

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Donetta Byrd,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case: 1:15-cv-01934
)	Assigned To : Unassigned
v.)	Assign. Date : 11/2/2015
)	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)
Superior Court of the District of Columbia)	
Judge Michael Rankin,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the plaintiff's application and dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a "federal question" is presented or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff is a District of Columbia resident. She sues a judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Plaintiff alleges that her case was dismissed while she "was locked . . . up for several days without [her medication] and . . . CPAP machine." Plaintiff further complains about other unfortunate events that seem to have nothing do with the named defendant. She seeks \$999 billion in damages. The complaint does not present a federal question, and the

parties are not of diverse citizenship. Moreover, judges are absolutely immune from lawsuits arising from acts, such as alleged here, taken in their judicial capacity. *See Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991); *Thanh Vong Hoai v. Superior Court for District of Columbia*, 344 Fed. Appx. 620 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (per curiam); *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993). Hence, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: October 27, 2015


United States District Judge