

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5199

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-00949-UNA

Filed On: November 10, 2022

Joseph M. Evans,

Appellant

v.

Amy Helene Zubrensky,

Appellee

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

BEFORE: Henderson, Wilkins, and Katsas, Circuit Judges

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 supplement 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 to appoint counsel, it is

ORDERED that the motion to appoint 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 May 3, 2022, be affirmed. Appellant has shown no error in the district court's dismissal of the complaint because it sought monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). Appellant has offered no valid reasons why the defendant would not be entitled to immunity from his claims in this case. See Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 430 (1976) (prosecutors are entitled to immunity from damages claims arising from conduct "intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.").

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5199

September Term, 2022

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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