

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5170

September Term, 2025

1:26-cv-00707-UNA

Filed On: August 26, 2026

Henry B. Berrocal,

Appellant

v.

Robert J. Conrad, United States Courts
Administrative Officer Official and Individual
Capacity, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Henderson, Wilkins, 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 order entered on May 15, 2026, be affirmed on the following grounds. Appellant does not address on appeal, and has thus forfeited any challenge to, the district court's dismissal of his claims insofar as he sought damages. See, e.g., United States ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir. 2004). And insofar as appellant sought prospective injunctive relief, he failed to adequately allege a nonfrivolous underlying claim for which he currently is being denied the right to seek redress. See Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403, 413–16 (2002) (observing that the right of access to courts “is ancillary to the underlying claim, without which a plaintiff cannot have suffered injury by being shut out of court”). Additionally, because the district court's dismissal was without prejudice, appellant remains free to file a new lawsuit remedying the deficiencies in his complaint. See, e.g., Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 671 (D.C. Cir. 2004). And appellant's dissatisfaction with the district court's decision is insufficient to establish bias on the part of the district court. See Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994). To the extent that appellant has raised additional arguments not specifically addressed in this judgment, those arguments lack merit.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5170

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Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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