UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
JANETTA SCONIERS,	CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00113-LJO-SMS
Plaintiff, v. FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, et al.,	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION NOTICE OF AMENDED DOCKET STATEMENT
Defendants.	(Doc. 56)

On January 21, 2011, Plaintiff Janetta Sconiers filed a 569-page complaint purporting to name as defendants numerous judicial, law enforcement, and other government officials. Since filing her complaint, Plaintiff has plagued this Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals with numerous malicious and frivolous findings, the most recent of which challenge this Court's inherent power to control its docket and the disposition of its cases with economy of time and effort for both the Court and the parties. *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 506 U.S. 915 (1992).

On October 31, 2011, Plaintiff again filed a frivolous and malicious motion, creatively entitled "Motion Notice of Amended Docketing Statement," which again challenges the Court's orders attempting to control Plaintiff's seemingly endless flood of frivolous and malicious motions. The Court may infer malice or a lack of good faith from documents containing untrue material allegations of fact or false statements made with the intent to harass or deceive the court or opposing parties. *See Horsey v. Asher*, 741 F.2d 209, 212 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984). The Court has the

1	inherent power to dismiss actions abusing judicial process. Glick v. Gutbrod, 782 F.2d 754, 757
2	(7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986).
3	The Court HEREBY STRIKES Plaintiff's Motion Notice of Filing of Amended
4	Docketing Statement, filed October 31, 2011, as Document 56.
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated:October 31, 2011/s/ Lawrence J. O'NeillUNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2