

**FILED**

October 3, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-30779

---

REYNALDO OYUELA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

SEACOR MARINE (NIGERIA), INC., ET AL,

Defendants,

SEACOR MARINE, INC., SEACOR MARINE (BAHAMAS), INC.,  
SEACOR SMIT, INC.,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Louisiana

---

Before DAVIS, BARKSDALE, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Reynaldo Oyuela appealed the district court's order denying his motion to reopen, which previously had been administratively closed upon the court's conditional dismissal for *forum non conveniens*. *Oyuela v. Seacor Marine (Nigeria), Inc.*, No. Civ.A.02-3298, 2005 WL 1400404 (E.D. La. June 8, 2005). Because

---

\*Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.

the district court did not make clear whether it intended the dismissal to remain conditional or to become final, we remanded for determination of that issue. *Oyuela v. Seacor Marine (Nigeria), Inc.*, No. 05-30779, 2006 WL 2277642 (5th Cir. Aug. 8, 2006). The district court subsequently converted its conditional dismissal into a final and unconditional dismissal. *Oyuela v. Seacor Marine (Nigeria), Inc.*, No. Civ.A.02-3298, slip op. (E.D. La. Aug. 25, 2006).

Having retained jurisdiction over this case during the pendency of our limited remand to the district court, we now review the court's final judgment dismissing Oyuela's claims with prejudice and entering judgment in favor of defendants-appellees.

A district court's refusal to reopen an administratively closed case that effectively terminates all litigation between the parties is reviewed for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Texas*, 457 F.3d 472, 476 (5th Cir. 2006); *see also Macklin v. City of New Orleans*, 293 F.3d 237, 240 (5th Cir. 2002) ("We review the district court's administrative handling of a case . . . for abuse of discretion.").

We find that the district court has not abused its discretion and AFFIRM for the reasons stated by the district court.

AFFIRMED.