STARLING v. ROYAL Doc. 4

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Edward Starling,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Civil No. 15-cv-01685 (APM)
C. Ashley Royal,	
Defendant.	) ) )

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Plaintiff Edward Starling, proceeding *pro se*, has filed a "Complaint for Deliberate Indifference to United States Congress Legislated United States Constitutional Guarantees." Compl., ECF No. 1. While the substance of his allegations are far from clear, Plaintiff appears to be seeking over \$2.5 billion in relief for alleged judicial misconduct by former Chief Judge Wilbur D. Owens, Jr. of the Middle District of Georgia while handling Plaintiff's criminal case starting in 1985. *See id.* at 12. After Chief Judge Owens left office in 1997, Plaintiff's criminal case was taken over by Judge C. Ashley Royal, the named defendant in this case. *See id.* at 10. Plaintiff's suit is hereby dismissed for want of subject matter jurisdiction because this court lacks jurisdiction to review the decisions of another federal district court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (requiring dismissal of an action "at any time" the court determines that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction).

This court lacks jurisdiction to review any action by Chief Judge Owens, Judge Royal, or any other judge for the Middle District of Georgia. *See, e.g., Bush v. Kollar-Kotelly*, Civ. No. 08-1122, 2008 WL 2595879, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 30, 2008) ("This Court has no authority to review the decisions of another federal district court judge."); *Lasko v. McAvoy*, Civ. No. 12-0093, 2012

WL 171542, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 20, 2012) ("[A] federal district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review the decisions of another district court.").

Accordingly, this case will be dismissed for want of subject matter jurisdiction. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: October 29, 2015

Amit P\_Mehta

United States District Judge