

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

---

**No. 24-7066**

**September Term, 2024**

**1:22-cv-01453-TJK**

**Filed On:** November 12, 2024

Lokesh B. Vuyyuru, M.D.,

Appellant

v.

Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy, et al.,

Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Henderson, Pillard, 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 and appendix 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 May 29, 2024 minute order be affirmed. The district court assumed that appellant was eligible for relief under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(6) because he did not receive notice from the Clerk of the district court, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 77(d), regarding the district court's September 2023 order dismissing the underlying case. The district court nonetheless concluded, as a matter of discretion, that relief was not warranted because appellant had actual notice of the September 2023 order but waited five months to file his Rule 4(a)(6) motion. Appellant has forfeited any challenge to this conclusion by not addressing it in his brief. See United States ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir. 2004).

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

**No. 24-7066**

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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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