

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

TYRONE HURT,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDGE ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, JR.,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND,

Defendant.

No. C 13-80053 MISC SI

**ORDER RE: PRE-FILING REVIEW OF
COMPLAINT**

Order also to be filed in C 12-4187 EMC

In an order filed January 11, 2013, Judge Chen of this Court declared plaintiff Tyrone Hurt a vexatious litigant. *Hurt v. All Sweepstakes Contests*, C 12-4187 EMC, Docket No. 18. Pursuant to that order, the Clerk of this Court may not file or accept any further complaints filed by or on behalf of plaintiff, and if plaintiff wishes to file a complaint, the Duty Judge must review the complaint to determine whether it should be accepted for filing.

On March 11, 2013, plaintiff sought to file a new complaint in this Court. The undersigned is the Duty Judge, and has reviewed the complaint to determine whether it should be accepted for filing. The Court concludes that the new complaint suffers from the same types of factual and legal deficiencies as the previous frivolous lawsuits that led to the declaration of plaintiff as a vexatious litigant. In the new complaint, plaintiff has named as a defendant Judge Alexander Williams, Jr., of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. Based upon an order attached to the complaint, it appears that on January 8, 2013, Judge Williams declared plaintiff a vexatious litigant in the District of

1 Maryland, and that plaintiff is subject to a pre-filing order in that district. The complaint contains
2 citations to various statutes, the United States Constitution, Black’s Law Dictionary, and case law, and
3 seeks relief based on unspecified alleged violations of the Constitution.

4 The new complaint is frivolous because, among other reasons, “[j]udges are immune from
5 damage actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts.” *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793
6 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986). The Clerk is directed not to accept the new complaint for filing, and
7 shall close this miscellaneous case.

8
9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: March 20, 2013



SUSAN ILLSTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE