

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 LUIS QUINTANILLA, ) Case No.: 1:13-cv-01917-AWI-SAB (PC)  
12 Plaintiff, )  
13 v. ) ORDER FINDING PLAINTIFF ACTED IN BAD  
14 SIX UNKNOWN AGENTS, et al., ) FAITH AND IMPOSING MONETARY  
15 Defendants. ) SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$250.00 ON  
16 ) PLAINTIFF  
17 ) (ECF No. 1)  
18 ) FORTY-FIVE DAY DEADLINE  
19 )  
20 )  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

17 To date, Plaintiff Young Yil Jo has filed over one-hundred fifty civil cases in this district. The  
18 complaint filed in this action is not signed and it sets forth no intelligible claims for relief, and fails to  
19 state any cognizable claims under federal law. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-668 (2009); Bell  
20 Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Federal courts, as all courts, are for the serious  
21 presentation of cases in which litigants wish to have their matters heard. Plaintiff is not one who takes  
22 his claim with any serious indication that he intends to pursue a righteous claim.

23 On June 12, 2013, the Court issued an order finding that Plaintiff acted in bad faith and  
24 imposed monetary sanctions in the amount of \$100.00 in a separate frivolous complaint filed by  
25 Plaintiff in Young Yil Jo v. Six Unknown Names Agents in case number 1:13-cv-00837-AWI-SAB,  
26 ECF No. 2. The Court cited to a previous frivolous complaint filed by Plaintiff in Pak v. Six  
27 Unknown Names Agent in case number 1:13-cv-00750-AWI-SAB, in which Plaintiff was forewarned  
28 that monetary sanctions would be imposed for filing frivolous complaints.

1 The Court also issued a findings and recommendations, in case number 1:13-cv-00837-AWI-  
2 SAB, recommending to dismiss the action with prejudice as frivolous. (Id., ECF No. 3.) The findings  
3 and recommendations were adopted in full on August 21, 2013, and the action was dismissed.

4 Plaintiff has previously been informed on numerous occasions that he may be monetarily  
5 sanctions for filing frivolous claims without basis in law or fact. See 1:13-cv-00750-AWI-SAB, ECF  
6 No. 2 (“Plaintiff is further forewarned that filing a complaint based upon facts and law that have no  
7 reasonable basis may result in further sanctions, including but not limited to an order to pay a penalty  
8 to the Court.”), 1:13-cv-00837-AWI-SAB, ECF No. 2. Plaintiff failed to heed the Court’s warning  
9 and filed this similar frivolous claim.

10 This Court has inherent power to sanction parties or their attorneys for improper conduct.  
11 Chambers v. Nasco, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 43-46 (1991); Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper, 447 U.S. 752,  
12 766 (1980); Fink v. Gomez, 239 F.3d 989, 991 (9th Cir. 2001). The imposition of sanctions under the  
13 Court’s inherent authority is discretionary. Air Separation, Inc. v. Underwriters at Lloyd’s of London,  
14 45 F.3d 288, 291 (9th Cir. 1995). A court’s inherent powers “are governed not by rule or statute but by  
15 the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and  
16 expeditious disposition of cases.” Chambers, 501 U.S. at 43. Such inherent power “is not a broad  
17 reservoir of power, ready at an imperial hand, but a limited source; and implied power squeezed from  
18 the need to make the court function.” Id. at 42. “Because inherent powers are shielded from direct  
19 democratic controls, they must be exercised with restraint and discretion.” Roadway Express, Inc.,  
20 447 U.S. at 764.

21 The Court’s “inherent power ‘extends to a full range of litigation abuses.’” Fink, 239 F.3d at  
22 992 (quoting Chambers, 501 U.S. at 46-47.) However, in order to sanction a litigant under the Court’s  
23 inherent powers, the Court must make a specific finding of “bad faith or conduct tantamount to bad  
24 faith.” Fink, 239 F.3d at 994. Although mere recklessness is insufficient to support sanctions under  
25 the Court’s inherent powers, “recklessness when combined with an additional factor such as  
26 frivolousness, harassment, or an improper purpose” is sufficient. Id. at 993-994. A litigant may be  
27 sanctioned for acting for an improper purpose, even if the act was “a truthful statement or nonfrivolous  
28 argument or objection.” Id. at 992.

1 Here, Plaintiff's constant bad faith filings requires members of the clerk's office who are  
2 limited in staffing with increased responsibilities due to budget constraints, to process plaintiff's  
3 numerous frivolous filings. Further, Plaintiff's claim delays this Court from addressing matters  
4 brought in federal court in good faith. The entire Court's time is better spent addressing matters  
5 brought in good faith. See Snyder v. I.R.S., 596 F.Supp. 240, 252 (N. D. Ind. 1984) ("[T]he doors of  
6 this courthouse are open to good faith litigation, but abuse of the judicial process . . . will not be  
7 tolerated."). Similarly, Plaintiff's constant frivolously filings will not be tolerated.

8 Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff filed this complaint in bad faith without any basis in  
9 law or fact. Plaintiff received notice in this Court's previous findings and recommendations that the  
10 filing of such complaints may result in monetary sanctions.

11 Based on the foregoing,

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. Plaintiff is assessed monetary sanctions in the amount of \$250.00 for filing a frivolous  
14 claim in bad faith;
- 15 2. The sanction amount shall be paid to the Court within forty-five (45) days from the date  
16 of service of this order; and
- 17 3. The failure to pay the sanction in accordance with this order may result in the  
18 imposition of additional sanctions.

19  
20  
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: November 27, 2013

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE