

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5057

September Term, 2021

1:22-cv-00394-UNA

Filed On: June 8, 2022

Raj K. Patel, from all capacities,

Appellant

v.

Joseph R. Biden, Jr., The Honorable; the
President of the United States, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Rogers and Tatel, 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 amended 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 expedite, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order filed February 18, 2022, be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that appellant failed to establish the threshold requirements for mandamus jurisdiction. See *Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Burwell*, 812 F.3d 183, 189 (D.C. Cir. 2016). Appellant has forfeited any claim that he is entitled to mandamus relief based on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, by failing to raise it before the district court in the first instance. See *Keepseagle v. Perdue*, 856 F.3d 1039, 1053 (D.C. Cir. 2017). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to expedite be dismissed as moot.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. 22-5057

September Term, 2021

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