

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 CALIFORNIARUDY MEZA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
Defendants.Case No. [18-cv-01454-RS](#)**ORDER REMANDING ACTION**

This is one of several attempts by pro se litigant Rudy Meza to challenge rulings by the Santa Rosa Superior Court related to domestic disputes involving his former spouse. Although limited circumstances exist in which federal courts have jurisdiction to review state court rulings, Meza has alleged no facts to support such an outcome here.

Meza's filings that resulted in the opening of this action are less than clear as to his intent. To the extent Meza may have intended to "remove" a state court action, he fails to show any viable basis for removal jurisdiction.


To the extent Meza may be attempting to assert affirmative claims against any of the named defendants in this action independently of removal jurisdiction, this order of remand is without prejudice to Meza's right to bring any such affirmative claims. Meza is cautioned, however, that the allegations he has advanced to date appear, at best, to present nothing more than grounds for potential relief in the state trial and/or appellate courts; nothing alleged would support federal claims.

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

This action is remanded to Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SFL-57853 and/or such other related case numbers to which Meza may contend the notice of removal applied, if any. Meza is advised that successive removals absent good cause may result in imposition of substantial financial sanctions.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 24, 2018



RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge