

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-7007

September Term, 2018

1:18-cv-02822-UNA

Filed On: April 29, 2019

Vanessa Holloway,

Appellant

v.

Daryl Scott, Professor, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Tatel and Millett, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, 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 order filed December 31, 2018, be affirmed. The district court correctly dismissed appellant’s complaint under the doctrine of res judicata. See *Allen v. McCurry*, 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980) (“Under res judicata, a final judgment on the merits of an action precludes the parties or their privies from relitigating issues that were or could have been raised in that action.”). Appellant provides no reason to question the district court’s conclusion that her current and previous cases share the same nucleus of facts. See *Drake v. FAA*, 291 F.3d 59, 66 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (“Whether two cases implicate the same cause of action turns on whether they share the same ‘nucleus of facts.’”).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. 19-7007

September Term, 2018

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