Butterfield v. Roge	r et al	Doc. 6
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9		
10	ROBERT L. BUTTERFIELD,	
11	Petitioner,	3:10-cv-00612-ECR-RAM
12	vs.	ORDER
13	DAVID ROGER, et al.,	
14	Respondents.	
15		
16	This action is a <i>pro se</i> petition for a writ of prohibition, filed by a Nevada state	
17	prisoner. Petitioner brings action against the District Attorney for Clark County, as well as Nevada	
18	District Court Judge Glass. Petitioner states that he objects to "the asserted jurisdiction in legislative	
19	equety [sic] being imposed, in personam, over his person and property." (Petition, Docket #1-1, at p.	
20	2). Petitioner states that respondents do not have "authority to conduct criminal actions against	
21	anyone who enters or resides in it's territory" (Petition, at p. 2). Petitioner "seeks remedy in	
22	this court through temporary prohibition of the Respondents from allowing the Las Vegas Police [to]	
23	make an arrest on their order and then placed Petitioner in prison on a contempt charge"	
24	(Petition, at p. 2).	
25	Petitioner is serving a prison sentence at Lovelock Correctional Center for his	
26	conviction of several counts of sexual assault of a minor under fourteen years of age. Petitioner's	

federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus was denied by this Court in 2009. (Docket #26, in Case No. 3:06-cv-00632-LRH-VPC). Petitioner's current petition for a writ of prohibition is meritless and frivolous. Petitioner brings action against a district attorney and a judge. Prosecutors are absolutely immune from civil suits which challenge activities related to the initiation and presentation of criminal prosecutions. Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409 (1976). Judges are absolutely immune from damages actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts. Schucker v. Rockwood, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988); Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. at 418. The petition must be dismissed with prejudice, on grounds of prosecutorial and judicial immunity. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending motions, including petitioner's motions "to extend prison copywork limit" (Docket #4 and #5) are **DENIED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly. DATED this 3rd day of November. 2010.