

**FILED**

**JUN 29 2012**

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

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

STEPHEN J. BECKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHELITA N. PARHAM,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **12 1072**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *pro se* "Notice of Removal," which is construed as a civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

On the defendant's motion, the Superior Court of the District of Columbia has issued a civil protection order against the plaintiff on or about January 31, 2011, *see* Compl. ¶ 3, and that order apparently was extended for another year, *id.* ¶ 6; *see id.*, Ex. (Order, *Parham v. Becker*, No. 2011 CPO 184 (D.C. Super. Ct. filed June 6, 2012)). According to the plaintiff, the presiding judge has violated provisions of the Code of Judicial Conduct and has expressed bias against him. *See id.* ¶¶ 9-10. Further, he complains that he "can't get a fair and impartial hearing in the Superior Court, and if [he] Appeal[s] the decision . . . you still lose." *Id.* ¶ 16.

By filing this action, it appears that the plaintiff asks this Court to review or overturn the Superior Court's rulings. This Court has no such jurisdiction, and declines to intervene in a matter pending before the Superior Court. *See, e.g., Mooreman v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, No. 10-1219, 2010 WL 2884661, at \*1 (D.D.C. July 10, 2010); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *aff'd*, 1994 WL 474995 (D.C. Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1150 (1995).

*W*

*3*

Accordingly, the Court will dismiss this action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 6/21/12

E. V. S. Hinkle  
United States District Judge