

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

SERAJUL HAQUE,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 12-80266 CRB

**ORDER DENYING FILING OF  
PAPERS**

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION  
ET AL.,  
Defendants.

Plaintiff Serajul Haque is subject to pre-filing review of papers he seeks to file because he has been declared a vexatious litigant. See Order Dismissing Complaints and Declaring Petitioner Vexatious Litigant (“Vex. Order”), In re cases filed by Serajul Haque, No. C-04-mc-231-MHP (N.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2005). Under the vexatious litigant order, Mr. Haque is barred from filing any papers regarding employment or employment-related matters unless permitted by the Court. Id. at 2 The instant matter relates to employment and thus is subject to that pre-filing review.

Haque’s papers include two documents styled as “Complaints”: one concerns alleged employment discrimination by Fry’s Electronics, where Haque apparently worked between 1998 and 1999 according to a resume attached to the complaint, see Compl. Ex. 10; the other is against the Social Security Commissioner and concerns alleged errors in “work credits” reflected in his social security statement. Compl. 1 & Ex. 1.

1           Haque has already filed multiple employment discrimination suits against Fry’s. E.g.,  
2 Haque v. Fry’s Elecs., Inc., No. 05-mc-80069-MHP (N.D. Cal. closed Feb. 15, 2006); Haque  
3 v. Fry’s Elecs., Inc., No. 05-1935-MHP (N.D. Cal. closed Feb. 15, 2006); Haque v. Fry’s  
4 Elecs., Inc., No. 04-2116-RMW (N.D. Cal. closed Jan. 25, 2005); Haque v. Fry’s Elecs., Inc.,  
5 No. 02-5147-RMW (N.D. Cal. closed Jan. 22, 2003). The Order declaring Haque a  
6 vexatious litigant dismissed Haque’s suit against Fry’s on the merits. Vex. Order at 1.

7           The claims in this matter are thus barred by *res judicata*; to the extent they concern  
8 conduct postdating his previous lawsuits—unlikely given the dates of his alleged  
9 employment—this Court finds that the current complaint is so conclusory and  
10 incomprehensible that it too fails to state a claim; the only allegations regarding the nature of  
11 Haque’s claims are:

12           ALL STATUTORY DISCRIMINATIONS-CONTRACT VIOLATIONS-  
13           BLACKLISTING IN JOB MARKET-NEGATIVE REF TO PROSPECTIVE  
14           EMPLOYERS-NOT USED/PLACED PLAINTIFF IN ACCOUNTS-  
15           FINANCE RELATED JOBS (qualifying services for CPA license) res judicata  
16           defendable

15 Compl. Ex. 1 at 2 (all formatting from original). Those allegations are too vague to support a  
16 plausible claim for relief, especially given the doubts about whether they have already been  
17 resolved in one of the other of the many<sup>1</sup> other suits Haque has filed.

18           As for his complaints regarding social security, Haque’s second “Complaint” is in a  
19 template for individuals seeking review of a decision by the Social Security Commissioner,  
20 yet Haque describes no action by the Social Security Administration that would be subject to

21 //  
22 //  
23 //  
24 //  
25 //

---


28           <sup>1</sup>A search of Mr. Haque’s name in the Court’s electronic filing system revealed that he has filed  
51 actions in the last ten years in this district alone.

1 judicial review. His papers would thus fail to state a claim against the Social Security  
2 Commissioner.

3 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Mr. Haque's filing.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6  
7 Dated: December 13, 2012

  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
CHARLES R. BREYER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE