

UNITED STATES SENATE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDICIAL NOMINEES

PUBLIC

1. **Name**: State full name (include any former names used).

Robin Michelle Meriweather

2. **Position**: State the position for which you have been nominated.

Judge, United States Court of Federal Claims

3. **Address**: List current office address. If city and state of residence differs from your place of employment, please list the city and state where you currently reside.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia  
333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20001

Residence: Alexandria, Virginia

4. **Birthplace**: State year and place of birth.

1974; Detroit, Michigan

5. **Education**: List in reverse chronological order each college, law school, or any other institution of higher education attended and indicate for each the dates of attendance, whether a degree was received, and the date each degree was received.

1995 – 1998, Yale Law School; J.D., 1998

1991 – 1995, University of Michigan; B.A. (high honors and high distinction), 1995

6. **Employment Record**: List in reverse chronological order all governmental agencies, business or professional corporations, companies, firms, or other enterprises, partnerships, institutions or organizations, non-profit or otherwise, with which you have been affiliated as an officer, director, partner, proprietor, or employee since graduation from college, whether or not you received payment for your services. Include the name and address of the employer and job title or description.

2017 – present

United States District Court for the District of Columbia  
333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest

Washington, DC 20001  
Magistrate Judge

2007 – 2017

United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
Deputy Chief (Civil Division) (2011 – 2017)  
Assistant United States Attorney (Civil Division) (2007 – 2017)

1999 – 2007; Summer 1998; Summer 1997

Jenner and Block, LLP  
1099 New York Avenue, Northwest, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
Associate (1999 – 2007)  
Summer Associate (Summer 1998, Summer 1997 (split with Chicago office))

1998 – 1999

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit  
333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20001  
Law Clerk to the Honorable Merrick B. Garland

Fall 1997

Professor Drew S. Days, III  
Yale Law School  
127 Wall Street  
New Haven, Connecticut 06511  
Coker Fellow

Summer 1996

Sonnenschein Nath and Rosenthal  
(now merged into Dentons, formerly SNR Denton)  
233 South Wacker Drive, # 5900  
Chicago, Illinois 60608  
Summer Intern

Summer 1995

Sullivan & Cromwell LLP  
125 Broad Street  
New York, New York 10004  
Summer Intern (through Sponsors for Educational Opportunity)

Other Affiliations (Uncompensated)

2023 – present

American Bar Association  
321 North Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654  
Secretary, Labor and Employment Law Section

2018 – present  
Jack and Jill of America, Inc.  
Alexandria - Mount Vernon Chapter  
5810 Kingstowne Center Drive  
P.O. Box 120 – 250  
Alexandria, Virginia 22315  
Recording Secretary (2019 – 2021)  
Co-Chair, Five Star Committee (2020 – present)  
Chair, Bylaws Committee (2017 – 2019)

2017 – 2022  
Federal Magistrate Judges Association  
P.O. Box 249  
Stanardsville, Virginia 22973  
Director (DC)

2013 – 2018 (approximately)  
Historical Society of the District of Columbia Circuit  
333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Room 4714  
Washington, DC 20001  
Member, Board of Directors

2013 – 2015  
Dress for Success, Washington DC  
1126 16th Street, Northwest, Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20036  
Member, Advisory Board

2005 (approximately) – 2011  
Yale Law School Alumni Association of Washington, D.C.  
(no current address)  
Board Member (2005 – 2011)  
President (2008 – 2011)

1996 – 1997  
Black Law Students Association  
Yale Law School  
President

7. **Military Service and Draft Status:** Identify any service in the U.S. Military, including dates of service, branch of service, rank or rate, serial number (if different from social

security number) and type of discharge received, and whether you have registered for selective service.

I did not serve in the military. I was not required to register for the selective service.

8. **Honors and Awards:** List any scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, academic or professional honors, honorary society memberships, military awards, and any other special recognition for outstanding service or achievement.

United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
Excellence In Management Award (2016)  
Special Achievement Award (2008, 2010, 2011, 2012). Additional dates may exist.

Yale Law School  
Coker Fellow (1997)  
Yale Law Journal, Senior Editor (1997 – 1998), Editor (1996 – 1997)

University of Michigan  
Bachelor of Arts with High Honors in English Literature (1995)  
Bachelor of Arts with High Distinction in French (1995)  
James B. Angell Scholar (1992 – 1994 (approximately))  
Dean's Merit Scholar (1991 – 1992 (approximately))  
Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society (1994)  
Undergraduate Honors Program (1991 – 1993)

I was also awarded various educational scholarships from the University of Michigan and private entities that provided academic scholarships for incoming college freshmen. I do not recall the names of the specific scholarships or the specific years they were awarded.

9. **Bar Associations:** List all bar associations or legal or judicial-related committees, selection panels or conferences of which you are or have been a member, and give the titles and dates of any offices which you have held in such groups.

Administrative Office of U.S. Courts  
Member, Magistrate Judges Advisory Group (2019 – 2022)

American Bar Association  
Secretary, Labor & Employment Law Section (2022 – present)  
Secretary-Elect, Labor & Employment Law Section (2021 – 2022)

Black Law Students Association  
Member (1995 – 1998)  
President, Yale Law School chapter (1996 – 1997)

Federal Magistrate Judges Association

Director (DC) (2017 – 2022)  
Member, Diversity Committee (2018 – present)

National Bar Association (approximately 2008 – present)

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit  
Member, Advisory Committee on Procedures (approximately 2016 – 2017)

United States District Court for the District of Columbia  
Member, Committee on Pro Se Litigation (approximately 2018 – present)

Washington Bar Association (approximately 2010 – present)

Yale Law School Alumni Association, Washington, DC (approximately 1999 – 2011)  
Board Member (2005 – 2011)  
President (2008 – 2011)

Yale Law School, Washington, D.C. Alumni Steering Committee (2012 – 2018)

10. **Bar and Court Admission:**

- a. List the date(s) you were admitted to the bar of any state and any lapses in membership. Please explain the reason for any lapse in membership.

District of Columbia, 2004  
Illinois, 1998

I allowed my membership in the Illinois bar to lapse in 2016 because I no longer practiced in Illinois. There have been no other lapses in membership.

- b. List all courts in which you have been admitted to practice, including dates of admission and any lapses in membership. Please explain the reason for any lapse in membership. Give the same information for administrative bodies that require special admission to practice.

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 2006  
United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 2005

There have been no lapses in membership.

11. **Memberships:**

- a. List all professional, business, fraternal, scholarly, civic, charitable, or other organizations, other than those listed in response to Questions 9 or 10 to which you belong, or to which you have belonged, since graduation from law school. Provide dates of membership or participation, and indicate any office you held.

Include clubs, working groups, advisory or editorial boards, panels, committees, conferences, or publications.

Jack and Jill of America, Inc., Alexandria – Mount Vernon Chapter (2017 – present)

Chair, Bylaws Committee (2017 – 2019)

Co-Chair, Five Star Committee (2020 – present)

Recording Secretary (2019 – 2021)

Higher Achievement Program, Mentor (approximately 2010 – 2012)

Maya Angelou Charter School, Mentor (do not recall dates)

University of Michigan Alumni Association (intermittently from 1995 – 2021)

- b. The American Bar Association's Commentary to its Code of Judicial Conduct states that it is inappropriate for a judge to hold membership in any organization that invidiously discriminates on the basis of race, sex, or religion, or national origin. Indicate whether any of these organizations listed in response to 11a above currently discriminate or formerly discriminated on the basis of race, sex, religion or national origin either through formal membership requirements or the practical implementation of membership policies. If so, describe any action you have taken to change these policies and practices.

Jack and Jill of America, Inc., a non-profit organization that focuses on educational and cultural opportunities for children, limits membership to mothers but has a fathers' auxiliary. To the best of my knowledge, none of the other organizations listed in response to Question 11a above currently discriminate or formerly discriminated on the basis of race, sex, religion, or national origin either through formal membership requirements or the practical implementation of membership policies.

**12. Published Writings and Public Statements:**

- a. List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, letters to the editor, editorial pieces, or other published material you have written or edited, including material published only on the Internet. Supply four (4) copies of all published material to the Committee.

None.

- b. Supply four (4) copies of any reports, memoranda or policy statements you prepared or contributed in the preparation of on behalf of any bar association, committee, conference, or organization of which you were or are a member. If you do not have a copy of a report, memorandum or policy statement, give the name and address of the organization that issued it, the date of the document, and

a summary of its subject matter.

None.

- c. Supply four (4) copies of any testimony, official statements or other communications relating, in whole or in part, to matters of public policy or legal interpretation, that you have issued or provided or that others presented on your behalf to public bodies or public officials.

None.

- d. Supply four (4) copies, transcripts or recordings of all speeches or talks delivered by you including commencement speeches, remarks, lectures, panel discussions, conferences, political speeches, and question-and-answer sessions. Include the date and place where they were delivered, and readily available press reports about the speech or talk. If you do not have a copy of the speech or a transcript or recording of your remarks, give the name and address of the group before whom the speech was given, the date of the speech, and a summary of its subject matter. If you did not speak from a prepared text, furnish a copy of any outline or notes from which you spoke.

November 9, 2023: Secretary's Address, American Bar Association, Labor and Employment Law Section Conference, Seattle, Washington. Speech supplied.

