

Judge Roberts enjoys absolute immunity from liability for acts taken in his judicial capacity. *See Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991) (finding that “judicial immunity is an immunity from suit, not just from ultimate assessment of damages”); *Pierson v. Ray*, 386 U.S.

547, 553-54 (1967) (“Few doctrines were more solidly established at common law than the immunity of judges from liability for damages for acts committed within their judicial jurisdiction, as this Court recognized when it adopted the doctrine, in *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L. Ed. 646 (1872).”). This immunity extends to clerks of court performing “tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.” *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); *Evans v. Suter*, 260 F. App’x 726 (5th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (“Clerks have absolute quasi-judicial immunity from damages for civil rights violations when they perform tasks integral to the judicial process.”), *cert. denied*, 552 U.S. 1282 (2008). Because it appears that the alleged constitutional violations committed by the defendants occurred in the course of the performance of judicial functions, judicial immunity protects them from suit. *See, e.g., Jones v. U.S. Supreme Court*, No. 10-0910, 2010 WL 2363678, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court clerks are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the “receipt and processing of a litigant’s filings”), *aff’d*, 405 F. App’x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010), *aff’d*, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011).

The Court will grant the plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. An Order is issued separately.

DATE: 6/13/16

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge