1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	ROD ANTHONY HUFF,	Case No. CV 20-08747 AB (RAO)	
12	Plaintiff,	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RE SUMMARY DISMISSAL	
13	V.		
14	AIRPORT COURTHOUSE,		
15	Defendant.		
16			
17	On September 21, 2020, Plaintiff Rod Anthony Huff ("Plaintiff"), proceeding		
18	pro se and who has not paid the filing fee nor filed a proper request to proceed in		
19	forma pauperis, filed a document entitled "Petition to Summons of a Lawsuit in a		
20	Civil Action" (hereinafter, "Complaint or "Compl."), naming the state courthouse		
21	located at 11701 South La Cienega Boulevard, Los Angeles, as the sole defendant		
22	and seeking "\$30 trillion" in damages. Compl. at 1. For the following reasons, the		
23	Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.		
24	Plaintiff alleges that, in May 2020, he was brought before a Los Angeles		
25	County Superior Court judge for a crime that he did not commit. Compl. at 2.		
26	During the proceedings, Plaintiff informed the superior court that he had		
27	"previously abdicated legal document(s) defined pursuant to (UCC Article 3). TO		
28	THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, TO THE UNITED STATES		

TREASURY on the behalf of (sover[ei]gn immunity)." Id. He alleges that the 1 court did not "use proper discretion in the matter(s) previously stated," and that the 2 case was thereafter referred to the mental health department. Id. Plaintiff alleges 3 that he is now being held at a mental health unit. Compl. at 2-3. Plaintiff does not 4 seek injunctive or declaratory relief; rather, he demands \$30 trillion in damages, 5 seemingly for Defendant's violation of his right under the United States б Constitution to be free from cruel and unusual punishment when it referred him to 7 the mental health unit. *Id.* at 1, 2. 8

As noted above, Plaintiff has sued the superior court. Judges and those 9 performing judge-like functions, however, are absolutely immune from damage 10 liability for acts performed in their official capacities. Ashelman v. Pope, 793 F.2d 11 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986) (citing *Richardson v. Koshiba*, 693 F.2d 911, 913 (9th 12 Cir. 1982)); see also Ingram v. Long Beach Superior Court, 2018 WL 4587115, at 13 *5 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2018) (dismissing damages claims against superior court 14 judge as barred by judicial immunity), adopted by 2018 WL 4566842 (C.D. Cal. 15 Sept. 18, 2018). Judicial immunity applies "however erroneous the act may have 16 been, and however injurious in its consequences it may have proved to the 17 plaintiff." Cleavinger v. Saxner, 474 U.S. 193, 199-200, 106 S. Ct. 496, 88 L.Ed.2d 18 507 (1985). 19

Furthermore, because the Court is persuaded that Plaintiff would be unable to
allege any facts based upon the circumstances he challenges that would state a
cognizable claim, amendment would be futile in this case. *See Hartmann v. Cal. Dep't of Corr. & Rehab.*, 707 F.3d 1114, 1130 (9th Cir. 2013) ("A district court
may deny leave to amend when amendment would be futile.").

25

 $\left|\right|$

26 \\

27 \\

28 \\

1	Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT the Complaint is
2	DISMISSED with prejudice.
3	$C_{1}C_{2}$
4	DATED: October 15, 2020
5	ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	3