October 28, 2023: Panelist, Robert E. Wone Judicial Clerkship and Internship Conference, Washington, DC. I participated in a panel and spoke to law students about applying for federal clerkships and the benefits of federal clerkships. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the 2023 Robert E. Wone Judicial Clerkship and Internship Conference is Georgetown Law Center, McDonough Hall, 600 New Jersey Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC 20001.

April 14, 2023: Panelist, "E-Discovery at a Crossroads," Rabiej Litigation Law Center, George Washington University Law School, Washington, DC. Notes supplied.

March 2, 2023: Judge, Moot Court, Historical Society for the District of Columbia Circuit, Washington, DC. I served as a judge for high school students' presentations of oral arguments using a hypothetical fact pattern and selected a "best advocate" among students who presented argument before me. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the Historical Society for the District of Columbia Circuit is 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Room 4714, Washington, DC 20001.

April 27, 2022: Guest, Greater Washington Area Chapter, Women Lawyers Division, National Bar Association, "GWAC Dinner Series." I was the featured guest at an informal dinner open to members of GWAC and spoke to attendees

about my career. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for GWAC is P.O. Box 77254, Washington, DC 20013.

March 4, 2022: Judge, Moot Court, Historical Society for the District of Columbia Circuit, Virtual Event. I served as a judge for high school students' presentations of oral arguments using a hypothetical fact pattern and selected a "best advocate" among students who presented argument before me. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the Historical Society for the District of Columbia Circuit is 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Room 4714, Washington, DC 20001.

March 6, 2021: Panelist, Robert E. Wone Judicial Clerkship and Internship Conference, Washington, DC. I participated in a panel and spoke to law students about applying for federal clerkships and the benefits of federal clerkships. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the 2021 Robert E. Wone Judicial Clerkship and Internship Conference is Asian Pacific American Bar Association Educational Fund, P.O. Box 2209, Washington, DC 20013.

October 15, 2020: College of Labor and Employment Lawyers CLE, "Civility in the Courtroom, Using Professionalism as a Strategic Tool in an Employment Case," Virtual Event. Notes supplied.

July 24, 2019: Faculty, National Institute for Trial Advocacy Deposition Skills Workshop, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC. I evaluated and spoke to attorney participants in a mock deposition workshop. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the Georgetown University Law Center is 600 New Jersey Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC 20001.

May 24, 2019: Panelist, Judge's Forum, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Notes supplied.

October 23, 2018: Panelist, Federal Bar Association & Metropolitan Washington Employment Lawyers' Association, "Motions Practice in Employment Cases," United States District Court for the District of Columbia. I participated in a panel for a session regarding discovery motions, as part of a half-day conference. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia is 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC 20001.

April 27, 2018 (approximately): Panelist, Judge's Forum, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Notes supplied.

May 18, 2017: Investiture of Magistrate Judge Robin M. Meriweather, United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Remarks supplied.

Approximately 2015 – 2016: Teacher, Project LEAD. For two semesters, I co-



taught a leadership and critical thinking curriculum to 5th grade students in a weekly class at a public school in Southeast DC through Project LEAD. I do not recall the precise dates of the classes. I have no notes, transcript, or recording. The address for Project LEAD is United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, 601 D Street Northwest, Washington DC 20004.

- e. List all interviews you have given to newspapers, magazines or other publications, or radio or television stations, providing the dates of these interviews and four (4) copies of the clips or transcripts of these interviews where they are available to you.

When I was in high school or college, the local newspaper had a short article about my academic accomplishments. I have not located a copy of the article and do not recall the date. Apart from that, I have not given any interviews to newspapers, magazines, other publications, or radio or television stations.

13. **Judicial Office:** State (chronologically) any judicial offices you have held, including positions as an administrative law judge, whether such position was elected or appointed, and a description of the jurisdiction of each such court.

Since January 2017, I have served as a United States Magistrate Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. I was selected for that position following a two-stage process. In the first stage, members of a merit selection panel comprised of lawyers and non-lawyers chose five finalists. In the second stage, the United States District Judges of the District of Columbia made the final selection from the five finalists. I am currently serving an eight-year renewable term. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is a court of limited jurisdiction, and the jurisdiction of United States Magistrate Judges is defined by 28 U.S.C. § 636.

- a. Approximately how many cases have you presided over that have gone to verdict or judgment?

Three, including a civil bench trial conducted earlier this year and for which judgment is pending. Additionally, I have taken guilty pleas and imposed sentences in approximately 6 misdemeanor cases.

- i. Of these cases, approximately what percent were:

jury trials:	34%
bench trials:	66%

- ii. Of these cases, approximately what percent were:

civil proceedings:	66 %
criminal proceedings:	34 %

- b. Provide citations for all opinions you have written, including concurrences and dissents.

See attached list of citations.

- c. For each of the 10 most significant cases over which you presided, provide: (1) a capsule summary of the nature of the case; (2) the outcome of the case; (3) the name and contact information for counsel who had a significant role in the trial of the case; and (4) the citation of the case (if reported) or the docket number and a copy of the opinion or judgment (if not reported).

1. *Hammons v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, No. 19-cv-2518 (ACR), 2023 WL 5933340 (D.D.C. July 24, 2023), *R. & R. adopted*, 2023 WL 6211248 (Sep. 25, 2023)

This case arose under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's terrorism exception, and the plaintiffs were individuals who resided at Camp Sullivan in Afghanistan at the time of a terrorist bombing and several of their family members. Plaintiffs sued Iran, alleging that it materially supported the Taliban terrorists who perpetrated the attack, and that the attack was an extrajudicial killing that caused plaintiffs physical and emotional injuries. Plaintiffs filed a motion for default judgment on liability, asking that the court issue an order finding Iran liable to plaintiffs under theories of assault, battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and solatium. I reviewed the motion for default judgment and supporting legal memoranda and affidavits and I recommended that the court grant default judgment regarding liability in favor of several plaintiffs. I recommended that the court deny without prejudice the default judgment motion for a subset of plaintiffs who had not submitted sufficient evidence to support their claims and allow those plaintiffs to supplement the record. The district judge adopted my recommendation.

Counsel for Plaintiffs:

Randy D. Singer  
Kevin Allin Hoffman  
Maryam M. Atty  
Singer Hoffman, LLC  
1209A Laskin Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23451  
(757) 301-9995

Counsel for Defendant:

None

2. *Perikli S. Z. v. Kijakazi*, No. 20-cv-812 (BAH), 2023 WL 3372309 (D.D.C.

May 11, 2023)

This case involves a challenge to the Social Security Administration's decision to suspend Mr. Z.'s receipt of retirement benefits based on his deportation from the United States. I issued a report and recommendation recommending that the court affirm the Social Security Administration ruling. The presiding district judge adopted the recommendation.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Plaintiff proceeded *pro se*

Counsel for Defendant:

Brittany Johanna Gigliotti  
Amanda Lockshin  
Social Security Administration Office of the General Counsel  
Office of the General Counsel  
6401 Security Boulevard  
Baltimore, MD 21235  
(215) 597-1890

3. *Sanchez Sanchez v. Ultimo, LLC d/b/a Malbec Restaurant*, No. 19-cv-3188  
(RMM)

This case arises under the Fair Labor Standards Act and corresponding DC state laws, and involves claims that a restaurant unlawfully failed to pay overtime to the plaintiff. The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment requesting that the court resolve certain aspects of the case in their favor. Plaintiff sought partial summary judgment and asked the court to rule that defendants violated federal and local wage and hour laws by failing to pay plaintiff overtime, that plaintiff was not an executive who was exempt from overtime pay requirements, that the owner of the restaurant should be jointly and severally liable for any damages owed, and that plaintiff should receive liquidated damages. Defendant sought summary judgment on all claims and asked the court to rule that the restaurant lacked sufficient revenue to be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and that Mr. Sanchez's duties made him ineligible for overtime under federal and state law. I resolved the parties' motions for summary judgment and concluded that disputed questions of fact precluded the entry of summary judgment on the merits of plaintiff's claims for unpaid overtime. I subsequently presided over a bench trial. This case remains pending, and I will issue a ruling after the parties submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Opinion on summary judgment provided.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Michael K. Amster  
Edith Thomas  
Zipin, Amster & Greenberg, LLC  
8757 Georgia Avenue, Suite 400  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
(301) 587-9373

Counsel for Defendant:

Michael E. Veve  
Michael E. Veve, PLLC  
320 S. West Street, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 309-3076

4. *United States v. Copeland*, No. 21-cr-570 (APM)

This was a criminal case in which I conducted multiple motion hearings to resolve mental competency issues and a motion seeking revocation of pretrial release. After conducting the hearings and receiving reports from a clinical psychologist, I issued a sealed memorandum opinion that denied the United States' motion to schedule a competency hearing and commit Mr. Copeland to the custody of the Attorney General for an evaluation of his competency pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 4241. The district judge ultimately accepted a guilty plea from Mr. Copeland and sentenced him to 36 months of incarceration.

