

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Michael F. Robillard, Jr. v. Judge David Harold Judd and Court Clerk Larinda Valdon

Robillard · No. 3:26-cv-00060-DCN · Decided April 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho dismissed Michael F. Robillard, Jr.’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against a state-court judge and court clerk with prejudice. The court held that the claims were barred by the Rooker–Feldman doctrine and by absolute judicial and quasi-judicial immunity. The court also denied leave to amend and closed the case because amendment would be futile and Robillard failed to comply with an order concerning the filing fee or in forma pauperis application.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	April 9, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-cv-00060-DCN
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On sua sponte initial review of a pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint in which the plaintiff had neither paid the filing fee nor submitted an application to proceed in forma pauperis, the district court dismissed the complaint with prejudice and without leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), including whether the complaint is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant; allegations were considered under the plausibility standard for a motion to dismiss.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; District of Idaho memorandum decision and order designated per curiam, with no reporter citation or precedential-status determination in the source.
PARTIES	Michael F. Robillard, Jr. v. Judge David Harold Judd, Court Clerk Larinda Valdon

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

section 1983

civil procedure

government liability

declaratory judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

federal jurisdiction

judicial immunity

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint could proceed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) when the plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprived the federal district court of jurisdiction over claims seeking review or reversal of the plaintiff's state-court proceedings.
3. Whether the state judge was entitled to absolute judicial immunity for acts performed in his judicial capacity.
4. Whether the court clerk was entitled to absolute quasi-judicial immunity for scheduling and noticing activities integral to the judicial process.
5. Whether amendment would be futile and the complaint should be dismissed without leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The Rooker-Feldman doctrine barred the district court from exercising subject-matter jurisdiction over claims that, in substance, sought federal review, reversal, or remand of the state-court proceedings.
2. Judge Judd was entitled to absolute judicial immunity because the challenged conduct consisted of judicial acts performed within the court's jurisdiction, and the complaint did not allege that he acted in a complete absence of jurisdiction.
3. Valdon was entitled to absolute quasi-judicial immunity because the challenged scheduling and noticing activities were normal clerk functions integral to the judicial process.
4. Dismissal without leave to amend was appropriate because amendment would be futile in light of the immunity bars and the Rooker-Feldman jurisdictional bar, and Robillard also failed to comply with the court's fee-or-in-forma-pauperis order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court finds that Robillard’s Complaint cannot proceed as is because Judge Judd and Valdon are protected under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, and both are immune from suit.” (§ IV.A)

“Robillard’s Complaint (Dkt. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. The case is CLOSED.” (§ VI)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Robillard sued an Idaho state judge and a county court clerk under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that amended notices scheduled small-claims proceedings in a manner that deprived him of the fourteen-day response period and made attendance difficult. He alleged that the judge authorized the notices and that the clerk issued or managed them. He sought declaratory, injunctive, and monetary relief directed at the state-court proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Robillard filed a civil-rights complaint concerning notices and scheduling in pending Idaho state-court proceedings but did not pay the required filing fee or apply to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court ordered him to pay the fee or submit an in forma pauperis application within thirty days; he did not respond. The court then conducted an initial review sua sponte and dismissed the complaint with prejudice, denied leave to amend, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Rice v. City of Boise City, 2013 WL 6385657, at *1 (D. Idaho Dec. 6, 2013)
- Omar v. Sea-Land Service, Inc., 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)
- United States v. McQuade, 647 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Jefferson v. United States, 277 F.2d 723, 725 (9th Cir. 1960)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Resnick v. Hayes, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Pena v. Gardner, 976 F.2d 469, 471 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Jackson v. Carey, 353 F.3d 750, 758 (9th Cir. 2003)
- District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983)
- Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.
- Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)
- Doe v. Mann, 415 F.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991)
- Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 362 (1978)
- Ashelman v. Pope, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Morrison v. Jones, 607 F.2d 1269, 1273 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Acres Bonusing, Inc. v. Marston, 17 F.4th 901, 915-16 (9th Cir. 2021)
- In re Castillo, 297 F.3d 940, 951-52 (9th Cir. 2002), as amended (Sept. 6, 2002)
- Doe & Associates Law Offices v. Napolitano, 252 F.3d 1026, 1030 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Kinney v. Cantil-Sakauye, 723 F. App'x 562 (9th Cir. 2018)