

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California  
San Francisco Division

QIU MIN JI,

No. C 15-01569 LB

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER (1) TO SHOW CAUSE AND  
(2) DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR AN EARLY CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENT AND  
OTHER AGENTS KNOWN AND  
UNKNOWN,

Defendants.

---

On April 6, 2015, Plaintiff Qui Min Ji, who is proceeding *pro se*, filed a document titled, “Complaint Disclose the Forever Mystery of our Cyber Security,” against “National Security Agent and other Agents Known or Unknown.” (Complaint, ECF No. 3.) The gist of Plaintiff’s complaint is that a Chinese spy who resides in the United States has been controlling the Internet for over four years. This Chinese spy implanted multiple biosensors into Plaintiff’s brain and uses them to control Plaintiff. Somehow, FCC regulations regarding DNS name registration are involved, too.

In the complaint, Plaintiff never describes the agent(s) sued, never alleges a specific legal claim against the agent(s), and never alleges why this court has subject-matter jurisdiction over the action. Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. *See Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994); *Guglielmino v. McKee Foods Corp.*, 506 F.3d 696, 700 (9th Cir. 2007). A plaintiff who seeks to invoke federal jurisdiction by filing a complaint in federal court bears the burden of establishing that jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. at 377; *Farmers Ins.*

1 *Exchange v. Portage La Prairie Mut. Ins. Co.*, 907 F.2d 911, 912 (9th Cir. 1990). The plaintiff must  
2 therefore plead sufficient facts in the complaint to establish the court's jurisdiction. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
3 8(a)(1). Plaintiff has not done this.

4 Accordingly, the court orders Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for  
5 lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff must do so in writing by April 22, 2015.

6 Further, because Plaintiff has not shown that this court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this  
7 action, the court denies Plaintiff's motion for an early case management conference which was filed  
8 on April 8, 2014.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: April 10, 2015



11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 LAUREL BEELER  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28