

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

*A*  
*Appendix*  
*Al*

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 18-20370  
\_\_\_\_\_



YOLANDA M. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant

A True Copy  
Certified order issued Oct 02, 2018

v.

*Stacy W. Cayce*  
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

JUDGE LISA A. MILLARD,

Defendant - Appellee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before REAVLEY, ELROD, and OLDHAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This court must examine the basis of its jurisdiction, on its own motion if necessary. *Hill v. City of Seven Points*, 230 F.3d 167, 169 (5th Cir. 2000). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2107(a) and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(1)(A), the notice of appeal in a civil case must be filed within thirty days of entry of judgment.

In this action, the district court entered final judgment dismissing the complaint on January 23, 2018. Therefore, the final day for filing a timely notice of appeal was February 22, 2018. The plaintiff's notice of appeal was filed on June 4, 2018. When set by statute, the time limitation for filing a notice of appeal in a civil case is jurisdictional. *Hamer v. Neighborhood Hous.*

Appendix  
A1

No. 18-20370

*Servs. of Chi.*, 138 S. Ct. 13, 17 (2017); *Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007). The lack of a timely notice mandates dismissal of the appeal. *Robbins v. Maggio*, 750 F.2d 405, 408 (5th Cir. 1985). All pending motions are denied as moot.

Appone

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas

**ENTERED**

January 23, 2018

David J. Bradley, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

**YOLANDA M. WILLIAMS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**VS.**

**LISA A. MILLARD,**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**MISCELLANEOUS ACTION  
18-mc-00231**

**ORDER**


A review of Petitioner's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* reveals that Petitioner cannot afford to pay the \$400.00 filing fee. Accordingly, Petitioner's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **GRANTED**.

However, Petitioner's complaint fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. "The Supreme Court has definitively established, in what has become known as the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, that federal district courts, as courts of original jurisdiction, lack appellate jurisdiction to review, modify, or nullify final orders of state courts." *Weekly v. Morrow*, 204 F.3d 613, 615 (5th Cir. 2000) (internal citation omitted). That doctrine applies in this case.

Additionally, the doctrine of judicial immunity bars any relief in this action. See *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978). Petitioner's complaint is therefore **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED** this 22nd day of January, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KEITH P. ELLISON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**