

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Andre Juste,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 20-383 (UNA)
)	
Hiram E. Puig-Lugo,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, is frivolous, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant).

Plaintiff is a District of Columbia resident. He has sued Associate Judge Puig-Lugo of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for “the sum of [\\$]25,000,000.” Compl. at 9. The complaint sets out four claims for relief: the first alleges violations of the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a; the second alleges violations of the Fifth Amendment’s due process clause; the third alleges obstruction of justice; and the fourth alleges legal malpractice. Compl. at 10-13. All of the claims, to the extent intelligible, are based on defendant’s “rulings against” plaintiff. *Id.* at 14.

An “*in forma pauperis* complaint is properly dismissed as frivolous . . . if it is clear from the face of the pleading that the named defendant is absolutely immune from suit on the claims asserted.” *Crisafi v. Holland* 655 F.2d 1305, 1308 (D.C. Cir. 1981). Additionally, a complaint that “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact” may be dismissed as frivolous. *Neitzke v.*

Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Judges enjoy absolute immunity from suits, such as this, based on acts taken in their judicial capacity, so long as they have jurisdiction over the subject matter. *Moore v. Burger*, 655 F.2d 1265, 1266 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (per curiam) (citing cases). Such “immunity is an immunity from suit, not just from ultimate assessment of damages.” *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991). In addition, a complaint against judges who have “done nothing more than their duty” is “a meritless action.” *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995). Accordingly, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: April 6, 2020

s/

AMY BERMAN JACKSON
United States District Judge