

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5109

September Term, 2026

1:25-cv-02586-UNA

Filed On: October 15, 2026

Sivokonev Pavel Igorevich, also known as
Pavel Igorevich Sivokonev,

Appellant

v.

New York State Government and United
States of America, hereinafter, The United
States, USA, US, or U.S. Government or
Federal Government and any of its known or
unknown allies,

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 and the motion to supplement the record, it is

ORDERED that the motion to supplement the record be denied. The court generally does not permit supplementation of the record with materials that were not before the district court, and appellant has not shown that supplementation of the record on appeal “would establish beyond any doubt the proper resolution of the pending issues” or would otherwise be in the interests of justice. Colbert v. Potter, 471 F.3d 158, 165–66 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that appellant’s appeal of the district court’s orders entered on November 13, 2025, and December 10, 2025, be dismissed as untimely. While appellant’s first motion for postjudgment relief restarted the time to appeal, his notice of appeal was filed more than 60 days after the denial of that motion, and his second motion for postjudgment relief did not again restart the time to appeal.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5109

September Term, 2026

See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), (a)(4)(A); see also Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007) (“[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement.”). It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s order entered on March 13, 2026, be affirmed. Because courts “may consider jurisdictional questions in any order that [they] deem prudent,” the district court correctly rejected the only basis for relief raised in appellant’s second postjudgment motion. Meza v. Renaud, 9 F.4th 930, 933 (D.C. Cir. 2021).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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