

SEP 21 2015

**Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts**

Case: 1:15-cv-01537 Jury Demand  
Assigned To : Unassigned  
Assign. Date : 9/21/2015  
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)

N

(citation omitted). “It is well settled that a writ of mandamus is not available to compel discretionary acts.” *Cox v. Sec’y of Labor*, 739 F. Supp. 28, 30 (D.D.C. 1990) (citing cases). And the United States Attorney General has absolute discretion in deciding whether to investigate claims for possible criminal or civil prosecution. As a general rule applicable here, such decisions are not subject to judicial review. *Shoshone-Bannock Tribes v. Reno*, 56 F.3d 1476, 1480-81 (D.C. Cir. 1995); see *Wightman-Cervantes v. Mueller*, 750 F. Supp. 2d 76, 80 (D.D.C. 2010) (“[A]n agency’s decision whether to prosecute, investigate, or enforce has been recognized as purely discretionary and not subject to judicial review.”) (citing *Block v. SEC*, 50 F.3d 1078, 1081-82 (D.C. Cir. 1995)) (other citation omitted).

A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: September 16, 2015

United States District Judge