Sau	nders et	t al v. S	ausalito Police Department et al				Doc. 5	
			Case 3:07-cv-00811-MMC	Document 5	Filed 02/13/2007	Page 1 of 2		
United States District Court		1						
		2						
		3						
		4						
		5						
		6						
		7						
		8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
		9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
		10						
	nia	11	ARLENE CAMPBELL and D	AVID A.	No. C-07-0811 N	ИМС		
	alifor	12	SAUNDERS,					
	of Cá	13	Plaintiffs v.		ORDER DISMIS	SING ACTION WITH		
	Northern District of California	14	SAUSALITO POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,					
		15	Defendants		,			
	orthe	16			/			
		17	Currently before the C	Court is the comp	plaint filed February	8, 2007 by plaintiffs Ai	rlene	
	For the	18	Campbell and David A. Saunders. By separate order filed concurrently herewith, the Court					
		19	has denied Saunders' motion to proceed in forma pauperis.					
		20	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court must dismiss any complaint filed by a					
		21	person seeking to proceed in forma pauperis if the complaint fails to state a claim.					
		22	Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a claim because plaintiffs fail to allege any basis for					
		23	federal jurisdiction over the instant action, fail to adequately set forth the factual and legal					
		24	basis of their claims, and fail to set forth the type of relief they seek from the Court. See					
		25	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) (requiring that complaint set forth "a short and plain statement of the					
		26	grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends," "a short and plain statement of the					
		27	claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," and "a demand for judgment for the					
		28	relief the pleader seeks"). Moreover, it appears that plaintiffs may be seeking this Court's					

intervention in ongoing state court criminal proceedings. In <u>Younger v. Harris</u>, the Supreme
 Court held there is a "fundamental policy against federal interference with state criminal
 prosecutions." <u>Younger v. Harris</u>, 401 U.S. 37, 46 (1971).

Accordingly, the complaint is hereby DISMISSED, with leave to file an amended
complaint no later than March 13, 2007. If, by that date, plaintiffs fail to file an amended
complaint, accompanied by the requisite filing fee, the above-titled action will be dismissed
with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: February 13, 2007

Mafine M. Cherney

MAXINE M. CHESNEY United States District Judge