

Rehberg v. Paulk

566 U.S. 356 (2012)

Supreme Court of the United States

Issue: *Related absolute immunity (grand jury witnesses)*

Holding on Judicial Immunity

A grand jury witness — including a law-enforcement 'complaining witness' — has absolute immunity from any § 1983 claim based on the witness's testimony, and cannot be sued even for allegedly conspiring to present false testimony to the grand jury.

Key Quotations (verbatim)

“[A] grand jury witness has absolute immunity from any § 1983 claim based on the witness' testimony.”

— Rehberg v. Paulk, 566 U.S. 356, 369 (2012).

“[T]his rule may not be circumvented by claiming that a grand jury witness conspired to present false testimony or by using evidence of the witness' testimony to support any other § 1983 claim concerning the initiation or maintenance of a prosecution.”

— Rehberg v. Paulk, 566 U.S. 356, 369 (2012).

Note / Caveat: Adjacent doctrine: witness immunity, part of the family of absolute immunities shielding participants in the judicial process.

Full opinion (authoritative source): <https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/626447/rehberg-v-paulk/>

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.