

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7109**September Term, 2020****1:20-cv-02511-EGS****Filed On: March 18, 2021**

Robert C. Laity,

Appellant

v.

Kamala D. Harris,

Appellee

BEFORE: Tatel, Millett, and Rao, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the court's February 5, 2021 order to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed against appellant, and the response thereto, it is

ORDERED that the order to show cause be discharged. Laity's response to this court's order to show cause does not challenge the district court's ruling that he lacks standing. See *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) ("generally available grievance about government" does not confer standing); *Chapman v. Obama*, 719 F. App'x 13 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (no standing to challenge President Obama's qualifications to hold office). He has therefore failed to demonstrate that his appeal is not frivolous. See *Reliance Ins. Co. v. Sweeney Corp., Maryland*, 792 F.2d 1137, 1138 (D.C. Cir. 1986) ("An appeal is considered frivolous when its disposition is obvious, and the legal arguments are wholly without merit."). Although the court declines to impose sanctions in this instance, Laity is forewarned that this court will not hesitate to grant a motion for sanctions against him, or impose sanctions on its own motion, in any of his future appeals, if warranted. See Fed. R. App. P. 38; D.C. Cir. R. 38; 28 U.S.C. § 1912; see also *In re American President Lines, Ltd.*, 804 F.2d 1307, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (explaining monetary sanctions may serve as warning to vexatious pro se litigant and

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 20-7109

September Term, 2020

noting that the district court may consider injunctive relief to prevent further abuse of judicial process).

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk