.2d 902, 906 (D.C. Cir. 1987). Appellant has failed to establish standing because he has not pled any actual or imminent injury aside from, at best, a generalized grievance. Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490, 499 (1975) (“When the asserted harm is a ‘generalized grievance’ shared in substantially equal measure by all or a large class of citizens, that harm alone normally does not warrant exercise of jurisdiction.”).

Moreover, appellant has failed to present any argument on appeal challenging the district court’s denial of his motion to alter or amend the judgment and has therefore forfeited any such argument. See, e.g., U.S. ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir 2004).

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