Counsel for Government:

Michael John Romano  
U.S. Department of Justice  
1331 F Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 307-6691

Counsel for Defendant:

H. Heather Shaner  
Law Offices of H. Heather Shaner  
1702 S Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20009  
(202) 265-8210

Ryan Stout,  
132 West Tabernacle Street  
Building B  
Saint George, UT 84770  
(435) 628-4411

5. *Relman Dane & Colfax PLLC v. Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley*, No.18-cv-495 (TNM/RMM), 2019 WL 3779901 (D.D.C. Aug. 12, 2019), *R. & R. adopted*, 2019 WL 4737113 (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2019)

This case involved a contract dispute between a law firm and its former clients. The law firm alleged that its former clients improperly terminated their relationship and that those actions constituted an anticipatory breach of contract. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss, asserting that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the claims were not ripe and that the court lacked personal jurisdiction because the defendants had insufficient contacts with the District of Columbia. The defendants alternatively argued that venue was improper and the case should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. One defendant also requested that the court dismiss plaintiff's claims for failure to state a viable claim for anticipatory breach of contract. I issued a report and recommendation recommending that the court partially grant and partially deny the motions to dismiss. I concluded that the claims were ripe and that the court had personal jurisdiction over defendants because the business relationship between the parties established a connection between defendants and DC. I concluded that venue was proper in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia but recommended that the case be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California in furtherance of the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties and witnesses. I did not rule on the merits of the motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim and recommended that the motion be denied without prejudice so that it could be re-filed and resolved in the Central District of California. The district judge adopted the report and recommendation and transferred the case over the law firm's objections.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Andrew Soukop  
Bejamin John Razi  
Covington & Burling LLP  
850 Tenth Street, Northwest  
One City Center  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 662-5066

Steven John Winkelman  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20210  
(202) 693-9009

Counsel for Defendant:

Donald R. Warren  
Phillip E. Benson  
Warren Benson Law Group  
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1100  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
(949) 721-6636

Dennis J. Whelan, II  
Dennis J. Whelan, PC.  
2222 Monument Avenue  
Richmond, VA 23220  
(804) 359-4123

Scott P. Moore  
Mark J. Goldsmith  
1700 Farnam Street, Suite 1500  
Omaha, NE 68102  
(402) 344-0500

Robert Aaron Caplen  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 252-2523

6. *United States v. Barnes*, No. 18-mj-54 (D.D.C.) 2019 WL 1980991 (D.D.C. May 3, 2019); *United States v. Barnes*, No. 18-mj-54, 2019 WL 5538550 (D.D.C. Oct. 24, 2019), *aff'd*, 481 F. Supp. 3d 15 (D.D.C. 2020), *appeal dismissed*, 2021 WL 2525376 (D.C. Cir. May 17, 2021), 2021 WL 4723992 (D.C. Cir. May 18, 2021)

I was the presiding judge for this criminal misdemeanor case involving defendants who protested outside the United States Supreme Court in an area where demonstrations, speeches, and similar First Amendment activity are not allowed. The parties filed a motion requesting a jury trial, arguing that they had a statutory and constitutional right to a jury trial, and alternatively requesting that I exercise my discretion to allow them to have a jury trial. I denied that motion and concluded that: (1) the charged offense was a petty offense for which no constitutional right to a jury trial existed; (2) even if defendants would have been entitled to a jury trial under local law if the prosecution had elected to file the charges in D.C. Superior Court, that did not give them a right to a jury trial in federal court; and (3) the policy considerations that defendants raised did not warrant the exercise of my discretion to empanel a jury. The defendants also moved to dismiss the charges against them as unconstitutional, asserting that the statute they were accused of violating—40 U.S.C. § 6135—itsself violated the

First Amendment and was unconstitutionally vague and overbroad. In addition, one defendant (Hawkins) alleged that the charges against him should be dismissed because he was subject to selective prosecution. I denied the motions to dismiss in their entirety. I noted that the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit had held that the Supreme Court is a nonpublic forum, and I concluded that the statute was a permissible viewpoint neutral restriction that furthered the governmental interest in maintaining order and decorum at the Supreme Court and protecting the integrity of the judicial process. Defendants appealed my ruling, and the Chief Judge of the District Court affirmed my conclusion. The plaintiffs appealed the Chief Judge's ruling to the D.C. Circuit and subsequently dismissed that appeal.

Counsel for the Government:

Lisa N. Walters  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 252-7499

Kelly Smith Brown  
I am unable to locate current business contact information for Ms. Brown

Counsel for Defendants:

Jason Gregory Downs (Barnes)  
Downs Collins PA (formerly)  
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck  
1155 F Street, Northwest, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 383-4436

Jeffrey D. Robinson (Barnes)  
Lewis Baach Kaufman Middlemiss PLLC  
1101 New York Avenue, Northwest, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 833-8900

Karima Tawfik (Barnes)  
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC  
1700 K Street, Northwest, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006-3807  
(202) 452-7996

David Barry Benowitz (Hagler)  
Price Benowitz LLP

409 Seventh Street, Northwest, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 417-6000

Carmen D. Hernandez (Hawkins)  
7166 Mink Hollow Road  
Highland, MD 20777  
(240) 472-3391

Nathan I. Silver, II (Lamar)  
Law Offices of Nathan I. Silver  
6300 Orchid Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
(301) 229-0189

Mark John Carroll (Malette)  
Mark John Carroll Esq., P.C.  
39641 Tern Road  
Bethany Beach, DE 19930  
(443) 421-3475

Mary Petras  
Ubong Akpan (Sandweiss-Back)  
Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia  
625 Indiana Avenue, Northwest, Suite 550  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 208-7500

Dwight E. Crawley (Stephens)  
Law Office Of Dwight E. Crawley  
1300 I. Street, Northwest, Suite 400e  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 580-9794

Ronald S. Sullivan Jr. (Theoharis)  
Harvard Law School  
250 Hartman Road  
Newton, MA 02459  
(617) 496-4777

Shawn Sukumar (Theoharis)  
Price Benowitz LLP  
409 Seventh Street, Northwest, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 417-6000



7. *Shaw v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-cv-738 (DLF), 2019 WL 498731 (D.D.C. Feb. 8, 2019), *R. & R. adopted*, 2019 WL 935418 (D.D.C. Feb. 26, 2019)

This was an Individuals with Disabilities Education Act case involving a challenge to the school's provision of an adequate education to a student with intellectual disabilities. The plaintiff (the student's parent) moved for summary judgment and asked that the court reverse the underlying administrative decision in which a hearing officer concluded that the school district had provided the student the free and appropriate public education required by law. The parent challenged four of the hearing officer's conclusions regarding: (1) whether the school district had adequately cured its prior reliance on outdated evaluations of the student; (2) whether the student's individualized education plans (IEPs) adequately addressed her transition from an academic setting to post-school activities; (3) whether the school district improperly excluded the parent from participating in some aspects of the student's educational planning; and (4) whether the school district denied the student a free and appropriate public education by graduating her from high school before she was adequately prepared to graduate and failing to give the parent prior written notice of the graduation. I issued a report and recommendation concluding that the school district violated the student's rights by relying on outdated evaluations and failing to give the parent adequate notice of the plan to graduate the student, and that the record was insufficient to determine whether the student's rights also were violated by the decision to award her a high school diploma when her academic skills were between a third- and fifth-grade level. I recommended that the district court reverse the hearing officer's decision and remand the case for further administrative proceedings. The district judge adopted my recommendation in full.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Charles Moran  
Moran & Associates  
1100 H Street, Northwest, Suite 260  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 450-2864

Carolyn W. Houck  
Law Office of Carolyn Houck  
P.O. Box 252  
St. Michaels, MD 21663  
(301) 951-4278

Counsel for Defendant:

Tasha Monique Hardy

D.C. Office of Attorney General  
400 6th Street, Northwest, Suite 8100  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 724-7794

8. *Lelchhook v. Syrian Arab Republic*, No. 16-01550 (RC), 2019 WL 2191323 (D.D.C. Jan. 31, 2019), *R. & R. adopted*, 2019 WL 2191177 (D.D.C. Mar. 25, 2019)

This case arose under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's terrorism exception, and the plaintiffs were five family members who sued the Syrian Arab Republic (Syria) under theories of wrongful death and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The plaintiffs alleged that Syria's material support of the terrorist organization Hezbollah rendered Syria liable for the extrajudicial killing of their relative during a rocket attack that struck their relative's residence. Plaintiffs moved for default judgment on liability, seeking a ruling that Syria was liable to plaintiffs for wrongful death and intentional infliction of emotional distress. I reviewed plaintiffs' motion for default judgment and supporting legal memoranda and recommended that the court grant the motion for default judgment against Syria regarding liability for the intentional infliction of emotional distress claims brought by four plaintiffs and the wrongful death claim brought by the plaintiff representing the deceased relative's estate. I recommended that the court deny the default judgment motion on the wrongful death claim brought by the four remaining plaintiffs because the controlling statute only allows the decedent's estate to bring such a claim. The district judge adopted my recommendation.

Counsel for Plaintiffs:

Richard D. Heideman  
Noel Jason Nudelman  
Tracy Reichman Kalik  
Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, PC  
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20015  
(202) 463-1818

Counsel for Defendant:

None

9. *Larue v. Johnson*, No. 16-cv-504 (EGS), 2018 WL 1967128 (D.D.C. Feb. 22, 2018), *R. & R. adopted*, 2018 WL 2561036 (D.D.C. Apr. 4, 2018)

This was a civil action in which the plaintiff alleged that the defendant had defamed her and intentionally inflicted emotional distress upon her by posting

statements online accusing her of fraudulent activity and sending plaintiff's clients, friends, and business contacts a 73-page document which contained numerous false statements about plaintiff's professional qualifications and personal life and accused her of unprofessional and unethical behavior. The plaintiff moved for default judgment against the defendant based on his failure to respond to the civil complaint, for a permanent injunction barring the defendant from contacting, communicating with, or approaching plaintiff or posting any reviews online regarding plaintiff or her business, and for monetary damages to redress the defamatory and emotionally distressing conduct. The plaintiff also filed a separate motion for permanent injunction alleging that a criminal statute regarding cyber stalking entitled her to an injunction barring the defendant from stalking her, going within 500 feet of plaintiff's residence, place of employment, or places plaintiff regularly frequents, or contacting plaintiff directly or indirectly. I conducted an evidentiary hearing and issued a report and recommendation that recommended that plaintiff's motion for default judgment be granted, that her motion for permanent injunction be denied, that she be awarded \$280,000 in damages, and that the defendant be enjoined from further distributing the defamatory document. The district judge adopted my recommendation.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Kathleen Balthrop Havener  
The Cullen Law Firm, P.L.L.C.  
1101 30th Street, Northwest, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 298-4775

Keith Alan Rosten  
Berliner Corcoran & Rowe, LLP  
1101 17th Street, Northwest, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 293-5555

Counsel for Defendant:

None

10. *United States v. Islam*, 15-cr-67 (RDM), ECF No. 69 (Dec. 4, 2017), *R. & R. adopted orally, adoption of R. & R. aff'd*, 932 F.3d 957 (D.C. Cir. 2019)

In this criminal case I conducted numerous hearings regarding alleged violations of supervised release and issued a detailed report and recommendation recommending that the district judge reject Mr. Islam's various legal challenges to the revocation proceedings. The district judge ruled orally at a hearing and adopted all of my recommendations except for my recommendation that Mr. Islam be sentenced to four months of incarceration as a consequence for his release violations; the district judge imposed a longer period of incarceration. On

appeal, the D.C. Circuit concluded that Mr. Islam forfeited his right to appeal the district judge's decision to adopt my report and recommendation. Report and Recommendation supplied.

Counsel for the Government:

Jonathan P. Hooks  
Corbin A. Weiss  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 252-7796

Counsel for Defendant:

Mr. Islam *pro se*

Matthew J. Peed  
Clinton & Peed  
1775 Eye Street, Northwest, Suite 1150  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 919-9491

- d. For each of the 10 most significant opinions you have written, provide: (1) citations for those decisions that were published; (2) a copy of those decisions that were not published; and (3) the names and contact information for the attorneys who played a significant role in the case.

1. *Nyarko v. Crothall Healthcare, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-2728 (RMM), 2023 WL 6388950 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2023)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Michael Reiter  
Chasenboscolo Injury Lawyers  
7852 Walker Drive  
Greenbelt, MD 20770  
(301) 220-0050

Counsel for Defendants:

Caitlin Rose Convery  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon  
1800 K Street, Northwest, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 783-8400

2. *707 G Street LLC v. Jemal's Mickelson, LLC*, No. 20-cv-685 (RMM), 2023 WL 2571753 (D.D.C. Mar. 20, 2023)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

A. Wolfgang McGavran  
Nathan Robert Pittman  
McGuire Woods LLP  
888 16th Street, Northwest  
Black Lives Matter Plaza, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 857-2471 (McGavran)  
(202) 857-2469 (Pittman)

Counsel for Defendants:

Andrew Blake Schulwolf  
Albert & Schulwolf, LLC  
110 North Washington Street, Suite 300  
Rockville, MD 20850  
(301) 519-1919

3. *Wilson v. Federal Communications Commission*, No. 21-cv-895, 2022 WL 4245485 (D.D.C. Sept. 15, 2022)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Arthur Vasyi Belendiuk  
Smithwick & Belendiuk, PC  
5028 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest, Suite 301  
Washington, DC 20016  
(202) 363-4050

Counsel for Defendant:

Dedra Seibel Curteman  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
Civil Division  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 252-7566

4. *United States v. Barnes*, No. 19-mj-54, 2019 WL 5538550 (D.D.C. Oct. 24, 2019), *aff'd*, 481 F. Supp. 3d 15 (D.D.C. 2020), *appeal dismissed*, 2021 WL 2525376 (D.C. Cir. May 17, 2021), 2021 WL 4723992 (D.C. Cir. May 18,

2021)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Lisa N. Walters  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 252-7499

Kelly Smith Brown  
I am unable to locate current business contact information for Ms. Brown

Counsel for Defendants:

Jason Gregory Downs (Barnes)  
Downs Collins PA (formerly)  
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck  
1155 F Street, Northwest, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 383-4436

Jeffrey D. Robinson (Barnes)  
Lewis Baach Kaufman Middlemiss PLLC  
1101 New York Avenue, Northwest, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 833-8900

Karima Tawfik (Barnes)  
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC  
1700 K Street, Northwest, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006-3807  
(202) 452-7996

David Barry Benowitz (Hagler)  
Price Benowitz LLP  
409 Seventh Street, Northwest, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 417-6000

Carmen D. Hernandez (Hawkins)  
7166 Mink Hollow Road  
Highland, MD 20777  
(240) 472-3391

Nathan I. Silver, II (Lamar)

Law Offices of Nathan I. Silver  
6300 Orchid Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
(301) 229-0189

Mark John Carroll (Malette)  
Mark John Carroll Esq., P.C.  
39641 Tern Road  
Bethany Beach, DE 19930  
(443) 421-3475

Mary Petras (Sandweiss-Back)  
Ubong Akpan (Sandweiss-Back)  
Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia  
625 Indiana Avenue, Northwest, Suite 550  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 208-7500

Dwight E. Crawley (Stephens)  
Law Office Of Dwight E. Crawley  
1300 I. Street, Northwest, Suite 400e  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 580-9794

Ronald S. Sullivan Jr. (Theoharis)  
Harvard Law School  
250 Hartman Road  
Newton, MA 02459  
(617) 496-4777

Shawn Sukumar (Theoharis)  
Price Benowitz LLP  
409 Seventh Street, Northwest, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 417-6000

5. *LaRue v. Johnson*, No. 16-cv-504 (EGS), 2018 WL 1967128 (D.D.C. Feb. 22, 2018), *R. & R. adopted*, 2018 WL 2561036 (D.D.C. Apr. 4, 2018)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Kathleen Balthrop Havener  
The Cullen Law Firm, P.L.L.C.  
1101 30th Street, Northwest, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 298-4775

Keith Alan Rosten  
Berliner Corcoran & Rowe, LLP  
1101 17th Street, Northwest, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 293-5555

Counsel for Defendant:

None

6. *Relman Dane & Colfax PLLC v. Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley*, No.18-cv-495 (TNM/RMM), 2019 WL 3779901 (D.D.C. Aug. 12, 2019)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Andrew Soukop  
Bejamin John Razi  
Covington & Burling LLP  
850 Tenth Street, Northwest  
One City Center  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 662-5066

Steven John Winkelman  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20210  
(202) 693-9009

Counsel for Defendant:

Donald R. Warren  
Phillip E. Benson  
Warren Benson Law Group  
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1100  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
(949) 721-6636

Dennis J. Whelan, II  
Dennis J. Whelan, PC.  
2222 Monument Avenue  
Richmond, VA 23220  
(804) 359-4123



Scott P. Moore  
Mark J. Goldsmith  
1700 Farnam Street, Suite 1500  
Omaha, NE 68102  
(402) 344-0500

Robert Aaron Caplen  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 252-2523

7. *Lechhook v. Syrian Arab Republic*, 2019 WL 2191323 (D.D.C. Jan. 31, 2019),  
*R. & R. adopted*, 2019 WL 2191177 (D.D.C. Mar. 25, 2019)

Counsel for Plaintiffs:

Richard D. Heideman  
Noel Jason Nudelman  
Tracy Reichman Kalik  
Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, PC  
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20015  
(202) 463-1818

Counsel for Defendant:

None

8. *Shaw v. District of Columbia*, No. 17-cv-738 (DLF), 2018 WL 5044248  
(D.D.C. Sept. 11, 2018), *R. & R. adopted*, 2019 WL 935418 (D.D.C. Feb. 26,  
2019)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Charles Moran  
Moran & Associates  
1100 H Street, Northwest, Suite 260  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 450-2864

Carolyn W. Houck  
Law Office of Carolyn Houck  
P.O. Box 252  
St. Michaels, MD 21663  
(301) 951-4278

Counsel for Defendant:

Tasha Monique Hardy  
D.C. Office of Attorney General  
400 6th Street, Northwest, Suite 8100  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 724-7794

9. *United States v. Islam*, 15-cr-67 (RDM), ECF No. 69 (Dec. 4, 2017), *R. & R. adopted orally, adoption of R. & R. aff'd*, 932 F.3d 957 (D.C. Cir. 2019).  
Opinion previously supplied in response to Question 13c.

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Jonathan P. Hooks  
Corbin A. Weiss  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 252-7796

Counsel for Defendant:

Mr. Islam *pro se*

Matthew J. Peed  
Clinton & Peed  
1775 Eye Street, Northwest, Suite 1150  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 919-9491

10. *English v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 293 F. Supp. 3d 13 (D.D.C. 2017)

Counsel for Plaintiff:

Kenneth J. LaDuca  
Price Benowitz LLP  
409 7th Street, Northwest, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 599-1786

Peter Grenier  
Grenier Law Group PLLC  
1920 L Street, Northwest, Suite 750

Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 768-9600

Counsel for Defendants:

M. Richard Coel  
Office of General Counsel  
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority  
600 Fifth Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 962-6096

Clifton M. Mount  
The Law Office of Clifton M. Mount, PLLC  
1627 K Street, Northwest, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 262-9125

- e. Provide a list of all cases in which certiorari was requested or granted.

