

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY DOMINICK,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
KAMALA D. HARRIS, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-04485-JD](#)


**ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

Even read generously in light of plaintiff Dominick’s pro se status, the complaint is an unintelligible mass of allegations that falls far short of presenting a short and plain statement of a claim showing plaintiff’s entitlement to relief. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a); *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009). The complaint also fails to provide a statement identifying the basis for federal jurisdiction over the case, in violation of Rule 8(a)(1) and Local Rule 3-5(a). This is of particular concern here because the complaint makes reference to California DMV fees and appears to name California residents as putative defendants.

The complaint is dismissed with leave to file an amended complaint by **June 19, 2018**. Failure to meet this deadline will result in dismissal of the case with prejudice. All pending motions related to the pleadings, including plaintiff’s multiple motions for default, are terminated.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 22, 2018

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES DONATO  
United States District Judge