

FREDERICK B. HAYES (State Bar No. 165315)
Fred.Hayes@hayeslawoffice.net
HAYES LAW OFFICE
2447 Pacific Coast Highway, 2nd Floor
Hermosa Beach, California 90254

JS-6

Telephone: 310-698-8729
Facsimile: 310-388-0310

Attorney for Defendants,
TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE, KATHRYN M. WERDEGAR,
MING W. CHIN, CAROL A. CORRIGAN, GOODWIN H. LIU,
MARIANO-FLORENTINO CUELLAR, and LEONDRA R. KRUGER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—SOUTHERN DIVISION

PAUL VIRIYAPANTHU,
Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 8:16-CV-01274 JVS (JCG)

vs.

**JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL IN
FAVOR OF THE JUDICIAL DEFENDANTS**

EDMUND BROWN, TANI GORRE
CANTIL-SAKAUYE, KATHRYN
WERDEGAR, MING CHIN,
CAROL CORRIGAN, GOODWIN
LIU, MARIANO-FLORENTINO
CUELLAR, LEONDRA KRUGER,
SHERRI HONER, CHARLES
LARSON, RAYMOND
KALDENBACH, ORANGE
COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
JOHN NELSON, CESAR
VIVEROS, RICHARD GREEN and
DOES 1 to 10, inclusive

Defendants.

This action came before the Court on the First Amended Complaint of Plaintiff **PAUL VIRIYAPANTHU** (“Plaintiff”) for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants, **TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE**, *Chief Justice of California*; and **KATHRYN M. WERDEGAR**, **MING W. CHIN**, **CAROL A. CORRIGAN**, **GOODWIN H. LIU**, **MARIANO-FLORENTINO CUELLAR**, and **LEONDRA R. KRUGER**, *Justices of the*

1 *Supreme Court of California* (collectively, the “Judicial Defendants”).

2 The Court, on October 25, 2016, having entered an Order granting the
3 Judicial Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, it is
4 hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED** and **DECREED** that, pursuant to Federal Rule
5 of Civil Procedure 58, Judgment be entered in this action for the Judicial
6 Defendants, and each of them, and against Plaintiff Paul Viriyapanthu as follows:

- 7 1. As to Plaintiff’s First Cause of Action for violation of federal rights
8 under 42 U.S.C. 1983, the Court does not have subject matter
9 jurisdiction over this claim because of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.
10 2. As to Plaintiff’s Second Cause of Action for violation of federal rights
11 under 42 U.S.C. 1983, the Court does not have subject matter
12 jurisdiction over this claim because of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.
13 3. Plaintiff cannot cure the jurisdictional deficiency in his pleading, and
14 accordingly, the Judicial Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s
15 First Amended Complaint is granted without leave to amend.

16 It is further **ORDERED, ADJUDGED** and **DECREED** that the Judicial
17 Defendants, and each of them, are the prevailing parties in this action. Pursuant to
18 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d), the Judicial Defendants are awarded their
19 costs in an amount to be determined pursuant to the procedures specified in Local
20 Rules 54-1 et seq.

21
22
23 DATED: November 04, 2016

By: 

James V. Selna
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is Hayes Law Office, 2447 Pacific Coast Highway, 2nd Floor, Hermosa Beach, California 90254.

On October __, 2016, I served the within document entitled:

- **[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL IN FAVOR OF JUDICIAL DEFENDANTS**

___ PERSONAL SERVICE - by personally delivering the document listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

___ MAIL - by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, addressed as set forth below. I am readily familiar with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

XX ELECTRONIC SERVICE (on registered ECF Users) – by electronic transmission of the Notice of Electronic Filing through the Court’s transmission facilities for parties and/or counsel who are registered ECF Users pursuant to the Court’s General Order requiring same.

Paul Viriyapanthu
Plaintiff Pro Per

This Certificate of Service was executed on October __, 2016, at Hermosa Beach, California.

By: /s/ Frederick B. Hayes
Frederick B. Hayes