

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5253

September Term, 2019

1:19-cv-02383-UNA

Filed On: January 14, 2020

Charlotte Horst, D.J.H., S.J.H., M.J.H.,
D.X.H.,

Appellant

v.

Clayton R. Higgins, Jr., et al.,

Appellees

**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 and appendix filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, and the “motion for relief,” which the court construes as a motion for appointment of counsel, it is

ORDERED that the motion for appointment of counsel be denied. In civil cases, appellants are not entitled to appointment of counsel when they have not demonstrated sufficient likelihood of success on the merits. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s order filed August 27, 2019, be affirmed. Appellant has not shown any error in the district court’s conclusion that it lacked authority to grant her request for injunctive relief against the Supreme Court and its clerks. See In re: Marin, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (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.”).

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5253

September Term, 2019

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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