

KEITH RUSSELL JUDD,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
TEXAS, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 05-0780 (PLF)

This action, brought pro se by a federal prisoner, is before the Court on its initial review of the complaint. The Court is required to screen a prisoner's complaint and dismiss it as soon as practicable if, among other grounds, the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seeks monetary damages from officials who are immune from suit. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a)-(b). The Court will dismiss the complaint on both grounds.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has a number of motions pending that, in light of this outcome, will be denied as moot.

court pursuant to § 2255. See Judd v. United States of America, Civ. Action No. 05-1152 (D.D.C., June 9, 2005); Judd v. United States of America, Civ. Action No. 05-1221 (D.D.C., June 22, 2005). This Court lacks authority to review plaintiff's judgment of conviction.

Plaintiff also seeks \$10 million in damages. Although he lists four individuals as defendants, plaintiff complains only about acts taken by United States District Judge Royal Ferguson. See Complaint at 3-4. Judges are absolutely immune from suit for actions, such as those alleged here, taken in a judicial or quasi-judicial capacity. Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978); Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993). As for the other named defendants, plaintiff has made no accusations against them and therefore has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court, acting sua sponte, dismisses the complaint in its entirety. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: October 3, 2005