

**FILED**

**MAY 28 2014**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert Wayne Robinson, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Honorable Judge Paul A. King *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

Civil Action No. **14-901**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, has filed an action styled “Complaint for Notice of Intentional Error by Inferior Court and Change of Venue to D.C. Superior Court,” along with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (requiring dismissal of an action “at any time” the Court determines that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction).

Plaintiff is a Colorado state prisoner who seeks review by this Court of rulings issued by the United States District Court for the District of Colorado and the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. *See* Compl. at 1. This Court is not a reviewing court and, thus, lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review the decisions of another district court or a higher federal court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332 (general jurisdictional provisions); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995) (citing *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415, 416 (1923)); *see also Panko v. Rodak*, 606 F.2d 168, 171 n.6 (7th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied*, 444 U.S. 1081 (1980) (“It seems axiomatic that a lower court may not order

*N*

*3*

the judges or officers of a higher court to take an action."). Hence, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014

  
United States District Judge