

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5038

September Term, 2024

1:24-cv-03090-UNA

Filed On: June 4, 2025

Jordan Owens,

Appellant

v.

United States of America,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Pillard, Katsas, and Rao, 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 supplement thereto 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 amend, it is

ORDERED that the motion to amend be granted. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order entered February 7, 2025, be affirmed. The district court concluded that dismissal was required, among other reasons, because appellant had not shown that the court had subject-matter jurisdiction. On appeal, appellant does not challenge that conclusion, and he therefore has forfeited any such challenge. 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. 25-5038

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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk