

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5174

September Term, 2026

1:26-cv-00251-UNA

Filed On: September 18, 2026

Ruben Santoyo,

Appellant

v.

United States of America, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Wilkins, Walker, and Garcia, 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 filed April 24, 2026, be affirmed. The district court lacked jurisdiction to review the sanctions order issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. See Klayman v. Rao, 49 F.4th 550, 552–53 (D.C. Cir. 2022) (per curiam). Furthermore, appellant has not shown that the district court had jurisdiction to review the subsequent order issued by that other court's Executive Committee. Cf. In re Marin, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (per curiam) (explaining that the Supreme Court has exclusive authority to supervise its Clerk). And because that Executive Committee order directed the revocation of appellant's e-filing credentials, the district court could not undo that revocation without reviewing the Executive Committee's order.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. 26-5174

September Term, 2026

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