

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

PAMELA DUDGEON EISENLOHR, et  
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 3:17-cv-2174 (SRU)

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION**

Pamela Dudgeon Eisenlohr<sup>1</sup> initiated this action in December 2017 against fifty-five defendants, most of whom are state agencies, current or retired state judges, law firms, and attorneys. She alleges violations of her rights under the Americans with Disability Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act stemming from her state court divorce and child custody proceedings. *See* Compl., Doc. No. 1. Eisenlohr moved to proceed in forma pauperis, which was granted by Magistrate Judge William I. Garfinkel on January 24, 2018. *See* Doc. No. 7. Judge Garfinkel also issued a Recommended Ruling, recommending that I dismiss the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Recommended Ruling, Doc. No. 8. Eisenlohr objected to the recommendation. *See* Objection, Doc. No. 8. I approved and adopted Judge Garfinkel's Recommended Ruling and closed the case. Order, Doc. No. 10.

Eisenlohr has now moved to amend the judgment and/or for relief from the judgment. Motion, Doc. No. 11. As set forth in the Recommended Ruling, federal courts lack jurisdiction in cases such as this pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, which precludes a party who lost her state court case from seeking review of the judgment in federal district court. *See Rooker v.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Eisenlohr also brought this action as next friend and parent on behalf of "S.D.E.," a minor.

*Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 414-15 (1923), *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983). Accordingly, Eisenlohr's motion (Doc. No. 11) is **denied**.

So ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 21st day of August 2018.

/s/ STEFAN R. UNDERHILL  
Stefan R. Underhill  
United States District Judge