

FILED

JUN 19 2017

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

WILLIE RAY BUSH,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

Civil Action No. 17-1029 (UNA)


MEMORANDUM OPINION

Because the petitioner “repeatedly abused [the Supreme] Court's process, the Clerk [of the Supreme Court] is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and petition submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1.” *In re Bush*, 134 S. Ct. 2158 (2014). Now before this Court is the petitioner’s “Notice of Appeal” challenging the Supreme Court’s decision. This Court has no authority to determine what action, if any, must be taken by the Supreme Court and its administrative officers. *See Miller v. Harris*, 599 F. App'x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (“The district court correctly determined it lacked jurisdiction to review decisions of the United States Supreme Court, including those of its Clerk of Court.”); *In re Marin*, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir.) (per curiam) (“We are aware of no authority for the proposition that a lower court may compel the Clerk of the Supreme Court to take any action.”), *cert. denied*, 506 U.S. 844 (1992).

The Court will grant the petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the petition. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

June 16, 2017



United States District Judge