

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-7073

September Term, 2025

1:24-cv-03640-LLA

Filed On: October 2, 2025

Richard Otis,

Appellant

v.

U-Haul Corporation, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Walker, Childs, and Pan, 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 April 15, 2025, dismissal order be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the case without prejudice based on appellant’s failure to file the proof of service required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(*l*), or to establish good cause for failing to do so, after warning appellant that such failure would result in dismissal. See Morrissey v. Mayorkas, 17 F.4th 1150, 1157-58 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (concluding that district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing action without prejudice where plaintiff failed to provide proof of service, show good cause, or request an extension despite being warned that failure to do so would result in dismissal); Moore v. Agency for Int’l Dev., 994 F.2d 874, 876 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (noting that while pro se litigants are allowed more latitude to correct defects in service of process, the assistance provided by the district court is not a license for a pro se litigant to ignore the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure). 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.”).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-7073

September Term, 2025

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