

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-7166

September Term, 2024

1:23-cv-02329-JMC

Filed On: October 2, 2024

Won Suk Seo, Susan Property Management,
Foreign Entity, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Janet Hill,

Appellant

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

BEFORE: Wilkins, Rao, and Walker, 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 district court’s November 6, 2023 denial of leave to file a motion to reopen be affirmed. The district court remanded the case because removal is proper only “to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending,” 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), and it denied appellant’s two motions for reconsideration on the ground that she had not provided a legal basis to reconsider that ruling. Because appellant’s subsequent motion to reopen the case offered no new basis for reconsidering the court’s remand order, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying leave to file. See Berry v. District of Columbia, 833 F.2d 1031, 1037 n.24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (noting a “trial court’s decisions with respect to the management of its docket are normally entitled to deference”).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-7166

September Term, 2024

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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