

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-7005

September Term, 2025

1:19-cv-02057-TNM

Filed On: June 3, 2026

Gayle George,

Appellant

v.

Office of Chief Technology Officer
Government of the District of Columbia,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Henderson, Pillard, 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 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 December 5, 2025 and January 5, 2026 orders be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying leave to file her “claim for declaratory relief,” her motion for relief from judgment, and her motion to clarify where her submissions offered no valid basis for reopening the closed case. First, appellant’s submissions did not demonstrate “extraordinary circumstances” warranting relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6). See Kramer v. Gates, 481 F.3d 788, 791-92 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Additionally, appellant did not present any valid basis for reopening the case based on fraud on the court. See Baltia Air Lines, Inc. v. Transaction Mgmt., Inc., 98 F.3d 640, 642 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (stating that fraud on the court is fraud that “is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury”) (internal quotation marks omitted). Finally, appellant did not demonstrate that reopening the case to add a new claim for declaratory relief was warranted. Cf. Hettinga v. United States, 677 F.3d 471, 480 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (per curiam) (district court may deny motion to amend complaint where amendment would be “futile”).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-7005

September Term, 2025

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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