

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

MAR 20 2014

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

DAVONTA MELVIN ROWLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT BUILDING B,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 14-450

MEMORANDUM OPINION

According to the plaintiff, a judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia has “come[] up with some sort of inappropriate, unconstitutional, self-satisfactory reason to dismiss three very vital civil rights civil suits filed by [the plaintiff].” Compl. at 1. The judge, the plaintiff contends, “is proven not to be competent,” and has “no business even being able to review sensitive case detail.” *Id.* The plaintiff demands that any lawsuit she files in the Superior Court be immediately removed to this federal district court. *Id.* In addition, the plaintiff demands an award totaling \$20,038,006,000,000.00. *Id.* The Court will grant the plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint in its entirety.

The judge enjoys absolute immunity from liability for damages for acts committed within her judicial jurisdiction. *See Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991); *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988); *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872). Insofar as the plaintiff asks this Court to review or overturn any decision of a Superior Court judge, the request must be denied. This Court has no authority to review or reverse the decisions of a Superior Court judge, or to direct the activities of that court. *See, e.g., Mooreman v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, No. 10-1219,

N

3

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).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

2/21/14



United States District Judge