United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5099

September Term, 2023

1:23-cv-00351-UNA

Filed On: March 22, 2024

Merlin Lkent Williams,

Appellant

٧.

Jacob Levitan,

Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Henderson, Millett, and Walker, Circuit Judges

JUDGMENT

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's order filed February 24, 2023 be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that it lacks authority to compel the Supreme Court Clerk's Office to take any action or to compel the Supreme Court to take any action against an employee of the Clerk's Office. See In re: Marin, 956 F.2d 339, 340 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (per curiam) (stating that the Supreme Court has "exclusive" supervisory responsibility over its Clerk, and "neither a district court nor a circuit court of appeals has jurisdiction to interfere with it by mandamus or otherwise"). Additionally, the district court correctly concluded that the Supreme Court Clerk's Office employee is immune from appellant's suit for damages. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) ("[C]lerks, like judges, are immune from damage suits for performance of tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.").

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5099

September Term, 2023

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Michael C. McGrail Deputy Clerk