I

	Case 1:06-cv-01398-AWI-LJO Document 5 Filed 10/16/2006 Page 1 of 5			
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	DARYL LEON HANSON, CASE NO. CV F 06-1398 AWI LJO			
12	Plaintiff,FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS ACTION			
13	VS.			
14	GEORGE W. BUSH,			
15	Defendant.			
16				
17	INTRODUCTION			
18	Plaintiff Daryl Leon Hanson ("plaintiff") proceeds pro se and in forma pauperis and on October			
19	10, 2006, filed a document which this Court construes as a complaint against George W. Bush. The			
20	complaint is generally unintelligible and states that plaintiff "was kidnaped by Mexican Fresno police			
21	officers" and "got set up by black people." The complaint further alleges that "Mr. George Bush used			
22	my illegal civil rights case to get into office" and that plaintiff "witnessed George Bush's illegal			
23	campaign."			
24	DISCUSSION			
25	Standards For Screening			
26	"A trial court may dismiss a claim sua sponte under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6) Such dismissal			
27	may be made without notice where the claimant cannot possibly win relief." Omar v. Sea-Land Service,			
28	Inc., 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987); see Wong v. Bell, 642 F.2d 359, 361-362 (9th Cir. 1981). Sua			
	1			

sponte dismissal may be made before process is served on defendants. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S.
 319, 324 (1989) (dismissals under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) are often made sua sponte); *Franklin v. Murphy*,
 745 F.2d 1221, 1226 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984) (court may dismiss frivolous in forma pauperis action sua sponte
 prior to service of process on defendants).

5 When a plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, this Court, notwithstanding any filing fee that may have been paid, shall dismiss a case at any time if the Court determines the action is frivolous, malicious, 6 7 fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against an immune 8 defendant. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e); 2 Schwarzer, Tashima & Wagstaffe, California Practice Guide: 9 Federal Civil Procedure Before Trial (2006) Attacking the Pleadings, para. 9:226.1, pp. 9-69. A court 10 need not accept as true factual allegations in in forma pauperis complaints and may reject "completely baseless" allegations, including those which are "fanciful," "fantastic" or "delusional." Denton v. 11 12 Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 1733 (1992).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-1228 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984). A
frivolous claim is based on an inarguable legal conclusion or a fanciful factual allegation. *Neitzke*, 490
U.S. at 324. A federal court may dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably
meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327.

18 The test for maliciousness is a subjective one and requires the court to "determine the ... good 19 faith of the applicant." Kinney v. Plymouth Rock Squab Co., 236 U.S. 43, 46 (1915); see Wright v. Newsome, 795 F.2d 964, 968, n. 1 (11th Cir. 1986). A lack of good faith is found most commonly in 20 21 repetitive suits filed by plaintiffs who have used the advantage of cost-free filing to file a multiplicity 22 of suits. A complaint is malicious if it suggests an intent to vex defendants or abuse the judicial process 23 by relitigating claims decided in prior cases. Crisafi v. Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981); Phillips v. Carey, 638 F.2d 207, 209 (10th Cir. 1981); Ballentine v. Crawford, 563 F.Supp. 627, 628-629 24 25 (N.D. Ind. 1983); cf. Glick v. Gutbrod, 782 F.2d 754, 757 (7th Cir. 1986) (court has inherent power to dismiss case demonstrating "clear pattern of abuse of judicial process"). A lack of good faith or malice 26 27 also can be inferred from a complaint containing untrue material allegations of fact or false statements made with intent to deceive the court. See Horsey v. Asher, 741 F.2d 209, 212 (8th Cir. 1984). 28

A complaint, or portion thereof, may be dismissed for failure to state a claim if it appears beyond 1 2 doubt that plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of the claim or claims that would entitle him to 3 relief. See Hishon v. King & Spalding, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984) (citing Conlev v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)); see also Palmer v. Roosevelt Lake Log Owners Ass'n, 651 F.2d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 4 5 1981). "[W]hen a federal court reviews the sufficiency of a complaint, before the reception of any evidence either by affidavit or admissions, its task is necessarily a limited one. The issue is not whether 6 7 a plaintiff will ultimately prevail but whether the claimant is entitled to offer evidence to support 8 claims." Scheurer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 1688 (1974); Gilligan v. Jamco Development Corp., 108 F.3d 246, 249 (9th Cir. 1997). 9

10 The complaint's face reflects deficiencies to prevent plaintiff from offering evidence to proceed11 on the indecipherable complaint.

