1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CAROLINE BIRK, No. 2:15-cv-00446-KJM-CMK 12 Plaintiffs. 13 **ORDER** v. 14 ROYAL CROWN BANCORP, INC., et al.. 15 Defendants. 16 17 On June 10, 2015, plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a motion for a temporary 18 19 restraining order (TRO). (ECF No. 3.) It appears plaintiff seeks an order staying a writ of 20 possession issued by a state court that becomes effective on June 11, 2015. (Id. at 2.) She seeks a 21 stay, so that she can pursue her state law claims "in the state unlawful detainer action." (Id. at 9.) 22 "Under the Rooker–Feldman doctrine, however, federal courts lack jurisdiction to review the 23 propriety of state court rulings, including a writ of possession rendered during the course of a 24 state court unlawful detainer proceeding." Tucker v. Fed. Nat. Mortgage Ass'n, No. 13-01874, 25 2013 WL 5159730, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2013) (collecting cases); see also Drawsand v. F.F. 26 Properties, L.L.P., 866 F. Supp. 2d 1110, 1123 (N.D. Cal. 2011) ("To the extent that [the 27 plaintiff] is attempting to challenge the adverse ruling in the [unlawful detainer] action, such 28 claim is barred under the *Rooker–Feldman* doctrine."). 1

1	Accordingly, the court DENIES plaintiff's motion.
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.
3	DATED: June 10, 2015.
4	100 0.0
5	LINITED STATES DISTI
6	UNITED STATES DISTR
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	