

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Gu v. Trump

Gu v. Trump · No. Civil Action No. 25-460 (SLS) · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants motions to dismiss Feifei Gu’s claims against New York State, New York City, and federal defendants. The court holds that it lacks personal jurisdiction over the New York defendants and that Gu cannot obtain mandamus or the other requested relief against the federal defendants. The court also denies Gu’s motion for default judgment against Chief Judge Rowan D. Wilson because the New York State defendants timely responded.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sparkle L. Sooknanan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	December 19, 2025
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-460 (SLS)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action seeking mandamus, impeachment-related relief, and an order freezing federal funds, arising from a New York misdemeanor prosecution. New York State, New York City, and federal defendants moved to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), (2), (3), and (6). Plaintiff also moved for default judgment against a New York state judge.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(2) motion, the plaintiff bears the burden of establishing a factual basis for personal jurisdiction; the court may consider affidavits and other relevant materials and need not accept conclusory allegations. On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, construes the complaint in the plaintiff's favor, and dismisses claims that do not state a plausible entitlement to relief. A pro se complaint is liberally construed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

default judgment

civil procedure

federal spending

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

constitutional law

federal courts

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the District Court for the District of Columbia had personal jurisdiction over the New York State and New York City defendants.
2. Whether Gu was entitled to a writ of mandamus directing federal officials to investigate New York officials and hold defendants accountable.
3. Whether the court could initiate or participate in impeachment proceedings against federal judges.
4. Whether Gu adequately pleaded a basis for freezing federal funds allegedly used in connection with the New York prosecution.
5. Whether Gu was entitled to default judgment against Chief Judge Rowan D. Wilson for allegedly failing to respond to the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The court lacked personal jurisdiction over the New York State and New York City defendants because the complaint identified no applicable basis under the District of Columbia long-arm statute and no relevant conduct occurred in the District of Columbia.
2. Gu was not entitled to mandamus because she could not establish a clear and indisputable right to the requested investigations or a clear, nondiscretionary duty requiring the federal defendants to conduct them.
3. The court could not initiate or otherwise participate in impeachment proceedings against federal judges.
4. Gu failed to plead a basis for an order freezing federal funds to New York because she did not allege that any federal money funded her prosecution.
5. Gu was not entitled to default judgment because Chief Judge Wilson timely responded to the complaint through the New York State defendants' motion to dismiss filed by the court-ordered deadline.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The acts alleged in Ms. Gu’s Complaint do not fall under any of these bases of jurisdiction.” (at 5)

“Mandamus is an ‘extraordinary remedy, reserved only for the most transparent violations of a clear duty to act.’” (at 6)

“She ‘cannot establish that [she] is entitled by right’ to the investigations she requests or that the Federal Defendants have ‘a clear nondiscretionary duty to investigate.’” (at 6)

“This Court cannot initiate or otherwise involve itself in an impeachment proceeding.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gu, a New York resident, was facing a New York misdemeanor prosecution after a real estate agent reported that she allegedly damaged a surveillance camera in a New York apartment building. She alleged that New York state and city officials, judges, clerks, prosecutors, and others conspired to pursue a fake prosecution and improperly halt civil cases she filed against the real estate agent. Her complaint sought mandamus directing federal officials to investigate the alleged conspiracy, impeachment of several federal judges, and an order freezing federal funds used by New York for the prosecution.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Gu filed suit in the District Court for the District of Columbia against twenty-three federal, state, city, and private defendants. The New York State and City defendants moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, and the federal defendants moved to dismiss because the requested relief was unavailable and the claims were legally insufficient. The court granted all three motions to dismiss and denied Gu's motion for default judgment after finding that the relevant New York defendants had timely responded pursuant to extensions granted by the court.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wright v. Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Found., 68 F.4th 612, 619 (D.C. Cir. 2023)
- Crane v. New York Zoological Soc., 894 F.2d 454, 456 (D.C. Cir. 1990)
- Clay v. Blue Hackle N. Am., LLC, 907 F. Supp. 2d 85, 87 (D.D.C. 2012)
- Second Amend. Found. v. U.S. Conf. of Mayors, 274 F.3d 521, 524 (D.C. Cir. 2001)
- United States v. Philip Morris Inc., 116 F. Supp. 2d 116, 120 n.4 (D.D.C. 2000)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Hettinga v. United States, 677 F.3d 471, 476 (D.C. Cir. 2012)
- Trudeau v. FTC, 456 F.3d 178, 193 (D.C. Cir. 2006)
- Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)
- Ho v. Garland, 106 F.4th 47, 50 (D.C. Cir. 2024)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam)
- Nwosu v. Bolduc, No. 23-cv-3841, 2024 WL 1050339, at *1 (D.D.C. Mar. 10, 2024)
- Duarte v. Nolan, 190 F. Supp. 3d 8, 12 (D.D.C. 2016)
- Daimler AG v. Bauman, 571 U.S. 117, 125 (2014)
- Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 U.S. 462, 471-72 (1985)
- International Shoe Co. v. State of Washington, International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310, 319 (1945)

- *Alpine Consulting Partners, LLC v. Jacokes*, No. 25-cv-913, 2025 WL 2959574, at *2 (D.D.C. 2025)
- *Mallory v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co.*, 600 U.S. 122, 137 (2023)
- *In re Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 53 F.4th 665, 670 (D.C. Cir. 2022)
- *In re Bluewater Network*, 234 F.3d 1305, 1315 (D.C. Cir. 2000)
- *Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Burwell*, 812 F.3d 183, 189 (D.C. Cir. 2016)
- *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985)
- *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Schiff*, 474 F. Supp. 3d 305, 317-18 (D.D.C. 2020)
- *Nixon v. United States*, 938 F.2d 239, 243 (D.C. Cir. 1991), *aff'd*, 506 U.S. 224 (1993)
- *Lovitky v. Trump*, 949 F.3d 753, 759 (D.C. Cir. 2020)
- *In re Cheney*, 406 F.3d 723, 729 (D.C. Cir. 2005)
- *Akter v. Rubio*, No. 24-cv-3256, 2025 WL 1950884, at *3 (D.D.C. July 16, 2025)
- *Patel v. United States*, No. 23-cv-2152, 2023 WL 7128425, at *1 (D.D.C. Oct. 26, 2023)
- *Williams-Jones v. LaHood*, 656 F. Supp. 2d 63, 64 (D.D.C. 2009)