

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 AAREN WILLIAMS STRIPLIN,

No. C 12-6417 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**AMENDED ORDER GRANTING
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN
FORMA PAUPERIS AND DISMISSING
COMPLAINT WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**

10 v.

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
12 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA WILEY W.
13 MANUAL COURTHOUSE TRAFFIC
14 DIVISION, SHANTELL STOKES,
15 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES, EL
16 CERRITO,

Defendants.
17 _____/

18 On December 18, 2012, plaintiff Aaren Williams Striplin filed a complaint against defendants
19 Superior Court of California, County of Alameda Wiley W. Manual Courthouse Traffic Division;
20 Shantell Stokes; and the Department of Motor Vehicles in El Cerrito, California. The complaint consists
21 of several pages of requests for information and documents related to a traffic court case involving
22 plaintiff, as well as a several page statement regarding the traffic court case. The complaint states that
23 plaintiff is alleging claims for fraud, conspiracy, extortion, theft of personal property, character
24 defamation, falsifying documents, and seeks over \$1 million in damages. In addition, plaintiff states that
25 he “appeals” several of the findings and actions of the state courts and the DMV. Plaintiff has also filed
26 an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

27 Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) authorizes federal courts to dismiss a complaint filed *in forma*
28 *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 a basis for federal


1 jurisdiction, and from the face of the complaint it does not appear that this Court would have jurisdiction
2 over plaintiff's purely state law claims. "[The] *Rooker-Feldman*[doctrine] prohibits a federal district
3 court from exercising subject matter jurisdiction over a suit that is a de facto appeal from a state court
4 judgment." *Kougasian v. TMSL, Inc.*, 359 F.3d 1136, 1139 (9th Cir. 2004). In addition, the complaint
5 simply lists the claims that plaintiff wishes to allege, but does not allege any facts in support of each of
6 the claims, nor does the complaint allege what each defendant did. Finally, plaintiff is advised that
7 "[j]udges are immune from damage actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts."
8 *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986). Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint is
9 DISMISSED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND pursuant to Section 1915(e)(2). *See Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d
10 1122, 1128 (9th Cir. 2000). Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is GRANTED.

11 If plaintiff wishes to file an amended complaint, the complaint shall (1) state the basis for federal
12 jurisdiction; (2) specifically identify the claims that plaintiff is asserting (for example, if plaintiff is
13 suing under a federal or state statute, the complaint shall identify that statute); (3) state, as clearly as
14 possible, the facts giving rise to the complaint, including the dates upon which the events occurred; and
15 (4) state the relief that plaintiff seeks. **Any amended complaint must be filed by March 15, 2013.**

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 27, 2013



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge