

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5175

September Term, 2021

1:21-cv-01389-UNA

Filed On: November 29, 2021

Yan-Xu Lu, formerly known as Yung-Kai Lu,

Appellant

v.

Allison H. Eid and Clark Waddoups,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Rao and Walker, 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). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s July 12, 2021 order dismissing the case with prejudice be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that appellant’s damages claims against federal judges were barred by absolute judicial immunity. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (per curiam) (“Judges enjoy absolute judicial immunity from suits for money damages for all actions taken in the judge’s judicial capacity, unless these actions are taken in the complete absence of all jurisdiction.”). Any claims for injunctive relief are frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i); Richards v. Delta Air Lines, Inc., 453 F.3d 525, 531 n.6 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (“The general rule is that injunctive relief will not issue when an adequate remedy at law exists.”). Further, appellant’s argument that judicial immunity does not apply because he is suing for administrative acts is also frivolous. Appellant’s allegations all stem from the judges’ judicial decisions and the district court cannot review decisions of another district court or federal appellate court. See Klayman v. Kollar-Kotelly, No. 12-5340, 2013 WL 2395909, at *1 (D.C. Cir. May 20, 2013) (citing Jones v. Supreme Ct. of the United States, 405 F. App’x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010); Sanders v. United States, 184 F. App’x 13, 14 (D.C. Cir. 2006)).

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5175

September Term, 2021

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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