

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER COBB and UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

RON THOMSEN, ASSESSOR, COUNTY OF
ALAMEDA,

 Defendant.

No. C 12-1045 SI

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*,
DISMISSING COMPLAINT WITH
LEAVE TO AMEND, AND DENYING
“MOTION FOR BUSINESS MEETING”**

On March 1, 2012, plaintiff Christopher Cobb filed a complaint listing himself and the United States of America as plaintiffs, against defendant Alameda County Assessor Ron Thomsen. The complaint references numerous statutes, as well as real property located at 4975 Grizzly Peak Boulevard in Oakland, California. Plaintiff has also submitted exhibits regarding that property, including an allegedly “fictitious” grant deed. Compl ¶ 6 & Docket No. 7. Plaintiff has also filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, a “Motion to Amend,” and an “Amended: Motion for Business Meeting.” Docket Nos. 3, 6 & 10. The Motion to Amend states, among other things, that plaintiff “would like to acquire a Title to an Estate of Inheritance (Freehold) as the Successor (Successour); (U.S.C. Title 1, Chapter 1, Statute 5) to a Business Transaction, with the Judges Chamber, in regards to GRANT DEED” Docket No. 6 at 2.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) authorizes federal courts to dismiss a complaint filed *in forma pauperis* if the Court determines that the complaint fails to state a claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Here, the complaint is deficient because it does not allege any specific claims, and there does not appear to be any basis for federal jurisdiction. For example, although the complaint

1 references statutes and real property, the complaint does not contain a statement of facts regarding
2 plaintiff's claims related to that property. Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint is DISMISSED WITH
3 LEAVE TO AMEND pursuant to Section 1915(e)(2). *See Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1128 (9th Cir.
4 2000). Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is GRANTED. The Court DENIES
5 plaintiff's "motion for a business meeting."

6 If plaintiff wishes to file an amended complaint, the complaint shall (1) state the basis for federal
7 jurisdiction; (2) specifically identify the claims that plaintiff is asserting (for example, if plaintiff is
8 suing under a federal or state statute, the complaint shall identify that statute); (3) state, as clearly as
9 possible, the facts giving rise to the complaint, including the dates upon which the events occurred; and
10 (4) state the relief that plaintiff seeks. **Any amended complaint must be filed by April 20, 2012.**

11 This order resolves Docket Nos. 3, 6 and 10.

12
13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14
15 Dated: April 3, 2012



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge