

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

SEP 11 2006

Carl Jackson )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

George W. Bush, et al. )

Defendants. )

NANCY MAYER WHITTINGTON, CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Civil Case No. 05cv1856 (RJL)

*RL*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

(September 9, 2006) [#6]

Plaintiff Carl Jackson, proceeding *pro se*, brings this suit against President George W. Bush; his deputy Chief of Staff and advisor, Karl Rove; former Attorney General of the United States, John Ashcroft; "his current successor," Alberto Gonzales; and I. Lewis Libby, former Chief of Staff to Vice President Dick Cheney, alleging various violations of the United States Constitution. Currently before the Court is a Motion to Dismiss by defendants President Bush and Attorney General Alberto Gonzales.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons set forth below, the defendants' Motion is GRANTED.

---

<sup>1</sup> While plaintiff names President George W. Bush, Karl Rove, John Ashcroft, "his current successor," and I. Lewis Libby as defendants in this case, the December 19, 2005 Motion to Dismiss was filed only on behalf of defendants President Bush and Attorney General Gonzales, who, as successor to John Ashcroft, was joined in his official capacity on April 24, 2006, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 25(d). None of the other defendants have been personally served. Further, neither President Bush nor Attorney General Gonzales have been served in their individual capacities.

## BACKGROUND

On September 19, 2005, plaintiff filed the instant Complaint, later amended on November 14, 2005, seeking money damages for alleged violations of his rights under the First, Fourth,<sup>2</sup> and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. (Am. Compl. ¶ 2.) Though the facts underlying his Complaint are less than clear, plaintiff appears to advance a series of extraordinary allegations centering on an alleged conspiracy that all of the defendants supposedly formed, in both their official and individual capacities,<sup>3</sup> to aid certain individuals seeking revenge against him. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8-9, 13.) In particular, plaintiff alleges that on March 12, 2003, defendants Lewis Libby, John Ashcroft, and Karl Rove entered into a conspiracy under color of law to aid “the vigilante citizens in making a retaliatory strike against plaintiff based upon bad motive and bias towards plaintiff.” (*Id.* ¶ 8.) This conspiracy allegedly led to a deliberate car crash on June 12, 2003 that killed plaintiff’s “loved-one,” Eleanor Roe Munzer. (*Id.* ¶ 9.) The alleged role of defendants Libby, Ashcroft, and Rove in the conspiracy was to remove “said vigilante fears of prosecution for their unlawful acts.” (*Id.* ¶ 8.)

Moreover, in plaintiff’s second cause of action, plaintiff alleges that on January 21, 2004, in his State of the Union Address, “George W. Bush . . . signified his Presidential

---

<sup>2</sup> As plaintiff seems to be alleging due process violations under the Fifth Amendment, and makes no unlawful search or seizure claims that would fall under the Fourth Amendment, the Court will presume that plaintiff intended to invoke the Fifth Amendment in his Amended Complaint. (*See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 1-2.)

<sup>3</sup> Attorney General Gonzales was joined only in his official capacity. *See supra* note 1.

approval to the vigilante conduct.” (*Id.* ¶ 13.) Plaintiff alleges that the approval was “under the created false illusion of being a purportedly Presidential response to a letter purportedly written by a 10-year old girl from Lincoln, Rhode Island.” (*Id.*) According to plaintiff, the mother of the girl “has a close nexus family relationship to relative of Florida vigilantes with ties within the Florida law enforcement community.” (*Id.*)

On December 19, 2005, defendants President Bush and Attorney General Alberto Gonzales (hereinafter “defendants”) moved to dismiss plaintiff’s Complaint in its entirety. Defendants maintain that plaintiff’s Complaint is barred by the doctrines of sovereign immunity, absolute immunity, and qualified immunity. (*See generally* Defs.’ Mot Dismiss.) For the following reasons, the Court agrees and, defendants’ Motion to Dismiss must therefore be GRANTED.

## DISCUSSION

### I. *Standard of Review*

Defendants bring this Motion to Dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6).<sup>4</sup> In reviewing a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, and Rule 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim, the Court must accept all well-pleaded allegations as true, construing them in the light most favorable to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Defendants also bring their Motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(5). Under Rule 12(b)(5), a claim may be dismissed due to the insufficiency of service of process. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(5). If dismissing the claim without prejudice due to insufficient service would lead to the refile of a meritless claim, however, our Circuit has held that it is proper to consider other means of dismissing the case. *See Simpkins v. Dist. of Columbia Gov’t*, 108 F.3d 366, 369-70 (D.C. Cir. 1997).

plaintiff. See *Kalil v. Johanns*, 407 F. Supp. 2d 94, 96-97 (D.D.C. 2005); *Menkes v. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 402 F. Supp. 2d 204, 207 (D.D.C. 2005). Moreover, consistent with the leniency afforded *pro se* plaintiffs, the Court must make a concerted effort to discern a cause of action from the record presented if an action is in fact discernable. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); *Gee v. District of Columbia*, No. 04-1797, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17950, at \*2 (D.D.C. Aug. 22, 2005).

While the liberal rules of notice pleading mandate generosity in interpreting a complaint, the Court must be mindful that “generosity is not fantasy.” *Slade v. Hampton Rds. Reg'l Jail*, 407 F.3d 243, 253 (4th Cir. 2005). Thus, when defendants who are sued in their official capacities raise the doctrine of sovereign immunity as a bar to claims brought against them, a plaintiff must overcome the defense of sovereign immunity in order to establish the jurisdiction necessary to survive a Rule 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss. See *Tri-State Hosp. Supply Corp. v. United States*, 341 F.3d 571, 575 (D.C. Cir. 2003).

Similarly, when a plaintiff sues a government agent in his/her individual capacity and the defenses of absolute and qualified immunity are raised, that plaintiff must overcome those defenses in order to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. See *Olaniyi v. District of Columbia*, 416 F. Supp. 2d 43, 64 (D.D.C. 2006); *Gee*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17950, at \*7-9. While the Court is not confined to the pleadings and may consider outside matters when deciding questions of jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1), the Court’s review in the 12(b)(6) context is limited to the pleadings alone. See *Kalil*, 407 F. Supp. 2d at 96-97.

For the following reasons, plaintiff in this case fails to overcome defendants' Motion to Dismiss under both Rule 12(b)(1) and Rule 12(b)(6).

II. *The Defendants' Sovereign Immunity Defense*

The doctrine of sovereign immunity bars those suits against the United States that are not specifically waived by statute. *See United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 586 (1941); *Council on Am. Islamic Rels., Inc. v. Ballenger*, 366 F. Supp. 2d 28, 32 (D.D.C. 2005). Accordingly, claims against a government agent in his/her official capacity are barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity unless the government specifically waives the immunity, or the actions of the government agent fall within an exception to the immunity rule. *See Clark v. Library of Cong.*, 750 F.2d 89, 103-04 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (holding that the doctrine of sovereign immunity barred a claim for money damages against the Librarian of Congress, in his official capacity, because immunity had not been waived and the exceptions to immunity did not apply).

Here, plaintiff sues President Bush and Attorney General Gonzales in their official capacities under the First, Fourth,<sup>5</sup> and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. (Am. Compl. ¶ 2.) Our Circuit has found that Congress has not waived immunity for suits seeking monetary damages that arise under the Constitution. *See Clark*, 750 F.2d at 102-03. In fact, as noted in *Clark*, possible exceptions to sovereign immunity arise only when a plaintiff seeks non-monetary relief. *See id.* at 104. Accordingly, because

---

<sup>5</sup> *See supra* note 2.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.