

FILED

3/18/2021
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

GERALDINE TALLEY HOBBY,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 20-3842 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed what is construed to be a motion under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* Dkt. # 6 (“Motion in Response to Dismissal and a Request for Reinstatement”). She seeks relief from the order entered on January 19, 2021, which dismissed this action for insufficient pleading under Rule 8. *See* Mem. Op. [Dkt. # 3].

In its discretion, a court may relieve a party from a final judgment, order or proceeding for any one of six enumerated reasons. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)-(6). The instant motion and its assorted attachments provide no discernible grounds to merit reopening this case. *See Thomas v. Holder*, 750 F.3d 899, 902 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (a party seeking relief under Rule 60(b) must offer “a hint of a suggestion” that she might prevail if the case is reopened) (quoting *Marino v. DEA*, 685 F.3d 1076, 1080 (D.C. Cir. 2012)). Plaintiff’s confusing attempts to amend the complaint, *see generally* attachments, do not cure the pleading defects. *See* Mem. Op. at 2 (noting that “[i]nstead of differentiating her intended claims and succinctly identifying her allegations and entitlement to relief, plaintiff presents a rambling and disorganized discussion regarding a range of topics”). Therefore, plaintiff’s motion will be denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

_____/s/_____
AMIT P. MEHTA
United States District Judge

Date: March 18, 2021