

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5132

September Term, 2019

1:19-cv-00169-UNA

Filed On: January 14, 2020

John P. Fletcher,

Appellant

v.

Scott Harris, Clerk of the United States
Supreme Court,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Katsas and Rao, 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 appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the notice filed by appellant on October 28, 2019, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's orders filed February 7, 2019, April 17, 2019, and April 30, 2019, be affirmed. The district court correctly denied appellant's motion for injunction and dismissed the case with prejudice, because appellant's claim for money damages against the Clerk of the Supreme Court was barred by absolute immunity. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (per curiam) ("[C]lerks, like judges, are immune from damage suits for performance of tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process."). Although appellant asserts that Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc., 508 U.S. 429 (1993), and Atherton v. D.C. Office of the Mayor, 567 F.3d 672 (D.C. Cir. 2009), are controlling here, those cases held that absolute judicial immunity does not extend to court reporters and juror officers, respectively, and therefore do not apply to this case. Moreover, "immunity applies to all acts of auxiliary court personnel that are basic and integral parts of the judicial function, unless those acts are done in the clear absence of all jurisdiction." Sindram, 986 F.2d at 1461 (citations, internal quotation marks, and alteration omitted). Finally, appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion for extension of time, his motions to amend or alter the

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5132

September Term, 2019

judgment and for relief from judgment, and his request to amend the complaint. See, e.g., Firestone v. Firestone, 76 F.3d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (per curiam); Hettinga v. United States, 677 F.3d 471, 480 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (per curiam).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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