To my knowledge, based on a review of my records and legal databases, certiorari has not been requested or granted in any of my cases.

- f. Provide a brief summary of and citations for all of your opinions where your decisions were reversed by a reviewing court or where your judgment was affirmed with significant criticism of your substantive or procedural rulings. If any of the opinions listed were not officially reported, provide copies of the opinions.

My review of my records has revealed the following rulings that were reversed on appeal. I could not identify or review all of my rulings because they typically are not reported, I have made hundreds of such rulings, and I do not receive electronic notice of the outcome of appeals. Consequently, there may be additional rulings that were reversed that I cannot identify.

*United States v. Allen*, No. 23-cr-17 (D.D.C. Nov. 21, 2023). Copy supplied. In this criminal case in which the defendant was charged with conspiring to distribute narcotics, I conducted a pretrial detention and issued an oral ruling that the defendant be released on home detention with electronic monitoring pending trial. The United States appealed my ruling, and District Judge Colleen Kollar Kotelly reversed. Judge Kollar Kotelly concluded that Mr. Allen should be detained pending trial because release conditions could not adequately ensure the defendant's appearance at future court proceedings or the safety of the community.

*United States v. Johnson*, No. 23-cr-14 (D.D.C. Nov. 21, 2023). In this criminal

case in which defendant was charged with conspiring to distribute narcotics, I conducted a pretrial detention hearing and issued an oral ruling that the defendant be released on home detention with electronic monitoring pending trial. The United States appealed my ruling, and District Judge Colleen Kollar Kotelly reversed. Judge Kollar Kotelly concluded that Mr. Johnson should be detained pending trial because release conditions could not adequately ensure the defendant's appearance at future court proceedings or the safety of the community.

*United States v. Maucha*, No. 21-cr-00322, 2023 WL 4131016 (D.D.C. June 22, 2023). In this criminal case in which a defendant was awaiting trial on conspiracy, fraud, and money laundering charges, I conducted a hearing regarding whether the defendant should be detained pending trial in light of alleged violations of pretrial release conditions. I concluded that there was probable cause to believe that Mr. Maucha had violated federal law while on release, but that he should nonetheless remain on pretrial release but subject to more stringent conditions. The United States appealed that ruling, and District Judge Carl Nichols concluded that Mr. Maucha should be detained. Judge Nichols agreed with my findings regarding probable cause that Mr. Maucha had violated federal law, but concluded that stringent release conditions would be insufficient to adequately ensure that Mr. Maucha would not flee.

*United States v. Patel*, No. 23-cr-166, ECF No. 22 (D.D.C. May 31, 2023) (copy supplied). In this criminal case involving fraud charges, I conducted a pretrial detention hearing and concluded that the defendant did not pose a serious risk of flight that warranted pretrial detention. I ruled orally and relied on the fact that the defendant had appeared in court as required when on pretrial release for a prior criminal case. The United States appealed, and District Judge Dabney Friedrich reversed my ruling, concluding that Mr. Patel should be detained because release conditions would not adequately mitigate the risk of flight that he posed.

*United States v. Johnston*, No. 17-mj-00046 (RMM), 2017 WL 4277140 (D.D.C. Sep. 22, 2017), *rev'd*, 2017 WL 4326390 (D.D.C. Sept. 28, 2017). In this criminal case in which the defendant was charged with traveling with the intent to engage in illicit sexual conduct, I ordered that the defendant should be temporarily released from pretrial custody and placed on home incarceration for 21 days, so that he could obtain medical treatment for a cancer in which delayed treatment and diagnosis can be life-threatening. A significant factor in my ruling was that jail officials had repeatedly failed to transport the defendant to medical appointments, and he had a private physician who could promptly conduct testing and treatment. On appeal, then-Chief Judge Beryl A. Howell reversed the decision; the jail had arranged a medical appointment before appearing before Judge Howell, and she concluded that there was no evidence that the defendant would receive inadequate medical care while incarcerated.

Based on a review of my records and legal databases I have identified the following opinion that was affirmed in part. Additional opinions may exist that I was unable to identify.

*Mannina v. District of Columbia*, No. 15-cv-931 (KBJ), ECF Nos. 118, 120, 121 (D.D.C. Mar. 29, 2019, May 6, 2019), *aff'd in part*, ECF No. 153 (D.D.C. Feb. 22, 2021). Copies supplied. This civil case involves tort claims that plaintiff brought against the District of Columbia in connection with plaintiff's relative's suicide while incarcerated at a facility operated by the DC Department of Corrections. Then-District Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson referred all discovery matters to me for resolution. I issued opinions and orders to resolve three discovery disputes regarding a motion to compel production of documents, a motion for protective order, and a motion for sanctions. In a consolidated ruling, Judge Jackson partially affirmed my ruling on the motion to compel production of documents and concluded that DC should release one additional document and three sentences that were redacted from five documents.

To my knowledge, based on a review of my records and legal databases, only two reports and recommendations that I issued were rejected in full.

*Lattisaw v. District of Columbia*, No. 22-cv-510 (TNM), 2023 WL 3902737 (D.D.C. Mar. 3, 2023), *R. & R. rejected*, 2023 WL 3719814 (D.D.C. May 30, 2023). In this case plaintiff alleged that the District of Columbia violated the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") and sought an order reversing two rulings made by the hearing officer during administrative proceedings. The parties filed cross motion for summary judgment asking the court to resolve all claims in their favor. I recommended that the court reverse the hearing officer's decision that plaintiff's claims regarding an untimely educational evaluation should be dismissed as premature and that the court remand for further proceedings. District Judge Trevor McFadden rejected the recommendation and concluded that the plaintiff did not meet her burden of showing that the school district's delay in evaluating the student violated the IDEA.

*E.B. v. U.S. Dep't of State*, No. 19-cv-2856 (TJK/RMM), 2023 WL 4891521 (D.D.C. Mar. 1, 2023), *R. & R. rejected*, 2023 WL 6141673 (D.D.C. Sept. 20, 2023). This case involved a challenge to the State Department's compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act when promulgating a rule requiring passports for diversity visa applicants, and the plaintiffs' motion for attorney's fees and costs was referred to me for a report and recommendation. I recommended that the court award attorney's fees but reduce the requested award by five hours or \$1,035. District Judge Timothy Kelly rejected the recommendation and concluded that the United States' position was substantially justified, and therefore plaintiffs were not entitled to recover fees.

The following reports and recommendations that I have issued were adopted in part and rejected in part. After reviewing my records and legal databases, I have

not identified any additional reports and recommendations that were rejected in part, but it is possible that additional unpublished decisions exist.

*Thomas v. Moreland*, No. 18-cv-0800 (TJK/RMM), 2022 WL 2671272 (Mar. 4, 2022), *R. & R. adopted in part*, 2022 WL 21681093 (June 16, 2022). This case involved claims for defamation, and the court ordered plaintiff to pay the expenses and fees that defendant incurred as a result of plaintiff's violation of a court order compelling him to answer deposition questions. The motion for fees and expenses was referred to me for a report and recommendation. I recommended that the court award \$14,829 in attorney's fees and expenses. District Judge Timothy Kelly adopted most of my recommendations but declined to count approximately one hour claimed for participation in a sanction hearing, and reduced the award to \$14,689.

*Herrion v. District of Columbia*, No. 20-cv-3470 (RDM/RMM), 2022 WL 2753461 (Feb. 15, 2022), *adopted in part*, 2023 WL 2643881 (D.D.C. Mar. 27, 2023). In this case plaintiffs alleged that the District of Columbia violated the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and sought an order reversing certain rulings made by the hearing officer during administrative proceedings. I recommended that the court grant in part and deny in part the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment. District Judge Randolph Moss rejected my ruling on one of the issues addressed in my report and recommendation — whether the District unlawfully failed to fund an independent education evaluation — and remanded the case for further administrative proceedings on that narrow issue.

*Greenwald v. Azar*, No. 17-cv-797-EGS-RMM, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 258813 (D.D.C. Nov. 8, 2021), *R. & R. adopted in part sub nom. Greenwald v. Becerra*, No. CV 17-797 (EGS/RMM), 2022 WL 2046108 (D.D.C. June 7, 2022). This case involved a challenge to the validity of a Local Coverage Determination ("LCD") that the Social Security Administration ("SSA") cited when denying the plaintiff Medicare coverage for a device prescribed by his physician. Plaintiff alleged that the SSA improperly failed to follow Administrative Procedure Act procedural requirements when issuing the LCD. The SSA moved to dismiss plaintiff's complaint, asserting that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and that the plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies. I issued a report and recommendation recommending that the court dismiss the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. I concluded that the Social Security Act foreclosed reliance on general federal question jurisdiction, and that the relevant provision of that statute — 42 U.S.C. § 1395ff — did not confer jurisdiction because the plaintiff's case presented factual issues that should have first been addressed through the administrative process. District Judge Emmet Sullivan rejected my interpretation of 42 U.S.C. § 1395ff and concluded that the dispute presented a pure question of law over which the court had subject matter jurisdiction.

*Peck v. Selex Systems Integration, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-00073 (RJL/RMM), 2020 WL

8991721 (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2020), *R. & R. adopted in part*, 2021 WL 1146298 (D.D.C. Mar. 25, 2021). This case involved claims for payment of employee benefits and compensation under state law and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”). I issued a report and recommendation on a motion for attorney’s fees that was referred to me and recommended that the court grant the motion for attorney’s fees and supplemental motion for attorney’s fees, and award a total of \$421,905 in fees. District Judge Richard J. Leon partially adopted my report and recommendation and concluded that the fee award should be reduced to \$378,394.

