

**FILED**

OCT 15 2012

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

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

ANDRE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES SEYMORE,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)


Civil Action No. **12 1684**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *pro se* complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

The plaintiff alleges that the defendant, who presided over the direct appeal of his criminal case, failed to appoint counsel to represent him and thus "effectively suspend[ed] the due process of the appellate proceedings." Compl. at 3-4. He neither challenges his conviction nor demands monetary damages. *Id.* at 4. Rather, the plaintiff demands injunctive relief directing the defendant to appoint appellate counsel to represent the plaintiff on direct appeal. *Id.* This Court cannot grant the relief the plaintiff demands because "a United States District Court has no authority to review final judgments of a state court in judicial proceedings." *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983); *see Lightfoot v. District of Columbia*, 448 F.3d 392, 398 (D.C. Cir. 2006); *Weekly v. Morrow*, 204 F.3d 613, 615 (5th Cir. 2000). An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: *October 5, 2012*

  
United States District Judge