

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

LAL BHATIA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MANMOHAN K. WIG, WIG PROPERTIES,
LLC , AND DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

Case No: C 10-0072 SBA

Related to:

C 09-05581 SBA

CR 05-0334 SBA

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
COMMENCE DISCIPLINARY
PROCEEDINGS AGAINST
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY STEPHEN
CORRIGAN AND FEDERAL
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS
AGENT JANET BERRY**

16 Plaintiff Lal Bhatia (“Bhatia”) is a well-known civil and criminal litigant in this
17 Court. On February 28, 2006, Bhatia was convicted following a jury trial before District
18 Judge Claudia Wilken of nine counts of mail fraud and eighteen counts of money
19 laundering. See United States v. Lal Bhatia, CR 04-40071 CW. In addition, Bhatia
20 currently is a defendant in a multi-defendant action which is now pending before this Court,
21 in which he is charged with multiple counts of wire fraud and money laundering. See
22 United States v. Lal Bhatia, et al., CR 05-00334 SBA. Assistant United States Attorney
23 (“AUSA”) Stephen Corrigan is the attorney acting on behalf of the Government in both
24 criminal actions, while Federal Bureau of Investigations Agent Janet Berry (“Agent Berry”)
25 was involved in the criminal investigations.

26 On January 6, 2010, Bhatia, acting pro se, filed a prolix 157-page Complaint against
27 Defendants Manmohan K. Wig and Wig Properties. In his Complaint, Bhatia alleges that
28 Mr. Wig, a relative of Bhatia, was, in fact, responsible for the fraudulent scheme for which

1 he was convicted in CR 04-40071 CW, and currently is under indictment in CR 05-00334
2 SBA. Neither AUSA Corrigan nor Agent Berry are parties to the instant action. However,
3 Bhatia has sued AUSA Corrigan and Agent Berry in two prior civil actions. See Lal Bhatia
4 v. United States of America, et al., C 08-2808 SBA and Lal Bhatia v. Office of the United
5 States Attorney, C 09-5581 SBA.¹

6 On February 8, 2010, Plaintiff filed the instant “Motion to Commence Disciplinary
7 Proceedings Against Asst. United States Attorney Stephen G. Corrigan Pursuant to Code of
8 Judicial Conduct, Canon [sic] 3(b)(3) and to Ensure Effective and Expeditious
9 Administrate of the Business of the United States Courts.” (Docket 10.) On April 21,
10 2010, Plaintiff filed a “Second [Administrative] Motion Requesting the Court to Adjudicate
11 Plaintiff’s Unrefuted Motion to Commence Disciplinary Proceedings Against AUSA
12 Corrigan, Filed on February 8, 2010.” (Docket 37.) Both motions accuse AUSA Corrigan
13 and Agent Berry of engaging in misconduct in connection with the two criminal
14 prosecutions brought against him.

15 Bhatia’s motions to have disciplinary proceedings commenced against AUSA
16 Corrigan and Agent Better are improper, frivolous and in violation of Federal Rule of Civil
17 Procedure 11. Neither of these individuals is a party to this action. Moreover, Bhatia’s
18 motions are duplicative of similar motions that he previously filed in his other criminal and
19 civil actions, which the Court has already considered and rejected. See Bhatia, No. C 08-
20 2808 SBA, Docket 39 (N.D. Cal., June 10, 2010) (denying “Motion Pursuant to Federal
21 Rules of Civil Procedures (sic), Rule 60(b)(5) and 60(b)(6), to Commence Disciplinary
22 Proceedings Against Asst. United States Attorney, Stephen G. Corrigan for His Unethical,
23 Deceitful and Immoral Conduct in light of Ninth Circuit’s Opinion in Case No. 08-17784”);
24 Bhatia, No. C 09-5581 SBA, Docket 25 (N.D. Cal. May 19, 2010) (denying motion for
25 imposition of criminal penalties against AUSA Corrigan and Agent Berry based on alleged

26 _____
27 ¹ On November 6, 2008, the Court dismissed Case No. C 08-2808 SBA for lack of
28 jurisdiction. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the Court’s ruling on April 20, 2010. The other
civil action remains pending. Since both cases are assigned to this Court, the pending
motion to relate the cases (Docket 20) is denied as moot.

1 inaccurate information presented to the grand jury); Bhatia, CR 04-40071 CW, Docket 353
2 (N.D. Cal. March 10, 2009) (denying motion to dismiss indictment and commence
3 disciplinary proceedings against the Assistant United States Attorney).

4 Bhatia is warned against filing any further frivolous motions, including any motions
5 requesting that AUSA Corrigan and Agent Berry be referred for any type of disciplinary
6 proceedings based on their involvement in the above cases. Failure to comply with this or
7 any other order of this Court, as well as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local
8 Rules, may be deemed grounds for the imposition of sanctions, up to and including
9 dismissal of the action. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b). Accordingly,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

11 1. Bhatia's motions for disciplinary proceedings to be commenced against
12 AUSA Corrigan and Agent Berry are DENIED.

13 2. This Order terminates Docket 10, 20 and 37.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: 9/1/10


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge

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 BHATIA et al,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 WIG et al,

8 Defendant.

9 Case Number: CV10-00072 SBA

10 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

14 That on September 2, 2010, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
15 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing
16 said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
17 located in the Clerk's office.

18 Lal Bhatia 97562-011
19 Federal Detention Center
20 5675 - 8th Street
Camp Parks
Dublin, CA 94568

21 Dated: September 2, 2010

22 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

23 By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk