United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-5284

September Term, 2024

1:24-cv-02362-UNA

Filed On: June 4, 2025

Okechukwu Amadi,

Appellant

٧.

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Pillard, Katsas, and Rao, Circuit Judges

JUDGMENT

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). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion to appoint counsel, it is

ORDERED that the motion to appoint counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's November 22, 2024 order be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that appellant had shown neither a clear right to relief nor that the U.S. Department of Justice had a clear duty to act. See Row 1 Inc. v. Becerra, 92 F.4th 1138, 1149 (D.C. Cir. 2024). Contrary to appellant's assertions on appeal, 28 U.S.C. § 535 states only that the Attorney General may investigate government officials for alleged violations of criminal law and therefore does not establish a clear duty to act. And the Supreme Court's decision in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U.S. 369 (2024), is not relevant to this case.

United States Court of Appeals FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 24-5284

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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT: Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy Deputy Clerk