

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 00-5165

September Term, 2000

00cv00624

Filed On: October 11, 2000 [549253]

L. C. Jones,
Appellant

v.

William K. Suter, Clerk's Office, Supreme Court,
Washington, D.C. and Gail Johnson, Clerk's Office,
Supreme Court, Washington, D.C.,
Appellees

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Edwards, Chief Judge; Ginsburg and Tatel, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief filed by the appellant. The court has determined that the issues presented occasion no need for an opinion. See Fed. R. App. P. 36; D.C. Cir. Rule 36(b). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's memorandum and dismissal order filed March 22, 2000 be affirmed substantially for the reasons stated therein. To the extent appellant stated a claim against the named defendants in their individual capacities under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), the Supreme Court clerks would be protected by judicial immunity. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459 (D.C. Cir.1993) (clerks are absolutely immune from damages when undertaking acts that are integral to the judicial process); Mullis v. United States Bankruptcy Court, 828 F.2d 1385, 1390 (9th Cir.1987) (immunity in Bivens suit).

The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after disposition of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam