

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5237

September Term, 2022

1:21-cv-02968-CJN

Filed On: December 13, 2022

Larry Eugene Clark,

Appellant

v.

Merrick B. Garland, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Katsas 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. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s September 1, 2022, order be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed the case because appellant failed to establish his standing to sue. See *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 573-74 (1992) (“[A] plaintiff raising only a generally available grievance about government — claiming only harm to his and every citizen’s interest in proper application of the Constitution and laws, and seeking relief that no more directly and tangibly benefits him than it does the public at large — does not state an Article III case or controversy.”). Appellant’s allegations about manipulated votes do not constitute a particularized injury. See *Lance v. Coffman*, 549 U.S. 437, 442 (2007) (per curiam).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5237

September Term, 2022

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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