*SNH Medical Office Properties Trust v. A Bloomin’ Sandwich Café, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-745 (KBJ), ECF No. 13 (copy supplied), *adopted in part*, 2020 WL 5834858 (D.D.C. Sept. 30, 2020). In this case the plaintiff moved for default judgment against the defendant on breach of contract claims. I recommended that the court grant the motion for default judgment, recommended \$217,497 in damages, and that the court rejected plaintiffs’ request for collection fees and costs. Then-District Judge Jackson adopted my report and recommendation in part. She concluded that due to a scrivener’s error I had miscalculated the damages, which should be \$217,506, and that the request for collection costs was a placeholder that allowed the parties to return to request those costs later, if necessary, and thus should not be denied as premature.

*Bynum v. District of Columbia*, No. 16-cv-1904 (EGS/RMM), 2018 WL 10394890 (D.D.C. Jan 26, 2018), *adopted in part*, 424 F. Supp. 3d 122 (D.D.C. 2020). In this employment discrimination case, I recommended that the court dismiss one defendant as an improper party and dismiss two counts in the plaintiff’s complaint for failure to plead sufficient acts to state a viable claim of retaliation or hostile work environment. District Judge Emmet G. Sullivan partially rejected my recommendation and concluded that the plaintiff had pled sufficient facts to support her claims of retaliation and hostile work environment.

- g. Provide a description of the number and percentage of your decisions in which you issued an unpublished opinion and the manner in which those unpublished opinions are filed and/or stored.

I estimate that I have issued more than 1,000 orders, reports and recommendations, opinions, and memoranda explaining my orders. A significant number of those are routine orders or rulings memorializing pretrial detention rulings. Approximately 129 of the decisions that contain substant legal and factual analysis are published in a reporter, Lexis, and/or Westlaw. The remaining rulings are stored in the electronic case management system maintained by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

- h. Provide citations for significant opinions on federal or state constitutional issues, together with the citation to appellate court rulings on such opinions. If any of the opinions listed were not officially reported, provide copies of the opinions.

*Barnes v. District of Columbia*, No. 16-01027 (ACR), ECF No. 30 (Nov. 3, 2023), *R. & R. adopted*, ECF No. 33 (Dec. 4, 2023). Copies supplied.

*United States v. Barnes*, No. 18-mj-54, 2019 WL 5538550 (D.D.C. Oct. 24, 2019), *aff'd*, 481 F. Supp. 3d 15 (D.D.C. 2020), *appeal dismissed*, 2021 WL 2525356 (D.C. Cir. May 17, 2021), 2021 WL 4723992 (D.C. Cir. May 18, 2021).

*United States v. Barnes*, No. 18-mj-54, 2019 WL 1980991 (D.D.C. May 3, 2019).

*United States v. Islam*, 15-cr-67 (RDM), ECF No. 69 (D.D.C. Dec. 4, 2017).  
Opinion previously supplied in response to Question 13c.

- i. Provide citations to all cases in which you sat by designation on a federal court of appeals, including a brief summary of any opinions you authored, whether majority, dissenting, or concurring, and any dissenting opinions you joined.

I have not sat by designation on any federal court of appeals.

14. **Recusal:** If you are or have been a judge, identify the basis by which you have assessed the necessity or propriety of recusal (If your court employs an "automatic" recusal system by which you may be recused without your knowledge, please include a general description of that system.) Provide a list of any cases, motions or matters that have come before you in which a litigant or party has requested that you recuse yourself due to an asserted conflict of interest or in which you have recused yourself *sua sponte*. Identify each such case, and for each provide the following information:

- a. whether your recusal was requested by a motion or other suggestion by a litigant or a party to the proceeding or by any other person or interested party; or if you recused yourself *sua sponte*;
- b. a brief description of the asserted conflict of interest or other ground for recusal;
- c. the procedure you followed in determining whether or not to recuse yourself;
- d. your reason for recusing or declining to recuse yourself, including any action taken to remove the real, apparent or asserted conflict of interest or to cure any other ground for recusal.

I make recusal decisions in accordance with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges and 28 U.S.C. § 455. To my knowledge, no party, litigant, or attorney has requested that I recuse myself from a case. When I became a magistrate judge I *sua sponte* recused myself from all civil matters being defended by the United States Attorney's Office that were pending during my tenure as a Deputy Chief of the Civil Division because I supervised a significant percentage of civil cases handled by the office and frequently attended lunches when cases that I was not supervising were informally



discussed. I notified the Clerk's office of that recusal policy, and the cases generally were not assigned to me. When cases defended by attorneys from the United States Attorney's Office were assigned to me I immediately checked the docket to determine whether my recusal rule should apply. I do not recall the specific names of the cases that were assigned to me and from which I recused myself pursuant to that blanket policy, and do not have a record of those recusals.

15. **Public Office, Political Activities and Affiliations:**

- a. List chronologically any public offices you have held, other than judicial offices, including the terms of service and whether such positions were elected or appointed. If appointed, please include the name of the individual who appointed you. Also, state chronologically any unsuccessful candidacies you have had for elective office or unsuccessful nominations for appointed office.

I have not held any public office other than judicial office. I have not had any unsuccessful candidacies for elective office or unsuccessful nominations for appointed office.

- b. List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered, whether compensated or not, to any political party or election committee. If you have ever held a position or played a role in a political campaign, identify the particulars of the campaign, including the candidate, dates of the campaign, your title and responsibilities.

None.

16. **Legal Career:** Answer each part separately.

- a. Describe chronologically your law practice and legal experience after graduation from law school including:
- i. whether you served as clerk to a judge, and if so, the name of the judge, the court and the dates of the period you were a clerk;

From 1998 to 1999 I served as a law clerk to the Honorable Merrick B. Garland, who at that time was a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

- ii. whether you practiced alone, and if so, the addresses and dates;

I have never practiced law alone.

- iii. the dates, names and addresses of law firms or offices, companies or governmental agencies with which you have been affiliated, and the nature of your affiliation with each;

1999 – 2007  
Jenner & Block LLP  
1099 New York Avenue, Northwest, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
Litigation Associate

2007 – 2017  
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
Civil Division  
601 D Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
Assistant United States Attorney (2007 – 2017)  
Deputy Chief, Civil Division (2011 – 2017)

- iv. whether you served as a mediator or arbitrator in alternative dispute resolution proceedings and, if so, a description of the 10 most significant matters with which you were involved in that capacity.

I have never served as a mediator or arbitrator except in my capacity as a United States Magistrate Judge.

b. Describe:

- i. the general character of your law practice and indicate by date when its character has changed over the years.

From 1999 through 2006, after clerking on the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, I worked at Jenner and Block LLP's Washington, DC office as a litigation associate. My practice at that firm involved complex civil litigation in federal district courts and courts of appeals. The cases that I worked on involved a variety of constitutional, statutory, and regulatory claims. As part of the firm's telecommunications practice group, I represented clients in several regulatory matters pending before state and federal agencies and coordinated federal appeals of state utility commission rulings. I also worked on a variety of pleadings, motions, legal memoranda, and appellate briefs during my time at the firm, and gained more responsibility as my seniority increased. In a *pro bono* matter I briefed and argued an appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

In 2007 I became an Assistant United States Attorney in the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. I became a Deputy Chief of that division in 2011. While practicing as an AUSA, I handled a substantial docket of cases involving civil claims against the United States, federal agencies, and federal officials, such as

suits under the Federal Tort Claims Act, challenges to agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act, employment discrimination claims under federal anti-discrimination statutes, requests for the release or modification of records under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") and Privacy Act, and constitutional tort claims. I was the sole counsel for all but a few of those cases and frequently appeared in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. I also handled several appellate matters including briefs and oral arguments before the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. As a Deputy Chief, I supervised such cases, and maintained a smaller docket of cases in which I continued to serve as lead counsel.

- ii. your typical clients and the areas at each period of your legal career, if any, in which you have specialized.

At Jenner and Block, I handled matters involving several clients, including companies, organizations, and individuals. At the United States Attorney's Office, my client was the United States – including federal agencies and officials.

- c. Describe the percentage of your practice that has been in litigation and whether you appeared in court frequently, occasionally, or not at all. If the frequency of your appearances in court varied, describe such variance, providing dates.

- i. Indicate the percentage of your practice in:

- 1. federal courts: 99%
- 2. state courts of record: 1%
- 3. other courts: 0%
- 4. administrative agencies: 0%

- ii. Indicate the percentage of your practice in:

- 1. civil proceedings: 99%
- 2. criminal proceedings: 1%

- d. State the number of cases in courts of record, including cases before administrative law judges, you tried to verdict, judgment or final decision (rather than settled), indicating whether you were sole counsel, chief counsel, or associate counsel.

I was co-counsel in one case that went to a jury trial during my tenure at the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. Additionally, I argued approximately six appeals before the D.C. Circuit.

- i. What percentage of these trials were:

- 1. jury: 100%
- 2. non-jury: 0%

- e. Describe your practice, if any, before the Supreme Court of the United States. Supply four (4) copies of any briefs, amicus or otherwise, and, if applicable, any oral argument transcripts before the Supreme Court in connection with your practice.

I have never argued before the Supreme Court of the United States. As an associate at Jenner and Block LLP, I worked on the following amicus briefs:

*Lovitt v. True, cert. denied*, 541 U.S. 1006 (2004) (brief of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers as amicus curiae in support of the petition for certiorari, 2005 WL 673543)

*City of Los Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.*, 535 U.S. 425 (2002) (brief of the Liberty Project as amicus curiae in support of respondents, 2001 WL 950922)

*Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27 (2001) (brief of the Liberty Project as amicus curiae in support of petitioner, 2000 WL 1706770)

17. **Litigation:** Describe the ten (10) most significant litigated matters which you personally handled, whether or not you were the attorney of record. Give the citations, if the cases were reported, and the docket number and date if unreported. Give a capsule summary of the substance of each case. Identify the party or parties whom you represented; describe in detail the nature of your participation in the litigation and the final disposition of the case. Also state as to each case:

- a. the date of representation;
- b. the name of the court and the name of the judge or judges before whom the case was litigated; and
- c. the individual name, addresses, and telephone numbers of co-counsel and of principal counsel for each of the other parties.

1. *Boardley v. Dep't of Interior*, 605 F. Supp. 2d 8 (D.D.C. 2009) (Robertson), *aff'd in part*, 2009 WL 3571278 (Oct. 19, 2009) (Henderson, Rogers, Tatel), 615 F.3d 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (Sentelle, Brown, Kavanaugh), *fees awarded*, 924 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2013).

This case was brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and involved a First Amendment challenge to National Park Service regulations that required the plaintiff and other individuals to obtain a permit before distributing leaflets and engaging in certain other expressive activities in national parks. From 2007 to 2013 I represented the Department of Interior in this litigation as lead counsel and wrote the briefs, argued the motions, and orally argued the case on appeal. The district court granted the Department of Interior's motion for summary judgment, concluding that the

plaintiff's as-applied First Amendment claim was moot, and that the facial challenge to the regulations failed as a matter of law because the regulations' prohibition of "public expression of views," which was not narrowly tailored to further a government interest, could be severed from the regulations. On appeal, the D.C. Circuit summarily affirmed the district court's ruling regarding the as-applied claim, but reversed the district court's resolution of the facial challenge to the regulations. The D.C. Circuit concluded that the regulations were overbroad and not narrowly tailored to further the government's asserted interests because they provided no exception for individuals or small groups who wished to engage in First Amendment activity. After the D.C. Circuit ruled, plaintiff filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, which was granted.

Plaintiffs' Counsel:

Jonathan A. Scruggs  
Alliance Defending Freedom  
15100 North 90th Street  
Scottsdale, AZ 85260  
(480) 444-0020

Jordan Woodard Lorence  
Alliance Defending Freedom  
440 First Street, Northwest, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 393-8690

Heather Gebelin Hacker  
Alliance Defense Fund  
101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100  
Folsom, CA 95630  
(916) 932-2850

2. *Johnson v. Peake*, No. 08-cv-1103 (D.D.C.) (Bates).

This was an employment discrimination case that involved Ms. Johnson's sexual harassment allegations against her co-worker. I was co-counsel for the defendant in 2012 and joined the case to assist the lead attorney with trial. The trial began September 12, 2012, and concluded September 21, 2012. The jury entered a verdict in favor of the defendant. As co-counsel for this trial I prepared witnesses, conducted opening statements, examined and cross-examined witnesses, and discussed trial strategy with my co-counsel and agency officials.

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Michael J. Hoare (Deceased)  
Michael J. Hoare, P.C.

Dennis Chong

Carr Maloney, P.C.  
2020 K Street, Northwest, Suite 850  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 310-5566

Co-Counsel:

Andrea McBarnette, ALJ  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426  
(202) 502-8500

3. *Friedman v. Sebelius*, 755 F. Supp. 2d 98 (D.D.C. 2010) (Huvelle), *rev'd*, 686 F.3d 813 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (Sentelle, Ginsburg, Williams).

From 2009 to 2012, I represented the defendant, Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services in *Friedman v. Sebelius* and was sole counsel. The case originated in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and involved a challenge to an order issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services that excluded senior corporate officers from a pharmaceutical company from participating in federal health care programs for 12 years. The executives disputed whether their convictions for misdemeanor misbranding of OxyContin constituted “misdemeanors relating to fraud” that would allow them to be excluded, and alternatively argued that the length of the exclusion period was arbitrary and capricious. District Judge Ellen S. Huvelle granted the defendant’s motion for summary judgment in full. The D.C. Circuit reversed and held that the length of the executives’ exclusion was arbitrary and capricious. Judges Sentelle and Williams separately dissented in part. This case did not go to trial and was resolved on motions.

Plaintiffs’ Counsel:

Jonathan Lynwood Abram  
Jonathan L. Disenhaus  
Audrey E. Moog  
Hogan Lovells US LLP  
555 13th Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 637-5600

Carter G. Phillips  
Joseph R. Guerra  
Matthew D. Krueger  
Anand H. Das  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20005

(202) 736-80002

4. *Johnson v. District of Columbia*, 780 F. Supp. 2d 62 (D.D.C. 2011) (Collyer), *aff'd* 734 F.3d 1194 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (Rogers, Tatel, Griffith).

From 2007 to 2011 I was co-counsel for defendant Dillard, former United States Marshal for the District of Columbia Superior Court. This case was a class action in which female individuals who were detained in the Superior Court cellblock alleged that they were unconstitutionally subjected to partial strip searches prior to their appearance in court. The arrestees raised claims under the Fourth and Fifth Amendment, asserting that the searches were unreasonable and that they were treated differently than male arrestees. After extensive discovery and the narrowing of the claims through motions practice, the District Court concluded that the former United States Marshal for the Superior Court cellblock was entitled to qualified immunity. The D.C. Circuit affirmed. I worked with my co-counsel to defend dozens of depositions, drafted significant portions of the summary judgment and appellate briefs, and argued the appeal before the D.C. Circuit.

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Louis Allan Kleiman  
Louis A. Kleiman, Attorney At Law  
2055 15th Street North, Suite #333  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703) 524-3333

William Charles Cole Claiborne, III  
Claiborne Law  
717 D Street, Northwest, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 824-0700

Lynn E. Cunningham  
Law Offices of Lynn E. Cunningham  
306 Westview Drive  
Dubois, WY 82513  
(307) 431-4158

Co-Counsel

William Mark Nebeker (retired, former AUSA)  
Oliver McDaniel (retired, former AUSA)

5. *Navab-Safavi v. Glassman*, 650 F. Supp. 2d 40 (D.D.C. 2009) (Huvelle), *aff'd*, 637 F.3d 311 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (Sentelle, Garland, Williams).

From 2008 to 2011 I was lead counsel and represented the defendants, the Broadcasting Board of Governors ("BBG") and agency officials, in this matter. In this case, a former contractor for the BBG alleged that the agency violated her First and Fifth Amendment

rights by terminating her contract based on her production of a war protest video that spoofed a BBG network production. The defendants moved to dismiss, asserting qualified immunity and other defenses. The court denied the motion to dismiss, and the D.C. Circuit affirmed; both courts concluded that Ms. Navab-Safavi's claims were sufficient to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. This case did not proceed to trial because the parties settled after engaging in discovery. As lead counsel I wrote the briefs at the district court and appellate level, handled district court hearings, and argued the appeal before the D.C. Circuit.

Plaintiff's Counsel

Honorable Carolyn N. Lerner  
United States Court of Federal Claims  
717 Madison Place, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20439  
(202) 357-6407

Richard A. Salzman  
Heller, Huron, Chertkof & Salzman, PLLC  
1730 M Street, Northwest, Suite 412  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 293-8090

6. *Brown v. Short*, 729 F. Supp. 2d 125 (D.D.C. 2010) (Collyer).

From 2009 to 2012 I served as lead counsel for the United States and a former employee in this constitutional tort case. Plaintiff Brown alleged that she was unlawfully strip searched when she was briefly in the custody of the United States Marshals Service for the District of Columbia Superior Court. The parties settled this case after a motion to dismiss was denied in part. As lead counsel I wrote the motions and briefs, participated in mediation, and handled all hearings.

Plaintiff's Counsel

Jennifer Klar  
John Peter Relman  
Megan Cacace  
Relman Colfax PLLC  
1225 19th Street, Northwest, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 728-1888

7. *Camden County Council on Economic Opportunity v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services*, 586 F.3d 992 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (Kavanaugh, Rogers, Williams).



This case involved a challenge to a federal agency decision to terminate plaintiff's Head Start grant based on the county's failure to correct a safety issue. I represented defendant the Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS") in the appellate proceedings before the D.C. Circuit from 2008 through 2009. A different Assistant United States Attorney handled the district court proceedings. The district court concluded that HHS acted lawfully when it terminated plaintiff's grant. The D.C. Circuit affirmed and concluded that HHS's decision was not arbitrary and capricious and gave plaintiff adequate notice of the deficiencies on which the termination was based. I wrote the appellate briefs and argued the appeal.

Plaintiff's Counsel

Robert A. Graham, Jr.  
Offit Kurman, P.A.  
7501 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1000w  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(240) 507-1779

Edward T. Waters  
Feldesman Tucker Leifer Fidell LLP  
1129 20th Street, Northwest, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 466-8960

8. *Porter v. U.S. Capitol Police Bd.*, 816 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2011) (Boasberg).

