

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5083

September Term, 2024

1:24-cv-03224-UNA

Filed On: August 27, 2025

Erika Jacobs,

Appellant

v.

Scott Harris, et al.,

Appellees

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

BEFORE: Millett, Pillard, and Rao, 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 appendix 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 filed February 25, 2025, be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that it lacks authority to compel the Supreme Court or its Clerk's Office to take any action. See In re Marin, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (per curiam) (stating that the Supreme Court has "exclusive" supervisory responsibility over its Clerk, and "neither a district court nor a circuit court of appeals has jurisdiction to interfere with it by mandamus or otherwise"). In addition, the Supreme Court Clerk and Clerk's Office staff are immune from appellant's suit for damages. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) ("[C]lerks, like judges, are immune from damage suits for performance of tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process."); Chambers v. Burwell, 824 F.3d 141, 143 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (stating that the court "may affirm the district court on any ground supported by the record").

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5083

September Term, 2024

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.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

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk