

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5178

September Term, 2025

1:26-cv-00561-UNA

Filed On: August 26, 2026

Avoncinna Rakoczy, a natural person, as next
friend of Richard Louis Castro,

Appellant

v.

Jeanine F. Pirro and Todd Blanche, natural
persons exercising custodial authority over
Richard Louis Castro,

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). Upon consideration of the foregoing, the emergency motion to expedite case and for other relief, the supplements thereto, the emergency motion for leave to file ex parte and under seal, the emergency motion for a ruling on emergency motion and for other relief, and the emergency motion for other relief, it is

ORDERED that appellant's motions be denied in part and dismissed as moot in part. Insofar as appellant's motions seek sealing or pseudonymization, the motions are denied because appellant has shown no valid basis for such relief. See United States v. Hubbard, 650 F.2d 293, 317 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (There is a "strong presumption in favor of public access to judicial proceedings."); In re Sealed Case, 971 F.3d 324, 326 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (A litigant seeking pseudonymization "bears the weighty burden of both demonstrating a concrete need for such secrecy, and identifying the consequences that would likely befall it if forced to proceed in its own name."). The Clerk is directed to make all pleadings in this case available on the public docket. The motions are otherwise dismissed as moot. It is

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5178

September Term, 2025

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order entered April 29, 2026, be affirmed. Appellant does not address on appeal, and thus has forfeited any challenge to, the district court's conclusion that she has not shown that the true party in interest is unable to prosecute a habeas action on his own behalf. See United States ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir. 2004); see also Whitmore v. Arkansas, 495 U.S. 149, 163 (1990).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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