This was an employment discrimination case in which the plaintiffs, former Library of Congress police offers, alleged that their transfer to the United States Capitol Police constituted unlawful age and race discrimination and violated their equal protection rights. I represented defendant the Capitol Police Board from 2010 to 2011 and served as lead counsel. Chief Judge James E. Boasberg granted defendant's motion to dismiss and for summary judgment and held that some claims were barred by res judicata, other claims were exempted from the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and that the plaintiff's equal protection rights were not violated. As lead counsel I wrote the briefs and handled all hearings.

Plaintiff's Counsel

Jimmy A. Bell  
Law Offices of Jimmy A. Bell  
P.O. Box 2239  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20702

9. *Roth v. King*, No. 03-cv-1109, 2005 WL 4436163 (Urbina), *rev'd*, 449 F.3d 1272 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (Edwards, Sentelle, Brown).

In this case, several attorneys challenged the District of Columbia Superior Court's adoption of a new panel system for appointing counsel to indigent parties in family court cases, alleging that the new rules unconstitutionally deprived them of their property right to practice law and maintain their specialty caseload, violated their and their clients' due process rights, defamed and libeled them, tortiously interfered with their prospective economic advantage and contractual relations, and violated the Competition in Contracts Act. From approximately 2003 to 2007 I was one of two attorneys who represented the Superior Court Judge defendants. As co-counsel I drafted a significant portion of the briefs at the district court and appellate level. The district court concluded that the judicial defendants were immune from liability for damages but that plaintiffs had pleaded a potentially viable takings claim, and therefore partially granted and partially denied the judicial defendants' motion to dismiss. On appeal, the D.C. Circuit reversed and concluded that the Fifth Amendment claims should have been dismissed, and that judicial immunity shielded defendants from claims seeking both injunctive relief and damages.

#### Plaintiffs' Counsel

Pamela H. Roth  
Roth Law Firm PLLC  
1050 30th Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 445-4861

David J. Ontell  
5712 Nebraska Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20015-1222  
(202) 638-1696

David J. Sitomer *pro se*  
Marion Chou, *pro se*  
Glen Angelo Esq., *pro se*  
John McCabe, Jr. Esq., *pro se*  
Michael Hendrickson Esq., *pro se*  
Russell Torelle Esq., *pro se*  
Bruce Denslow Esq., *pro se*  
Annie Alexander Esq., *pro se*

#### Co-Counsel

Donald B. Verrilli, Jr.  
Munger, Tolles, and Olson LLP  
1155 F Street, Northwest, Seventh Floor  
Washington, DC 20004

#### Counsel for Co-Defendants

Jonathan Louis Stern  
Donald T. Stepka  
Ronald A. Schechter  
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 942-5000

10. *NextWave v. Federal Communications Commission*, 254 F.3d 130 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (Sentelle, Tatel, Garland), *aff'd*, *FCC v. NextWave Personal Communication Inc.*, 123 S. Ct. 832 (2003).

From approximately 2000 through 2003 I was part of a team of attorneys who represented NextWave in a challenge to the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC's) decision to cancel NextWave's personal communication service licenses based on a failure to make installment payments during NextWave's bankruptcy. The D.C. Circuit concluded that the FCC's decision violated the Bankruptcy Code, and the Supreme Court concurred. As an attorney on the case I conducted legal research, assisted with drafting briefs, and discussed case strategy with the partner and other associates.

Opposing Counsel

Daniel M. Armstrong  
Christopher J. Wright  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of General Counsel  
1919 M Street, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20554  
(202) 418-1700

Co-Counsel

Donald B. Verrilli, Jr.  
Munger, Tolles, and Olson LLP  
1155 F Street, Northwest, Seventh Floor  
Washington, DC 20004

Ian Heath Gershengorn  
Jenner & Block LLP  
1099 New York Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 639-6000

18. **Legal Activities:** Describe the most significant legal activities you have pursued, including significant litigation which did not progress to trial or legal matters that did not

involve litigation. Describe fully the nature of your participation in these activities. List any client(s) or organization(s) for whom you performed lobbying activities and describe the lobbying activities you performed on behalf of such client(s) or organizations(s). (Note: As to any facts requested in this question, please omit any information protected by the attorney-client privilege.)

As a litigator, I handled more than 200 cases at various stages of civil litigation in federal courts, from the initial filing of a complaint, to discovery and motion practice in the trial court, and appeals. I briefed and argued dozens of dispositive motions including motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment. I also argued several cases on appeal in the D.C. Circuit. From 2011 through 2017 I supervised hundreds of cases pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and in that capacity reviewed and edited the motions prepared by counsel of record.

I also volunteered through Project LEAD for several years when I was an Assistant United States Attorney. In that program I partnered with other attorneys to lead a recurring series of classes and workshops for disadvantaged fifth grade students in Washington, DC public schools. Our Project LEAD curriculum focused on encouraging the students to make responsible decisions and to give them an overview of the law and judicial system.

As a magistrate judge, I also have volunteered to serve as a judge for an annual moot court for high school students organized by the Historical Society for the District of Columbia Circuit. I also have served as a member of the district court's *Pro Se* Litigation Committee, a board member for the Federal Magistrate Judges Association, a member of the Federal Magistrate Judges Association Diversity Committee, and a member of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts' Magistrate Judges Advisory Group.

I have not performed lobbying activities or registered as a lobbyist.

19. **Teaching:** What courses have you taught? For each course, state the title, the institution at which you taught the course, the years in which you taught the course, and describe briefly the subject matter of the course and the major topics taught. If you have a syllabus of each course, provide four (4) copies to the committee.

None.

20. **Deferred Income/ Future Benefits:** List the sources, amounts and dates of all anticipated receipts from deferred income arrangements, stock, options, uncompleted contracts and other future benefits which you expect to derive from previous business relationships, professional services, firm memberships, former employers, clients or customers. Describe the arrangements you have made to be compensated in the future for any financial or business interest.

None.

21. **Outside Commitments During Court Service:** Do you have any plans, commitments, or agreements to pursue outside employment, with or without compensation, during your service with the court? If so, explain.

None.

22. **Sources of Income:** List sources and amounts of all income received during the calendar year preceding your nomination and for the current calendar year, including all salaries, fees, dividends, interest, gifts, rents, royalties, licensing fees, honoraria, and other items exceeding \$500 or more (if you prefer to do so, copies of the financial disclosure report, required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, may be substituted here).

When my nomination is formally submitted to the Senate, I will file my Financial Disclosure Report and will supplement this Questionnaire with a copy of that Report.

23. **Statement of Net Worth:** Please complete the attached financial net worth statement in detail (add schedules as called for).

See attached Net Worth Statement.

24. **Potential Conflicts of Interest:**

- a. Identify the family members or other persons, parties, categories of litigation, and financial arrangements that are likely to present potential conflicts-of-interest when you first assume the position to which you have been nominated. Explain how you would address any such conflict if it were to arise.

My spouse works for a company that competes for contracts with federal government agencies, BDO. Cases involving claims brought by his employer could present potential conflicts of interest. In such cases, I would review and follow the guidance in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges in determining whether recusal is appropriate, as well as complying with 28 U.S.C. § 455 by disqualifying myself in specific circumstances commanded by the statute and in any case where my impartiality might reasonably be questioned. If I determined that recusal was required, I would return the case to the Clerk's Office for reassignment to another judge.

- b. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest, including the procedure you will follow in determining these areas of concern.

If confirmed as a judge on the Court of Federal Claims, I would continue to resolve any potential conflict of interest by adhering to Canon 3 of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, 28 U.S.C. § 455, and any and all other laws, rules, and practices governing such circumstances. I will also utilize the internal system that the Court of Federal Claims uses to screen cases for potential recusal.

25. **Pro Bono Work:** An ethical consideration under Canon 2 of the American Bar Association's Code of Professional Responsibility calls for "every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional workload, to find some time to participate in serving the disadvantaged." Describe what you have done to fulfill these responsibilities, listing specific instances and the amount of time devoted to each.

I have not provided pro bono services since I left private practice in 2007, because my employment as a Department of Justice attorney and a magistrate judge prevented me from representing clients in that manner. I regularly worked on pro bono matters while I was an associate at Jenner & Block. I frequently participate in volunteer activities, principally involving in-kind donations to disadvantaged families and children. Through my Jack and Jill chapter I have organized and supported a variety of charitable activities including collecting and donating items to benefit organizations such as the Boys and Girls Club of America (book donations), the Pajama Program (children's pajamas and books), and the Ruby Tucker Family Center (children's books).

26. **Selection Process:**

- a. Please describe your experience in the entire judicial selection process, from beginning to end (including the circumstances which led to your nomination and the interviews in which you participated). Is there a selection commission in your jurisdiction to recommend candidates for nomination to the federal courts? If so, please include that process in your description, as well as whether the commission recommended your nomination. List the dates of all interviews or communications you had with the White House staff or the Justice Department regarding this nomination. Do not include any contacts with Federal Bureau of Investigation personnel concerning your nomination.

On October 3, 2023 officials from the White House Counsel's Office informed me that I was being considered for a vacancy on the United States Court of Federal Claims and invited me to interview. On October 5, 2023, I interviewed with officials from the White House Counsel's Office. Since October 10, 2023, I have been in contact with officials from the Office of Legal Policy at the Department of Justice. On December 19, 2023, the President announced his intent to nominate me.

- b. Has anyone involved in the process of selecting you as a judicial nominee discussed with you any currently pending or specific case, legal issue or question in a manner that could reasonably be interpreted as seeking any express or implied assurances concerning your position on such case, issue, or question? If so, explain fully.

No.