

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 22-5132

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-00952-TJK

Filed On: July 19, 2023

Alan Headman,

Appellant

v.

Clayton R. Higgins, Jr.,

Appellee

**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 the brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, the motion for other relief styled as a motion to affirm service and evidence of payment of appeal fee, and the motion for other relief styled as a motion to affirm service, it is

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court's April 26, 2022, order dismissing appellant's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that it lacked the authority to compel the Clerk of the Supreme Court to take any particular action. 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."). It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motions for other relief be dismissed as moot.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 22-5132**

**September Term, 2022**

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