

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**  
**OCT 23 2014**  
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

DALE B. ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

*14-1781 UNA*

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

By Order of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, plaintiff may not file more than one case in that district per calendar month, and he must pay a refundable bond of \$50 to the Clerk of Court, among other conditions. *See* Compl., Attach. (Order, *Adams v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, No. 3:12-cv-3077 (W.D. Ark. Sept. 25, 2013)). In this action, the plaintiff appears to raise claims under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Eighth Amendments to the United States Constitution, *see id.* ¶¶ 52-82 (Counts One through Four), and among other relief, he demands reversal of the decision rendered by the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, *id.* at 11 (page number designated by the Court), in another case, *Adams v. Tyson Foods, Inc.*, No. 09-3054 (W.D. Ark. filed Aug. 4, 2009).<sup>1</sup>


The complaint will be dismissed with prejudice because it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. This federal district court has no jurisdiction to review the decision

<sup>1</sup> A cursory review of the docket in that case, which as of September 15, 2014 has 257 entries, shows that the Western District of Arkansas has issued several orders. Although the plaintiff does not specify which ruling he seeks to reverse, the Court presumes that he challenges the order granting Tyson Foods' motion for summary judgment and dismissing the case with prejudice. *Adams v. Tyson Foods, Inc.*, No. 09-3054 (W.D. Ark. filed Mar. 15, 2011), *aff'd per curiam*, 433 F. App'x 487 (11th Cir. 2011).

of another district. See *Klayman v. Kollar-Kotelly*, No. 12-5340, 2013 WL 2395909, at \*1 (D.C. Cir. May 20, 2013) (per curiam) (“[T]his court has concluded that one district court does not have jurisdiction to review the decisions of another district court or federal appellate court . . . or to take disciplinary action against other federal judges . . . .”); *Jones v. Supreme Court of the United States*, 405 F. App’x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam) (“The district court properly held that it lacked jurisdiction to review decisions of the United States Supreme Court, . . . federal appellate courts, . . . or other district courts . . . .”); *Mason v. Kahn*, No. 08-1146, 2008 WL 2630078, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 30, 2008) (“This Court lacks jurisdiction to review either a sister district court’s orders or a federal appeals court’s orders or publication decisions.”).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 10/20/2014

  
United States District Judge