

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5177

September Term, 2018

1:19-cv-01346-UNA

Filed On: August 23, 2019

Eric Emanuel Taylor,

Appellant

v.

Supreme Court of the United States, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Millett and Pillard, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, Senior Circuit
Judge

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. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s May 24, 2019 order be affirmed. Appellant’s civil action challenged the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia’s refusal to file a complaint he submitted, pursuant to a pre-filing review and dismissal order. The district court for the District of Columbia correctly determined that it could not compel the district court for the Eastern District of Virginia to act, and therefore properly dismissed appellant’s case. See 28 U.S.C. § 1294(1) (providing that appeals from reviewable decisions of a district court must be taken “to the court of appeals for the circuit embracing the district”). To the extent appellant seeks damages against judges or judicial officers based on judicial actions, such relief is barred by absolute judicial immunity. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (per curiam).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5177

September Term, 2018

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk