## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

))

))

))

COLBY JEROME HALE EL,	
Plaintiff,	
V.	
STATE OF COLORADO, et al.,	
Defendants.	

Civil Action No. 24-0286 (UNA)

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) and *pro se* civil complaint (ECF No. 1). The Court GRANTS the application and, for the reasons stated below, DISMISSES the complaint and this civil action.

Plaintiff filed a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. *See* Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 1. The court dismissed that complaint, as amended, without prejudice for failure to comply with the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, and the Tenth Circuit dismissed the appeal for failure to prosecute. *See Hale-El v. Thornton Police Dep't*, No. 1:23-cv-0359 (D. Colo. Aug. 4, 2023), *appeal dismissed*, No. 23-1269 (10th Cir. Feb. 8, 2024). According to Plaintiff, his appeal should have gone directly from the District of Colorado to the Supreme Court of the United States, not to the Tenth Circuit, and neither the District of Colorado nor its Clerk had "discretion of where to send" his appeal. Compl. at 2. Plaintiff demands compensatory and punitive damages, a "decree [that] all future appeals from the U.S. District Court of Colorado ... go to the Supreme Court of the United States and to acknowledge [his] Nationality," *id.*, as a Moorish American, *see id.* at 1.

Plaintiff is under the mistaken impression that this federal district court may direct the actions and activities of other federal courts. "This court is not a reviewing court and cannot

compel Supreme Court justices or other Article III judges in this or other districts or circuits to act," *Jones v. U.S. Supreme Court*, No. 10-0910, 2010 WL 2363678, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010), *aff'd*, 405 F. App'x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam), *aff'd*, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011), and because federal judges and clerks of court are immune from suit, *see, e.g., id.*; *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460-61 (D.C. Cir. 1993), Plaintiff is not entitled to damages arising from the appeal of his district court case to the Tenth Circuit.

An Order is issued separately.

DATE: May 6, 2024

AMIT P. MEHTA United States District Judge