

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Johnson v. Chun

Johnson · No. Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02806 (UNA) · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grants the pro se plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses the action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court holds that it cannot review or alter decisions or actions of another federal district court or exercise jurisdiction over its judges.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Trevor N. McFadden
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02806 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On review of a pro se complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis, the district court granted the application and dismissed the action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the pro se complaint for subject matter jurisdiction and dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) when jurisdiction was lacking.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; no reporter citation appears in the source.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- appellate jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the District Court for the District of Columbia had subject matter jurisdiction to review or alter the decisions or actions of other federal district courts.
2. Whether the court could exercise jurisdiction over judges of other federal district courts based on the plaintiff's challenge to their judicial actions.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review or alter the decisions or actions of another federal district court.
2. The District Court for the District of Columbia lacked jurisdiction to exert jurisdiction over the judges of other federal district courts in connection with the challenged judicial actions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review or alter any of the decisions or actions of another federal district court, or to exert jurisdiction over its judges.”

“Accordingly, this matter is dismissed without prejudice.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a Texas resident, sued judicial officers and a court deputy from the United States District Courts for the Western District of Washington and the Northern District of Texas. She challenged the Northern District of Texas's transfer of her case to the Western District of Washington and alleged that the Washington court failed to escalate the matter because it involved national-security issues. She asked the District of Columbia district court to reverse and nullify the transfer order, declare it unconstitutional, and direct escalation of the underlying case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff challenged the Northern District of Texas's transfer of her case to the Western District of Washington and alleged that the latter court failed to escalate her case. She sought to have the transfer order reversed and declared unconstitutional and to compel further action in the underlying case. The District Court for the District of Columbia dismissed the complaint without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *In re Marin*, 956 F.2d 339 (D.C. Cir. 1992)
- *Prentice v. U.S. Dist. Court for Eastern Dist. of Michigan, Southern Div.*, 307 F. App'x 460 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 29, 2008) (per curiam)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Edwards*, 514 U.S. 300, 313 (1995)
- *Panko v. Rodak*, 606 F.2d 168, 171 n.6 (7th Cir. 1979)

- United States v. Choi, 818 F. Supp. 2d 79, 85 (D.D.C. 2011)
- Lewis v. Green, 629 F. Supp. 546, 553 (D.D.C. 1986)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INGRID JOHNSON,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02806 (UNA) v.)) JOHN CHUN, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the Court on its review of Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint (“Compl.”), ECF No. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”), ECF No. 2.

The Court grants Plaintiff’s IFP application, and for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this case without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Plaintiff, a resident of Texas, sues the Chief Court Deputy, Chief Judge, and a District Judge—all from the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington—and another District Judge from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

See Compl. at 1–3; Compl. Memorandum (“Compl. Memo”), ECF No. 1-1, at 1. She disagrees with the determination of the Northern District of Texas to transfer her case to the Western District of Washington and further challenges the Western District of Washington’s purported failure to “escalate” her case, which she contends involves matters of national security.

See Compl. at 5–6; Compl. Memo at 3– 5. She demands that this Court to “reverse and nullify” the transfer order and declare it unconstitutional, and to also direct the “escalation” of her case. See Compl. at 6; Compl. Memo at 5–6. This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review or alter any of the decisions or actions of another federal district court, or to exert jurisdiction over its judges.

See *In re Marin*, 956 F.2d 339 (D.C. Cir. 1992); *Prentice v. U.S. Dist. Court for Eastern Dist. of Michigan, Southern Div.*, 307 F. App’x. 460 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 29, 2008) (per curiam) (citing *Celotex Corp. v. Edwards*, 514 U.S. 300, 313 (1995)); see also *Panko v. Rodak*, 606 F. 2d 168, 171 n.6 (7th Cir. 1979) (finding it “axiomatic” that a federal court may review the actions of judges or officers of another federal court); *United States v. Choi*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 79, 85 (D.D.C.

2011) (stating that federal district courts “generally lack[] appellate jurisdiction over other judicial bodies, and cannot exercise appellate mandamus over other courts”) (citing *Lewis v. Green*, 629 F. Supp. 546, 553 (D.D.C. 1986)).

Accordingly, this matter is dismissed without prejudice. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion. TREVOR N. McFADDEN Date: December 1, 2025 United States District Judge

