

Pulliam v. Allen

466 U.S. 522 (1984)

Supreme Court of the United States

Issue: Immunity is no bar to injunctive relief or attorney's fees

Holding on Judicial Immunity

Judicial immunity does not bar prospective injunctive relief against a judge acting in a judicial capacity, nor does it bar an award of attorney's fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988. The case upheld an injunction and fee award against a magistrate who jailed people who could not make bail on non-jailable offenses.

Key Quotations (verbatim)

“We conclude that judicial immunity is not a bar to prospective injunctive relief against a judicial officer acting in her judicial capacity.”

— Pulliam v. Allen, 466 U.S. 522, 541–42 (1984).

Note / Caveat: SUPERSEDED IN PART BY STATUTE: The Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1996 amended § 1983 to bar injunctive relief against a judicial officer for acts taken in a judicial capacity 'unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.' See *Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234 (11th Cir. 2000). Pulliam's reasoning on the scope of common-law immunity remains influential.

Full opinion (authoritative source): <https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/111166/pulliam-v-allen/>

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.