

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

INEZ QTAISH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 23-3702 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR)	
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of *pro se* plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) and her civil complaint. The IFP application is GRANTED and, for the reasons stated below, the complaint and this civil action are DISMISSED.

The complaint is largely unintelligible. Plaintiff may fault the Clerk of Court and deputy Clerks for docketing an appeal in one of her cases, *see* Notice of Appeal, *Qtaish v. Bronzeville Park Nursing and Living Center, et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-2523 (D.D.C. Dec. 7, 2023) (ECF No. 9), but not in another case, *see Qtaish v. Malman, et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-3478 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2023). Perhaps plaintiff also objects to deputy Clerks’ instructions regarding the *Malman* case that she “scratch off [her] birthdate and social security number since [the] case is public.” Compl. at 1. Whatever plaintiff’s claim may be against the Clerk and her deputies, it fails. The absolute immunity that judges enjoy, *see Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991) (finding that “judicial immunity is an immunity from suit, not just from ultimate assessment of damages”), extends to Clerks of Court performing “tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process,” *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); *see Jones v. U.S. Supreme Court*, No. 10-0910,

2010 WL 2363678, at *1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court clerks are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the “receipt and processing of a litigant’s filings”), *aff’d*, 405 F. App’x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010), *aff’d*, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011); *Hurt v. Clerks, Superior Court of District of Columbia*, No. 06-CV-5308, 2006 WL 3835759, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 22, 2006) (per curiam) (affirming the dismissal of an action against judicial clerks to whom absolute judicial immunity is extended); *Sindram*, 986 F.2d. at 1461 (citations omitted). Accordingly, this case must be dismissed.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: December 28, 2023

BERYL A. HOWELL
United States District Judge