

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

---

**No. 24-7110**

**September Term, 2024**

**1:22-cv-01499-TNM**

**Filed On:** January 6, 2025

Harold Jean-Baptiste,

Appellant

v.

Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.,

Appellee

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

**BEFORE:** Katsas, Childs, and Garcia, 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 briefs filed by the parties. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court’s July 26, 2024 order denying appellant’s summary judgment motion and granting appellee’s cross-motion for summary judgment be affirmed. Appellant has not demonstrated that the district court erred in concluding that he failed to provide sufficient evidence for a reasonable finding of a conspiracy under 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3). See *Atherton v. D.C. Office of the Mayor*, 567 F.3d 672, 688 (D.C. Cir. 2009). Furthermore, appellant’s request for a default judgment under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 15(b)(2) fails because this is an appeal from the district court rather than an application for enforcement of an agency order. Finally, appellant’s allegations of judicial bias are without merit. See *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (“[J]udicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion.”).

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

**No. 24-7110**

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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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