United States District Court 1 2 District of Columbia 3 Case No.: 4:25-CV-0297/DRZ 4 ElijahJunaid **MEMORANDUM OPINION** Plaintiff 5 6 vs. United States District Court 7 8 Defendant 9 MEMORANDUM OPINION Plaintiff filed a Request for Entry of Default and the Clerk of the Court entered 10 11 Default against United States District Court on January 17, 2025. Now pending 12 before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment. Upon consideration of 13 Plaintiff's submissions, the relevant legal authorities, and the record as a whole, the 14 Court shall **DENY** Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment. 15 16 17 1. Legal Standard 18 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a) provides that the clerk of the court 19 "must enter [a] party's default" when a "party against whom a judgment for 20 affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend." Fed. R. 21 Civ. P. 55(a). Once a default has been entered by the clerk, a court may enter 22 default judgment against that party pursuant to Rule 55(b). See Fed. R. Civ. 23 P. 55(b). To warrant default judgment, the defendant "must be considered a 24 'totally unresponsive' party, and its default plainly willful, reflected by its 25 failure to respond to the summons and complaint, the entry of default, or the 26 motion for default judgment." Int'l Painters & Allied Trades Indus. Pension

Fund v. Auxier Drywall, LLC, 531 F. Supp. 2d 56, 57 (D.D.C. 2008) (ESH)

27

28

(citation omitted).

Default judgment is disfavored in this jurisdiction because courts prefer to resolve claims on their merits. See *Jackson v. Beech*, 636 F.2d 831, 835, 205 U.S. App. D.C. 84 (D.C. Cir. 1980). However, default judgments are available to "safeguard plaintiffs 'when the adversary process has been halted because of an essentially unresponsive party." *Mwani v. bin Laden*, 417 F.3d 1, 7, 368 U.S. App. D.C. 1 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (quoting Jackson, 636 F.2d at 836). The "determination of whether default judgment is appropriate is committed to the discretion of the trial court." *Auxier Drywall*, *LLC*, 531 F. Supp. 2d at 57 (citing *Jackson*, 636 F.2d at 836). Default judgment may be entered against a corporate defendant that is proceeding absent counsel, as corporate entities are not permitted to appear pro se. See *Motir Servs. Inc. v. Ekwuno*, 191 F. Supp. 3d 98, 107 (D.D.C. 2016) (BAH).

"[E]ntry of a default judgment is not automatic," however. *Mwani v. bin Laden*, 417 F.3d 1, 6, 368 U.S. App. D.C. 1 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (footnote omitted). The procedural posture of a default does not relieve a federal court of its "affirmative obligation" to determine whether it has subject-matter jurisdiction over the action. *See Ludwig*, 82 F.3d at 1092. Additionally, "a court should satisfy itself that it has personal jurisdiction before entering judgment against an absent defendant." *Mwani*, 417 F.3d at 6. The party seeking default judgment has the burden of establishing both subject-matter jurisdiction over the claims and personal jurisdiction over the defendants. *See*, *e.g.*, *FC Inv. Grp. LC v. IFX Mkts.*, *Ltd.*, 529 F.3d 1087, 1091, 381 U.S. App. D.C. 383 (D.C. Cir. 2008) ("The plaintiffs have the burden of establishing the court's personal jurisdiction over [the defendants]."); *Khadr*, 529 F.3d at1115 ("[T]he party claiming subject matter jurisdiction . . . has the burden to demonstrate that it exists.").

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2. Discussion

In the present case, the Clerk of the Court entered default against Defendant, and therefore the factual allegations in the Complaint are taken as true. See R.W. Amrine Drywall, 239 F. Supp. 2d at 30. The Court finds that Plaintiff's Complaint, alleges that the defendant in this matter, a federal district court, has committed a wrong by enacting a local rule. Judicial Immunity bars plaintiff's suit.

3. Judicial Immunity

A long line of Supreme Court precedent establishes the principle that generally a judge is immune from suit for money damages. *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 116 L. Ed. 2d 9, 112 S. Ct. 286 (1991); Cleavinger v. Saxner, 474 U.S. 193, 88 L. Ed. 2d 507, 106 S. Ct. 496 (1985); Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478, 57 L. Ed. 2d 895, 98 S. Ct. 2894 (1978); Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547, 18 L. Ed. 2d 288, 87 S. Ct. 1213 (1967). Absolute judicial immunity provides immunity from suit as well as from the ultimate imposition of damages; it therefore may not be overcome even by allegations of bad faith or malice. Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. at 11. In Ex Parte Virginia, the Supreme Court held that a judge who was criminally charged for depriving African-Americans of their civil rights to participate as jurors under the Fourteenth Amendment could not invoke the doctrine of judicial immunity. Even today, a judge may be criminally liable for willful deprivations of constitutional rights pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 242, but the same judge is absolutely immune from suit for civil liability for the same alleged unconstitutional deprivation. See Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. at 10 n.1; Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 429, 47 L. Ed. 2d 128, 96 S. Ct. 984 (1976); O'Shea v. Littleton, 414 U.S. 488, 503, 38 L. Ed. 2d 674, 94 S. Ct. 669 (1974). In Forrester v. White, the Court held that a judge is

| 1 | absolutely immune from liability for judicial actions but not for non-judicial |
|----------|--|
| $2 \mid$ | actions that judges also may perform. |
| 3 | |
| 4 | Although "judicial immunity is not a bar to prospective injunctive relief |
| 5 | against a judicial officer acting in her judicial capacity," Pulliam v. Allen, 460 |
| 6 | U.S. 522, 541-42, 104 S. Ct. 1970, 80 L. Ed. 2d 565 (1984), by statute |
| 7 | injunctive relief cannot be granted. See 42 U.S.C. § 1983 ("[I]n any action |
| 8 | brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's |
| 9 | judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted."). |
| 10 | |
| 11 | Conclusion |
| 12 | The claims against the defendant are dismissed with prejudice because it is |
| 13 | non-justiciable. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | SO ORDERED, |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Date: 1/17/2025 |
| 20 | |
| 21 | JustTheJudge |
| 22 | Hon Just T Judge |
| 23 | District Court Judge District of Columbia |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |