

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

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-columbia-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2025/johnson-v-chun-r5k96hcn>