

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5031

September Term, 2021

1:20-cv-02570-BAH

Filed On: May 10, 2022

Janice Wolk Grenadier,

Appellant

United States of America, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Wells Fargo Bank Nevada, National
Association, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Millett and Pillard, 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 January 4, 2022 order denying appellant’s motion to reopen the case be affirmed. Appellant did not specify in her motion to reopen under what rule she was seeking relief. Because her motion was filed more than a year after the district court’s order dismissing the case and its orders denying her motion for recusal and denying reconsideration thereof, and because it is not evident that relief is available under any other rule, we construe the motion to reopen as seeking reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6). See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c). However, both appellant’s motion to reopen and the brief she filed in this court only reiterate arguments that were already rejected by the district court and by this court in her prior appeal. Consequently, she has not demonstrated “extraordinary circumstances” warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6), see Salazar ex rel. Salazar v. District of Columbia, 633 F.3d 1110, 1120 (D.C. Cir. 2011), and the district

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5031

September Term, 2021

court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen, see United States v. Philip Morris USA Inc., 840 F.3d 844, 852 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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