

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAE. K. WADE,
Plaintiff,
v.
ELAINE CHAO, et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [17-mc-80148-WHO](#)**ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO FILE
COMPLAINT AND DENIAL OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 1, 2, 3

Plaintiff E.K. Wade seeks permission to file a complaint against Elaine Chao and a host of current and former employees of the Department of Labor and other government officials. Dkt. No. 1. Wade has filed many frivolous lawsuits in this Court (as well as in the Eastern District of California) and is subject to pre-filing orders that require him to “seek leave from this Court before filing any additional complaints against the Department of Labor, any of its employees, or against the United States or any other government official in connection with his disputes with the DOL stemming from his prior employment in the Office of Federal Programs Contract Compliance.” *Wade v. Gilliland*, Case No. 3:10-cv-00425-WHA, ECF No. 100 at 4; *see also Wade v. United States*, Case No. 3:06- cv-02346-CRB, ECF No. 55 (requiring pre-filing review for complaints “in connection with his disputes with the [Veterans Affairs] system”).

I have reviewed Wade’s latest complaint and his motion for a preliminary injunction and find them to be repetitive of past filings in his string of dozens of lawsuits and attempted lawsuits in this District and in the Eastern District of California. Wade has repeatedly attempted to sue these officials and employees with respect to his termination in 2004/2005, his complaints of being barred from and/or removed from federal buildings in 2004/2005, and his claims that these officials and employees retaliated against him and failed to rehire him. He has also repeatedly attempted (and had those attempts rejected by judges on this Court) to litigate negligence,


United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 conspiracy, and infliction of emotional distress claims based on his being barred from and/or
2 removed from federal buildings; claims Wade believes are supported by documents released to
3 him in 2012 and 2015 under the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). *See, e.g., Wade v.*
4 *Chao*, Case No. 3:17-mc-80141-WHA; *Wade v. Chao*, Case No. 3:17-mc-80094-WHA; *Wade v.*
5 *Chao*, Case No. 17-mc-80130-JST; *Wade v. Perez*, Case No. 3:17-cv-03830-EDL (transferred
6 from the Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:16-cv-2354 TLN DB PS); *Wade v. Perez*, Case
7 No. 3:16-mc-80221-WHA.

8 Pursuant to the pre-filing review order applicable to Wade in Case No. 10-cv-00425-WHA,
9 I DENY Wade's request to file this duplicative action and DENY his motion for a preliminary
10 injunction. The Clerk is directed not to accept Wade's complaint for filing.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: December 5, 2017

13
14 

15 William H. Orrick
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28