## United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 10-5175

September Term 2010

1:09-cv-02316-UNA

Filed On: February 2, 2011

Theodore Shove, et al.,

**Appellants** 

٧.

United States District Court Judges, In and for California, et al.,

**Appellees** 

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

**BEFORE:** Sentelle, Chief Judge, and Garland and Brown, Circuit Judges

## JUDGMENT

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief and supplement filed by the appellants. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's orders issued January 25, 2010, and May 3, 2010, be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed the appellants' complaint for damages and for declaratory and injunctive relief as barred by Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), because success on their claims would necessarily imply the invalidity of their convictions and sentences. See Edwards v. Balisok, 520 U.S. 641 (1997) (applying Heck to bar a state prisoner's claims for declaratory and injunctive relief in addition to money damages).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

## Per Curiam