

1 physical injury.”¹

2 The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s complaint and finds that his allegations do not satisfy
3 the imminent danger exception to section 1915(g).² *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047,
4 1053–55 (9th Cir. 2007). In the complaint, Plaintiff attempts to raise claims against the United
5 States, California, Stanislaus County, the city of Modesto, Israel, various churches, the California
6 Secretary of State, all nations of the world, all people of the world, and all Christian churches.
7 (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff appears to raise claims regarding his arrest for thinking he was the King of
8 Israel and violations of his rights regarding his entitlement to religious tithes from all churches,
9 his attempt to run as a write-in candidate for the United States presidency, and his secession from
10 the United States and formation of his own nation. (*Id.*)

11 “Imminent danger of serious physical injury must be a real, present threat, not merely
12 speculative or hypothetical.” *Blackman v. Mjening*, 2016 WL 5815905, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 4,
13 2016). To meet his burden under § 1915(g), Plaintiff must provide “specific fact allegations of
14 ongoing serious physical injury, or a pattern of misconduct evidencing the likelihood of imminent
15 serious physical injury.” *Martin v. Shelton*, 319 F.3d 1048, 1050 (8th Cir. 2003). “[V]ague and
16 utterly conclusory assertions” of imminent danger or insufficient. *White v. Colorado*, 157 F.3d
17 1226, 1231–32 (10th Cir. 1998).

18 The allegations in the complaint disjointed and difficult to decipher at best, and appear to
19 raise only frivolous allegations. At no point does Plaintiff allege that he is at risk of suffering any
20 physical injury.

21 Accordingly, Plaintiff has failed to allege that he was in any imminent danger of serious
22 physical injury at the time the complaint was filed. Plaintiff has not satisfied the exception from
23 the three strikes bar under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and Plaintiff must pay the \$402.00 filing fee if he
24 wishes to litigate this action.

25 ¹ The Court takes judicial notice of the following United States District Court cases: (1) *Long v. USA*, Case
26 No. 1:13-cv-01368-SAB (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on Sept. 11, 2013 as frivolous); (2) *Long v. USA*, Case No. 1:13-cv-
27 01228-JLT (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on Jan. 16, 2014 as frivolous); (3) *Long v. Stanislaus Cty. Super. Ct.*, Case No.
1:13-cv-01370-SAB (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on May 1, 2014 for failure to state a claim); (4) *Long v. USA California*,
Case No. 1:13-cv-01256-GSA (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on June 23, 2014 for failure to state a claim).

28 ² The Court expresses no opinion on the merits of Plaintiff’s claims.