12

## Subject Matter Jurisdictional

13 Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and lack inherent or general subject matter jurisdiction. Federal courts can adjudicate only those cases in which the United States Constitution and 14 15 Congress authorize them to adjudicate. Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375, 114 S.Ct. 16 1673, 1677 (1994); Finley v. United States, 490 U.S. 545, 109 S.Ct. 2003, 2008 (1989). Federal courts 17 are presumptively without jurisdiction over civil actions, and the burden to establish the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction. Kokkonen, 511 U.S. at 377; 114 S.Ct. at 1677. Lack of subject 18 matter jurisdiction is never waived and may be raised by the court sua sponte. Attorneys Trust v. 19 20 Videotape Computer Products, Inc., 93 F.3d 593, 594-595 (9th Cir. 1996). "Nothing is to be more jealously guarded by a court than its jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is what its power rests upon. Without 21 jurisdiction it is nothing." In re Moonev. 841 F.2d 1003, 1006 (9th Cir. 1988). 22

23

24

25

26

F.R.Civ.P. 8 establishes general pleading rules and provides in pertinent part:

(a) Claims for Relief. A pleading which sets forth a claim for relief . . . shall contain (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, unless the court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new grounds of jurisdiction to support it, (2) a short plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks.

27 28

1

2

5

(e)

Pleading to be Concise and Direct; Consistency.

(1) Each averment of a pleading shall be simple, concise and direct.

3 The complaint alleges neither grounds for nor facts to support this Court's jurisdiction. The
4 complaint reveals no grounds to properly invoke this Court's jurisdiction.

## **Pleading Deficiencies**

6 A pleading may not simply allege a wrong has been committed and demand relief. The 7 underlying requirement is that a pleading give "fair notice" of the claim being asserted and the "grounds 8 upon which it rests." Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47-48, 78 S.Ct. 99, 103 (1957); Yamaguchi v. United States Department of Air Force, 109 F.3d 1475, 1481 (9th Cir. 1997). Although a complaint need 9 10 not outline all elements of a claim, "[i]t must be possible . . . for an inference to be drawn that these elements exist." Walker v. South Central Bell Telephone Co., 904 F.2d 275, 277 (5th Cir. 1990); Lewis 11 v. ACB Business Service, Inc., 135 F.3d 389, 405-406 (6th Cir. 1998). Despite the flexible pleading 12 policy of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a complaint must give fair notice and state the elements 13 of the claim plainly and succinctly. Jones v. Community Redev. Agency, 733 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 14 1984). A plaintiff must allege with at least some degree of particularity overt facts which defendant 15 16 engaged in to support plaintiff's claim. Jones, 733 F.2d at 649.

The complaint makes fanciful and delusional references to kidnaping, getting set up, using civil
rights violations to reach elected office, and witnessing an illegal campaign. The complaint is
unintelligible and alleges no specific claims. The complaint fails to provide fair notice and to state facts
to support elements of particular claims. The complaint seeks no relief.

21

## **RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER**

For the reasons discussed above, this Court RECOMMENDS to DISMISS this action without prejudice on grounds that: (1) the complaint fails to establish this Court's subject matter jurisdiction; (2) the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; and (3) a further attempt at amendment is unwarranted based on jurisdictional defects and the complaint's fanciful, delusional and unintelligible statements.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States district judge assigned
to this action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and this Court's Local Rule 72-304. No later than

October 30, 2006, plaintiff may file with the Court written objections to these findings and
recommendations otherwise in compliance with this Court's Local Rule 72-304(b). Such a document
should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The district
court will then review the magistrate judge's ruling, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). Plaintiff is
admonished that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the
district court's order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

Plaintiff is admonished not to attempt to file an amended complaint as plaintiff's recourse
is to object to these findings and recommendations. Plaintiff is further admonished this Court will
strike any papers to attempt to file an amended complaint unless this Court specifically grants
plaintiff permission to file an amended complaint.

11	II	IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated:	October 13, 2006	/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	66h44d		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			5