

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 16-7109

September Term, 2016

1:15-cv-01798-APM

Filed On: May 19, 2017

Michelle D. Smith,

Appellant

v.

Mayor, District of Columbia, et al.,

Appellees

BEFORE: Griffith, Srinivasan, and Pillard, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for summary affirmance and the opposition thereto, it is

ORDERED that the motion for summary affirmance be granted. The merits of the parties' positions are so clear as to warrant summary action. See Taxpayers Watchdog, Inc. v. Stanley, 819 F.2d 294, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam). The issues appellant presented in her district court complaint either were or could have been presented in the prior lawsuits she brought in the District of Columbia local courts. As a result, her claims were barred under longstanding preclusion doctrines. See Allen v. McCurry, 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980).

Pursuant to D.C. Cir. Rule 36(c)(2)(F), this order will be published because it affirms a decision of the district court upon grounds different from those set forth in the district court's published opinion. The Clerk is further 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:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Ken Meadows
Deputy Clerk/LD