



2008 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

8-11-2008

Boyd v. State Farm Ins Co

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008

Recommended Citation

"Boyd v. State Farm Ins Co" (2008). *2008 Decisions*. 682.
https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008/682

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2008 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 07-2930

JOANNE BOYD,
Appellant

v.

STATE FARM INSURANCE COMPANY

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 07-02030)
District Judge: Honorable J. Curtis Joyner

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
February 12, 2008

Before: McKee, Smith and Chagares, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: August 11, 2008)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

On May 24, 2007, Boyd filed a document titled “Petition for Notice of Appeal from the Order of the Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk” in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. In an order

entered that same day, the District Court denied Boyd's petition for notice of appeal. The District Court based its denial, in part, on Boyd's failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 3 and, in part, for lack of jurisdiction because it sought review of the United States Supreme Court's processing and denial of her writ of prohibition. Boyd appeals and has filed a motion to supplement the record. We will affirm.

District courts do not have jurisdiction to review decisions by the United States Supreme Court. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1330-1369. Accordingly, the District Court properly dismissed Boyd's petition for notice of appeal for lack of jurisdiction and we will affirm its judgment. Boyd's motion to supplement the record is denied. We note that there is nothing in the motion that can cure the jurisdictional defect.