

As the Tenth Circuit has explained:

"Generally speaking, only the most egregious misconduct, such as bribery of a judge or members of a jury, or the fabrication of evidence by a party in which an attorney is implicated will constitute a fraud on the court. Less egregious misconduct, such as nondisclosure to the court of facts allegedly pertinent to the matter before it, will not ordinarily rise to the level of fraud on the court. *Buck*, 281 F.3d at 1342, quoting *Weese*, 98 F.3d at 552-53 (quoting *Rozier v. Ford Motor Co.*, 573 F.2d 1332, 1338 (5th Cir. 1978)); *Yapp*, 186 F.3d at 1231 (Relief under Rule 60(b)(3) may be granted only when the motion is substantiated by clear and convincing evidence that the defendants acted with an intent to deceive or defraud the court, by means of a deliberately planned and carefully executed scheme.).

While plaintiff uses the right legalese in his single-sentence, bald accusation of fraud, he presents not one allegation of fact or piece of evidence to support a claim of fraud upon the court. Nor does he describe intentionally fraudulent acts by any named defendants. Granting relief from judgment based upon plaintiff's conclusory statement would clearly be an abuse of the court's discretion."