

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

FAREED SEPEHRY-FARD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL  
CORPORA FICTA EMPLOYEE(S), et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-mc-80061-JD](#)

**ORDER DENYING FILING**

On March 10, 2015, Judge Lucy Koh of this court entered an order finding pro se plaintiff Fareed Sepehry-Fard to be a vexatious litigant. *Fareed Sepehry-Fard v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 14-cv-05142 (N.D. Cal. 2015), Dkt. No. 58. The order was in response to eight separate foreclosure-related lawsuits concerning two properties that Sepehry-Fard owned in Saratoga, California. *Id.* at 14. Judge Koh handled the eighth lawsuit and dismissed it on res judicata grounds without leave to amend. *Id.* at 10. The vexatious litigant portion of the order states that plaintiff “must submit for pre-filing review any complaint filed in this district concerning the foreclosure” of his property located at 18314 Baylor Avenue, Saratoga, California 95070. *Id.* at 21. It further states that if the general duty judge assigned to pre-filing review determines that the complaint is duplicative of these claims or frivolous, it will not be filed and will be returned to plaintiff. *Id.*

On May 15, 2017, Sepehry-Fard lodged five documents with the clerk. One document is formatted like a complaint and states that it is a “bill for \$1,412,514,261.78 [f]or striking against the constitutional form of government.” Dkt. No. 1. It names more than fifty defendants, including Judge Koh and a United States Senator for California. Three of the documents are forms purporting to “fire” the President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States.

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

Dkt. Nos. 2, 3, 4. The fifth is entitled an “Oath on Admission,” also attacking government officials. Dkt. No. 5.

All of these documents are frivolous on their face, and one expressly states that Sepehry-Fard is suing “because of grand theft of [his] properties.” Dkt. No. 1 at 8. They fall within the ambit of the vexatious litigant order, and the Clerk of the Court is directed not to accept any of the five documents for filing.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 22, 2017

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