

1
2
3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5

6
7 In re RICKARD D. ANDERSON,

No. C 08-05248 SBA (PR)

8 **ORDER OF DISMISSAL**
9


10 _____ /
11
12 Plaintiff Rickard D. Anderson, a state prisoner and frequent litigant in federal court, filed the
13 above-referenced "complaint" filled with nonsensical phrases with no clear relationship to each
14 other. Section 1915A requires a federal court to engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which
15 prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer, or employee of a governmental entity.
16 See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The section applies even if the prisoner has not been granted leave to
17 proceed in forma pauperis. See Rowe v. Shake, 196 F.3d 778, 781 (7th Cir. 1999) (joining Second,
18 Fifth, Sixth and Tenth Circuits in holding that § 1915A applies even when prisoner pays full fee at
19 outset). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which
20 are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary
21 relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2).

22 Nowhere does Plaintiff assert identifiable causes of action or make coherent factual
23 allegations that could give rise to a valid cause of action. In addition, Plaintiff has filed well over
24 one hundred complaints in this Court since 2003, all of which have been unintelligible. The Court
25 finds that Plaintiff's complaints are numerous and frivolous. It is difficult to ascertain from
26 Plaintiff's complaints who he is seeking relief from or what relief he is seeking. These filings serve
27 no reasonable litigation purpose, and they impose an unreasonable burden on the Court and its staff.
28 Furthermore, based on Plaintiff's past history of failing to respond to this Court's orders to amend
unintelligible complaints, the Court finds that granting Plaintiff leave to amend would be futile.

1 Accordingly, Plaintiff's incomprehensible complaint is DISMISSED as frivolous because it
2 is without an arguable basis in law. See Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 641 (9th Cir. 1989) (a
3 complaint that is totally incomprehensible is subject to dismissal as frivolous for lacking an arguable
4 basis in law). Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is DENIED. The Court
5 has rendered its final decision on this matter; therefore, this Order TERMINATES Plaintiff's case.
6 The Clerk of the Court shall terminate all pending motions and close the file.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: 12/8/08


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4
5
6 RICKARD D ANDERSON,
7 Plaintiff,

Case Number: CV08-05248 SBA
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

8 v.

9 UNITED STATE POSTAL OFFICE et al,
10 Defendant.

11
12 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
Court, Northern District of California.

13 That on December 8, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
14 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
15 envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
located in the Clerk's office.

16
17 Rickard Dennis Anderson F-11871
18 Mule Creek State Prison
19 P.O. Box 409040
4001 State Highway 104
Ione, CA 95640

20 Dated: December 8, 2008

21 Richard W. Wiekling, Clerk
By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk