

Forrester v. White

484 U.S. 219 (1988)

Supreme Court of the United States

Issue: No immunity for administrative acts

Holding on Judicial Immunity

A judge is NOT entitled to absolute immunity for administrative acts. A unanimous Court held that a judge who demoted and dismissed a probation officer (allegedly because of her sex) was acting in an administrative capacity, not a judicial one, and so could be sued. The Court adopted a 'functional' approach that reserves absolute immunity for 'truly judicial acts.'

Key Quotations (verbatim)

“The decided cases ... suggest an intelligible distinction between judicial acts and the administrative, legislative, or executive functions that judges may on occasion be assigned by law to perform.”

— Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 227 (1988).

“In the case before us, we think it clear that Judge White was acting in an administrative capacity when he demoted and discharged Forrester.”

— Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 229 (1988).

Full opinion (authoritative source): <https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/111977/forrester-v-white/>

This case file states the court's holding on judicial immunity and reproduces verbatim, pin-cited excerpts for research and citation. It is a research summary, not the complete slip opinion; consult the linked source for the full text and to Shepardize/verify current status before relying on it in a filing.