

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 17-5210

September Term, 2017

1:17-cv-00018-UNA

Filed On: April 10, 2018

Dennis Andrew Ball,

Appellant

v.

Maricopa County, et al.,

Appellees

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

**BEFORE:** Rogers and Griffith, Circuit Judges, and Ginsburg,  
Senior Circuit Judge

### 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 orders filed July 19, 2017, and August 18, 2017, be affirmed. The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying leave to file motions after the case was transferred, as the district court no longer had jurisdiction over the case. See In re Asemani, 455 F.3d 296, 299-300 (D.C. Cir. 2006). To the extent appellant seeks review of the transfer order filed January 4, 2017, or the order filed March 27, 2017, his notice of appeal filed September 5, 2017, was untimely as to those orders. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B); Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 209 (2007) (the timely filing of a notice of appeal is "mandatory and jurisdictional").

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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:**  
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Ken Meadows  
Deputy Clerk