

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
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ARKALGUD LAKSHMINARASIMHA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES COLE et al.,

Defendants.

No. MC 12-80277 RS

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH
PREJUDICE**

Mr. Lakshminarasimha filed a criminal complaint on December 4, 2012. Because no citizen can file a criminal complaint, this matter was filed as a civil miscellaneous complaint and plaintiff was afforded the opportunity to amend to identify any civil claims he could advance. On December 17, 2012, Mr. Lakshminarasimha filed an amended complaint, labeled as a civil matter. To the extent the amended complaint is decipherable, it set forth no facts to support a claim for relief. Rather, it contains only conclusory allegations. Plaintiff was thus instructed to show cause why the case should not be dismissed. On December 31, 2012, he filed what appears to be a response to that Order. In it he insists there is a conflict of interest for the Court to dismiss the case because “access to court has been controlled” and “defendants have inflicted injury.” However, he again asserts no facts to support those bald conclusions. Thus, there remain no cognizable civil claims and Mr.

NO. MC 12-80277 RS
ORDER

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

Lakshminarasimha has not met his burden to show why this case should not be dismissed. To allow amendment of his complaint yet again would be futile. Accordingly, this case is dismissed with prejudice. The Clerk is instructed to close the case file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 1/3/13


RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE