

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Raymond L. Ortiz v. John E. Raimondi

25-CV-5956 (NRM) (ARL) (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 13, 2026) · No. 25-CV-5956 (NRM) (ARL) · Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York dismissed Raymond L. Ortiz’s pro se complaint against a Suffolk County Family Court support magistrate. The court held that the defendant’s alleged acts were judicial acts performed within judicial proceedings and were therefore protected by absolute judicial immunity. The court granted in forma pauperis status for purposes of the order, dismissed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii), and denied in forma pauperis status for any appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nina R. Morrison
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-5956 (NRM) (ARL)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint seeking monetary compensation from a state family-court support magistrate. The court granted in forma pauperis status for purposes of screening and dismissed the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii) because the defendant was immune from suit.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At the in forma pauperis pleading-screening stage, the court liberally construed the pro se complaint, accepted nonconclusory factual allegations as true, assessed whether the complaint stated a plausible claim, and dismissed claims seeking monetary relief from an immune defendant under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order; persuasive authority only

PARTIES

Raymond L. Ortiz v. John E. Raimondi, Support Magistrate

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

family law

damages

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

family law

judicial immunity

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint seeking monetary compensation from a support magistrate for acts taken in Family Court proceedings must be dismissed because the defendant is protected by absolute judicial immunity.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed during in forma pauperis screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii).

HOLDINGS

1. A support magistrate is absolutely immune from a damages action arising from official acts performed in a judicial capacity, absent allegations that the acts were nonjudicial or taken in the complete absence of all jurisdiction. Ortiz's allegations concerned judicial acts performed in Family Court proceedings, so the claim was barred by judicial immunity.
2. The complaint was dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii) because its only defendant was immune from suit for the monetary relief sought.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It is well-settled that judges have absolute immunity from suits for damages arising out of judicial acts performed in their judicial capacities.”

“Judicial immunity may be overcome only if the court is alleged to have taken nonjudicial actions or if the judicial actions taken were “in the complete absence of all jurisdiction.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ortiz appeared in Suffolk County Family Court concerning his child-support obligations. He alleged that Support Magistrate John E. Raimondi required him to produce medical, employment, and tax records but did not require the other party to produce comparable records. Ortiz also alleged that the magistrate relied on outdated income information and ordered support payments exceeding the amount required by New York law, resulting in deductions from his disability payments.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ortiz filed the complaint on October 20, 2025, alleging that the defendant support magistrate improperly handled financial-document production and calculated child-support obligations. The district court granted plaintiff's

requests to proceed in forma pauperis, screened the complaint, dismissed the action, denied in forma pauperis status for an appeal as not taken in good faith, directed the Clerk to close the case and enter judgment, and ordered that the order be mailed to plaintiff.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant #1, 537 F.3d 185, 191–93 (2d Cir. 2008)
- Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., 621 F.3d 111, 123 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11–13 (1991)
- Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988)
- Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----
-----X RAYMOND L. ORTIZ, Plaintiff, MEMORANDUM &
ORDER 25-CV-5956 (NRM) (ARL) -against- JOHN E. RAIMONDI, Support Magistrate,
Defendant. -----X NINA R. MORRISON, United
States District Judge: Pro se Plaintiff Raymond L. Ortiz filed the instant Complaint on October 20,
2025.

ECF No. 1. Plaintiff’s requests to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2; ECF No. 3, are granted for the purpose of this Order. For the reasons that follow, the Complaint is dismissed. BACKGROUND Plaintiff appeared in Suffolk County Family Court to determine his support obligations to his child. ECF No. 1 at 5. Plaintiff claims that the Support Magistrate, Defendant John E. Raimondi, required Plaintiff to produce medical records, employment records, and tax documents, but did not require the other party to produce records.

Id. at 4–5. Plaintiff asserts that New York State law required both parties to produce records. Id. Plaintiff also asserts that the magistrate judge relied on outdated income information and ordered support payments greater than the amount required by New York State law. Id. at 5–6. He seeks reimbursement of funds that were deducted from his disability payments.

Id. at 6. STANDARD OF REVIEW Pro se complaints are held to less stringent standards than pleadings drafted by attorneys, and the Court is required to read Plaintiff’s pro se complaint

liberally and interpret it as raising the strongest arguments it suggests. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); see *Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant #1*, 537 F.3d 185, 191–93 (2d Cir.

2008). At the pleadings stage of the proceeding, the Court must assume the truth of “all nonconclusory factual allegations” in the complaint. *Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.*, 621 F.3d 111, 123 (2d Cir. 2010) (citing *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)). A complaint must plead sufficient facts to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl.*

Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A district court shall dismiss an in forma pauperis action where it is satisfied that the action “(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). DISCUSSION It is well-settled that judges have absolute immunity from suits for damages arising out of judicial acts performed in their judicial capacities.

See *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991); *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988). The absolute judicial immunity of the court and its members “is not overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice,” nor can a judge “be deprived of immunity because the action he took was in error... or was in excess of his authority.” *Mireles*, 502 U.S. at 11, 13 (quotation marks and citations omitted).

Judicial immunity may be overcome only if the court is alleged to have taken nonjudicial actions or if the judicial actions taken were “in the complete absence of all jurisdiction.” *Mireles*, 502 U.S. at 11–12. All of Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant involve the magistrate judge’s official acts in judicial proceedings in Family Court, which are protected by judicial immunity.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s claim for monetary compensation against Support Magistrate John E. Raimondi is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). CONCLUSION Plaintiff’s request to proceed in forma pauperis is granted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

The action is dismissed because the only Defendant is immune from suit. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for purpose of an appeal. See *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court shall close this case and enter judgment and mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at the address provided and note the mailing on the docket. SO ORDERED. /s/ Nina R. Morrison NINA R. MORRISON United States District Judge Dated: February 13, 2026 Brooklyn, NY