

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

October 24, 2025

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

WILLIAM C. DANKS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,
v.

SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR.;
CLARENCE THOMAS,

Defendant - Appellees.

No. 25-1293
(D.C. No. 1:25-CV-01282-LTB-RTG)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **BACHARACH**, **MORITZ**, and **ROSSMAN**, Circuit Judges.

The plaintiff, Mr. William Danks, sued two United States Supreme Court Justices, claiming that they should recuse in any cases involving President Trump. The district court screened the complaint under Local Rule 8.1, concluding that Mr. Danks lacked standing and dismissing the action without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

* The plaintiff does not request oral argument, and it would not help us decide the appeal. So we have decided the appeal based on the record and the parties' briefs. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)(C); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G).

This order and judgment is not binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. But the order and judgment may be cited for its persuasive value if otherwise appropriate. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 32.1(a); 10th Cir. R. 32.1(A).

Mr. Danks doesn't question the underlying decision that he lacked standing. He instead challenges the district court's process, arguing that the local rule deprived him of due process by subjecting him to screening just because he didn't have an attorney. Irrespective of the local rule, however, the court needed to consider standing because (1) district courts must ensure that they have jurisdiction, *Collins v. Yellen*, 594 U.S. 220, 242 (2021), and (2) standing is a jurisdictional requirement, *Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1*, 119 F.3d 1437, 1445 (10th Cir. 1997). We thus affirm the dismissal.

Entered for the Court

Robert E. Bacharach
Circuit Judge