

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

---

**No. 24-5090**

**September Term, 2023**

**1:24-cv-00650-UNA**

**Filed On: August 2, 2024**

Matthew Jones,

Appellant

v.

Judicial Branch of United States Government,

Appellee

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

**BEFORE:** Katsas, Rao, and Childs, 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 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 order entered March 27, 2024, be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that appellant’s complaint was frivolous because it lacked an arguable basis either in law or in fact. See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) (providing that “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action or appeal . . . is frivolous or malicious”).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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