

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

ERIC RODNEY HILL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 23-01010 (UNA)
)	
)	
PETER A. KRAUTHAMER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed a complaint against D.C. Superior Court Judge Peter Krauthamer and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the application and dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (requiring immediate dismissal of a prisoner’s case against a governmental officer upon a determination that the complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted).

Plaintiff is incarcerated at the D.C. Jail. He alleges that on June 7, 2022, Judge Krauthamer allowed “a witness to lie in court on the witness stand.” Compl., ECF No. 1 at 5. As a result, he was denied a fair trial under the U.S. Constitution and “falsely convicted.” *Id.* Plaintiff seeks “one hundred thousand dollars in actual, punitive damages.” *Id.* at 6.

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). It is established that judges enjoy absolute immunity from suits for damages based, as here, on their decisions in a judicial proceeding within their jurisdiction. *See Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-13 (1991); *Forrester v.*

White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); *see also Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 179 (D.D.C. 2011) (finding “claims against the district and court of appeals judges . . . patently frivolous because . . . judges are absolutely immune from lawsuits predicated, as here, for their official acts”); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1150 (1995) (a complaint against judges who have “done nothing more than their duty” is “a meritless action.”). Because no “allegation of other facts” could plausibly cure this defect, the complaint is dismissed with prejudice.¹ *Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1209 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (per curiam). A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 18, 2023

/s/

CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff’s recourse for an unconstitutional conviction in Superior Court lies, if at all, in an appeal to the D.C. Court of Appeals.