

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE HURT,

No. C-13-80011 MISC EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER RE PRE-FILING REVIEWUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
JUDGE ALEXANDER WILLIAMS,Defendant.

Plaintiff in this case is subject to pre-filing review for all complaints filed in this District pursuant to a January 11, 2013 Order in the case *Hurt v. All Sweepstakes Contests*, No. C-12-4187 EMC (N.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2012) (Docket No. 18). In that case, the Court found that Plaintiff had filed twenty one lawsuits in the previous year, the majority of which had been dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim. The Court found that Plaintiff's complaints are "often vague, confusing, or unintelligible" and that where the substance of his allegations can be discerned, they are often based on specious legal theories. In many of the cases, Plaintiff had brought suit based on sweeping allegations of general societal wrongs to which he had no personal connection. The named defendants were often immune to suit or not clearly identified.


In this case, Plaintiff filed suit against the United States District Court Judge Alexander Williams of the District of Maryland. The allegations in the complaint are not entirely clear, but seem to concern an Order to Show Cause Judge Williams issued directing Plaintiff to show cause why he should not be subject to pre-filing review in that court. Regardless of the merits of

1 Plaintiff's claim, however, the defendant in this case is a federal judge who is immune to suit.
2 *Mullis v. U.S. Bankr. Court for Dist. of Nevada*, 828 F.2d 1385, 1388 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Judges are
3 absolutely immune from civil liability for damages for their judicial acts.").

4 The Clerk of the Court is therefore directed not to file Plaintiff's complaint in this matter.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: January 29, 2013

9
10 
11 EDWARD M. CHEN
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28