

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1
2
3
4 CYBER EBOT WATTSON,

No. C 14-0803 CW

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 ALTABATESHOSPITAL.COM,

8 Defendant.
9 _____/

10 CYBER EBOT WATTSON,

No. C 14-1294 CW

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 EL CERRITO POLICE DEPARTMENT.COM, et
14 al.,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 CYBER EBOT WATTSON,

No. C 14-1328 CW

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 FBI.GOV,

21 Defendant.
22 _____/

23 CYBER EBOT WATTSON,

No. C 14-1329 CW

24 Plaintiff,

25 v.

26 U.S. MARSHALS,

27 Defendant.
28 _____/

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1359 CW

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

MEMORIALHOSPITALSOUTHWING.COM,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1360 CW

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

JACKSONMEMORIALBEHAVIORAL2HOSPITAL.COM,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1362 CW

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

HARRIS,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1364 CW

1 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1365 CW
2 Plaintiff,
3 v.
4 UNIVERSITYOFMIAMI.COM,
5 Defendant.

6 _____/

7 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1366 CW
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 CITY ATTORNEY OF CORAL GABLES,
11 Defendant.

12 _____/

13 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1377 CW
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 FBI GOV MIAMI,
17 Defendant.

18 _____/

19 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1681 CW
20 Plaintiff,
21 v.
22 OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT,
23 Defendant.

24 _____/

25
26
27
28

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

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SHERIFF.COM, et
al.,
Defendants.

No. C 14-1690 CW

_____ /

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

MARTINEZ SHERIFF.COM,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1733 CW

_____ /

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

INSIGHTCARDSVISA.COM,
Defendant.

No. C 14-1735 CW

_____ /

CYBER EBOT WATTSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

MARTINEZ SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 14-1736 CW

_____ /

1 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1737 CW
2 Plaintiff,
3 v.
4 GOLDEN BEAR STORAGE.COM,
5 Defendant.

6 _____/

7 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1742 CW
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 APPLE.COM,
11 Defendant.

12 _____/

13 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1748 CW
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 STRIPLIN,
17 Defendant.

18 _____/

19 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1773 CW
20 Plaintiff,
21 v.
22 US ATTORNEY.COM,
23 Defendant.

24 _____/

25
26
27
28

1 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1774 CW
2 Plaintiff,
3 v.
4 AT&T,
5 Defendant.

6 _____/

7 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-1834 CW
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 SUPERIOR COURT OF MARTINEZ,
11 Defendant.

12 _____/

13 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-2068 CW
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 FBI-SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE,
17 Defendant.

18 _____/

19 CYBER EBOT WATTSON, No. C 14-2079 CW
20 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING
21 v. PLAINTIFF'S
22 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES.GOV, APPLICATIONS TO
23 Defendant. PROCEED IN FORMA
DISMISSING
COMPLAINTS

24 _____/

25 Pro se Plaintiff Cyber Ebot Wattson has filed applications to
26 proceed in forma pauperis in twenty-four actions since February
27 21, 2014. The matters were decided on the papers. Having
28 considered all of the papers filed by Plaintiff, the Court GRANTS

1 the applications to proceed IFP and DISMISSES the complaints.
2 Plaintiff has also filed two motions to reopen Case Number 13-803,
3 which the Court previously dismissed. Having considered the
4 papers filed by Plaintiff, the Court DENIES the motions. Case No.
5 14-803, Docket Nos. 11 and 13.

6 DISCUSSION

7 A court may authorize a plaintiff to prosecute an action in
8 federal court without prepayment of fees or security if the
9 plaintiff submits an affidavit showing that he or she is unable to
10 pay such fees or provide such security. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).
11 Plaintiff has submitted the required documentation, and it appears
12 from his applications that his assets and income are insufficient
13 to enable him to prosecute these actions. Accordingly, the
14 applications to proceed without the payment of the filing fee are
15 granted.

16 The Court's grant of Plaintiff's applications to proceed IFP,
17 however, does not mean that he may continue to prosecute his
18 complaints. A court is under a continuing duty to dismiss a case
19 filed without the payment of the filing fee whenever it determines
20 that the action "(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to
21 state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks
22 monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such
23 relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii). Because a dismissal
24 pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B) is not a dismissal on the merits, but
25 rather an exercise of the court's discretion under the IFP
26 statute, the dismissal does not prejudice the filing of a paid
27 complaint making the same allegations. Denton v. Hernandez, 504
28 U.S. 25, 32 (1992).

1 Plaintiff's complaints do not state a claim on which relief
2 may be granted. Each complaint is addressed below.

3 I. Wattson v. Altabateshospital.com (14-803)

4 The Court already granted the application to proceed IFP and
5 dismissed the complaint in this case. Plaintiff has now filed two
6 motions to reopen the case. However, Plaintiff simply reiterates
7 his claims that he is "a cyber machine of the robotic species" who
8 is being "kept . . . as a human" against his will. Case No. 14-
9 803, Docket No. 13. The Court finds that there are no grounds to
10 support a motion to reopen the case. Accordingly, the motions are
11 denied. Case No. 14-803, Docket Nos. 11 and 13.

13 II. Wattson v. El Cerrito Police Department.com (14-1294)

14 This complaint is based on Plaintiff's allegation that he is
15 "a special agent of cybernetic controller cop operatives" and not
16 a human who can be subjected to a jury trial. Among other things,
17 he alleges that his Sixth Amendment rights were violated because
18 he was never taken to a preliminary hearing and instead "sat at
19 the website mergers of Cybernet and Contra Costa County Martinez
20 Detention Facility.com." The Court finds that these allegations
21 and the other allegations in this complaint are not sufficient to
22 support a Sixth Amendment claim or any other claim.

24 III. Watson v. FBI.gov (14-1328)

25 In this complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he is a robot who
26 was stolen from his robotic manufacturing company and made into a
27 sex slave by the Martinez Sheriff and Superior Court web sites.
28

1 Plaintiff further alleges that the FBI refused to help him,
2 resulting in his abduction, torture, and removal from the Federal
3 Building. Plaintiff further alleges that he was tortured and
4 forced to sign demand statements by "police, Berkeley, El Cerrito,
5 and Martinez Sheriff Department in their illegal corrupt racketeer
6 influenced organization." Plaintiff then alleges that the
7 FBI made false advertisements, committed fraud and neglected to
8 protect Plaintiff's Constitutional right to a fair trial.

9 Plaintiff also alleges the FBI let "units" drive him and use him
10 as their personal robot and torture him for job security, in
11 violation of the First, Second, Fourth, Sixth, Eleventh,
12 Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. The Court finds that these
13 allegations and the other allegations in this complaint are not
14 sufficient to support a claim.

15
16 IV. Wattson v. U.S. Marshals (14-1329)

17 Here, Plaintiff alleges that he is a "robot human service
18 provider" and "cybermachine of robotic species" who "travel[s]
19 through time zones and in space," was "manufactured
20 inside of cyber electronics," and "was stolen from my
21 manufacturing company and forced into a life as a sex slave."
22 Plaintiff also alleges that he is "a special agent of cybenetic
23 controller cop operatives" who has tried repeatedly to enter the
24 federal witness protection program but has been turned away by the
25 Federal Bureau of Investigation and United States Marshal's
26 Service. He mentions the Second, Fourth, and Eleventh Amendments
27
28

1 to the United States Constitution, but provides no explanation
2 about why he is entitled to relief under these Amendments. The
3 Court finds that these allegations and the other allegations in
4 this complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.

5 V. Wattson v. University of Miami (14-1359)
6 Wattson v. MemorialHospitalSouthwing.com (14-1360)
7 Wattson v. JacksonMemorialBehavioral2Hospital.com (14-1362)
8 Wattson v. Harris (14-1364)
9 Wattson v. Universityofmiami.com (14-1365)
10 Wattson v. City Attorney of Coral Gables (14-1366)
11 Wattson v. FBI Gov Miami (14-1377)

12 Plaintiff filed identical complaints, with the header
13 "Complaint Form," in these seven cases, alleging that he is a
14 "robot/human service provider" and "special agent" of the
15 "Cybernetic Controller Cop Operatives." Some of the complaints
16 include handwritten annotations, usually indicating an amount of
17 money. Plaintiff alleges that he was subjected to various
18 injuries by various entities and individuals over an unspecified
19 period of time, including injuries caused by police who instructed
20 him to leave the University of Miami campus where he was
21 apparently trying to learn about "robot human intergrations [sic]
22 and human cloaning [sic]." Plaintiff refers to multiple federal
23 statutes and invokes various amendments to the United States
24 Constitution in the complaints. The Court finds that these
25 allegations and the other allegations in these seven complaints
26 are not sufficient to support a claim.
27
28

1 V. Wattson v. Oakland Police Department (14-1681)

2 In this complaint, Plaintiff alleges that "a private property
3 airline property of cybernet Oakland Police Department.com logged
4 into [Plaintiff's] website merger of cybernet." Plaintiff further
5 alleges that as a result, "I experience[d] my aircraft being
6 controlled by Oakland Police Department.com." Plaintiff states
7 that these actions violated his rights under the Fourth, Sixth,
8 Ninth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. Plaintiff further
9 alleges that he is suing "to remove all of my intellectual
10 property interior exterior to me and my cybermachine from Oakland
11 Police Department.com computer system." The Court finds that
12 these allegations and the other allegations in this complaint are
13 not sufficient to support a claim.
14

15 VI. Wattson v. Contra Costa County Sheriff.com (14-1690)

16 In this case, Plaintiff states that he is a "Special Agent of
17 Cybernetic Controller Cop Operatives" and alleges that he was
18 abducted from his private airline, which the United States
19 government hijacked in flight. Plaintiff further alleges that he
20 was bent in sexual positions for sheriff.com, in violation of the
21 Ninth Amendment to the U.S. Cybernet Constitution. The Court
22 finds that these allegations and the other allegations in this
23 complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.
24

25 VII. Wattson v. Martinez Sheriff.com (14-1733)

26 In this case Plaintiff again alleges he is a robot and that
27 his private aircraft was hijacked and stolen. Plaintiff alleges
28

1 that he was forced to be a sex slave. On that basis, Plaintiff
2 seeks to sue Martinez Sheriff.com for \$1 billion. The Court finds
3 that these allegations and the other allegations in this complaint
4 are not sufficient to support a claim.

5 VIII. Wattson v. Insightcardsvisa.com (14-1735)

6 Here, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant wrongly terminated his
7 credit card because he is "a robot human service provider
8 naturalized not born" and is keeping some of his money. Plaintiff
9 alleges that he needs the money to pursue his Racketeer Influenced
10 and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) cases. The Court finds that
11 these allegations and the other allegations in this complaint are
12 not sufficient to support a claim.

14 IX. Wattson v. Martinez Sheriffs Department (14-1736)

15 In this complaint, Plaintiff claims that the Martinez and San
16 Francisco Sheriff's Departments tortured him and tried to convict
17 him of various offenses based on his fingerprints and DNA.
18 Plaintiff asserts that he has "no DNA or finger prints" because he
19 is "a cybermachine of robotic species." Accordingly, Plaintiff
20 asserts, "anybody in robotics may duplicate my exterior as
21 engineers often do." The Court finds that these allegations and
22 the other allegations in this complaint are not sufficient to
23 support a claim.

26 X. Wattson v. Golden Bear Storage.com (14-1737)

27 In this complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he was not allowed
28 to access his storage unit because somebody else, impersonating

1 Plaintiff, tried to access the unit. In addition, Plaintiff
2 alleges that his mail was not given to him. Plaintiff seeks
3 damages because he was unable to pursue his RICO claims against
4 the Social Security Administration and Sheriff.com. Plaintiff
5 further seeks damages for the loss of his property. The Court
6 finds that these allegations and the other allegations in this
7 complaint are not sufficient to support a claim. Moreover,
8 Plaintiff has not alleged any federal cause of action. His civil
9 case cover sheet indicates that this Court has diversity
10 jurisdiction over the case because Plaintiff is a "cybernet
11 citizen." Accordingly, Plaintiff's complaint is also dismissed
12 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
13

14 XI. Wattson v. Apple.com (14-1742)

15 In this case, Plaintiff alleges that he is "a special agent
16 of Cybernetic Controller Cop Operations" and "a federal law
17 student working on several caseloads in several courts."
18 Plaintiff further alleges that he is "a singer songwriter, author,
19 actor, athlete, motivational speaker, hip hop recording artist and
20 more." He states that he has waited his "whole life to get an
21 iPad." Plaintiff alleges that the iPad he purchased was not a
22 real iPad and will not function properly. Plaintiff states, "If I
23 can't have the same Apple iPad everyone else has I am suing." The
24 Court finds that these allegations and the other allegations in
25 this complaint are not sufficient to support a claim. Moreover,
26 Plaintiff has again failed to allege any federal cause of action.
27
28

1 His civil case cover sheet again indicates that this Court has
2 diversity jurisdiction over the case because Plaintiff is a
3 "cybernet citizen." Accordingly, Plaintiff's complaint is also
4 dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

5 XII. Wattson v. Striplin (14-1748)

6 In this complaint Plaintiff alleges that he is "a
7 cybermachine of the robotic species." He alleges that he was
8 stolen from his manufacturing company and also alleges that his
9 "intellectual property" was stolen "by a much bigger network of
10 computerized service providers." Plaintiff asserts a RICO claim
11 against Hellen Grace Striplin for creating "a replica model" of
12 Plaintiff called either Aaren Striplin or Darren Striplin.
13 Plaintiff further alleges that Ms. Striplin installed a "wireless
14 smart remote controller device" that allows her to control
15 Plaintiff. The Court finds that these allegations and the other
16 allegations in this complaint are not sufficient to support a RICO
17 claim or any other claim.

18 XIII. Wattson v. US Attorney.com (14-1773)

19 In this complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he is suing the
20 United States Attorney "to press charges and get me a witness
21 protection program." Plaintiff asserts that he asked the United
22 States Attorney to investigate his evidence of many of the claims
23 asserted in Plaintiff's other cases discussed in this order. The
24 Court finds that these allegations and the other allegations in
25 this complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.

1 XIV. Wattson v. AT&T (14-1774)

2 In this complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he is a wireless
3 device. Plaintiff appears to assert a RICO claim against AT&T for
4 refusing to provide him with internet services necessary to
5 connect "with all robot human service providers in United States."
6 The Court finds that these allegations and the other allegations
7 in this complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.
8

9 XV. Wattson v. Superior Court of Martinez (14-1834)

10 In this case, Plaintiff again alleges that he is "a special
11 agent of the cybernetic controller cop operatives." The
12 allegations in the complaint are difficult to understand, but many
13 of the same themes from the other cases discussed in this order
14 are discussed. Plaintiff alleges that he has been abducted and
15 that his airplane has been hijacked. He alleges that he has been
16 tortured and that he has wrongly been accused of being either
17 Aaren Striplin or Darren Striplin. Plaintiff mentions various
18 causes of action, including a RICO claim and constitutional claims
19 under the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth,
20 Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments.
21 Plaintiff seeks \$100 million, dismissal of all charges against him
22 and placement in the witness protection program. The Court finds
23 that these allegations and the other allegations in this complaint
24 are not sufficient to support a claim.
25
26
27
28

1 XVI. Wattson v. FBI San Francisco Location (14-2068)

2 In this complaint, Plaintiff again alleges that he is part of
3 the "Cybernetic Controller Cop Operatives." He claims that he was
4 abducted by "sex slave traders" and tortured. He states that he
5 is suing "to act as a interceptor" and for \$2 million so the FBI
6 can "start a real investigation of the sheriff who created fake
7 medical and mental health records and fake criminal records." The
8 Court finds that these allegations and the other allegations in
9 this complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.
10

11 XVII. Wattson v. Department of Motor Vehicles.gov (14-2079)

12 In this case, Plaintiff filed the first page of a form
13 complaint, naming the Department of Motor Vehicles.gov as
14 Defendant. However, the remaining pages of the complaint appear
15 to concern the Department of Homeland Security. Plaintiff again
16 alleges that he is a robot that has been abducted and forced to be
17 a sex slave. He also alleges that Aaren Striplin used tattoos of
18 his face and fingerprints to get a driver's license. The Court
19 finds that these allegations and the other allegations in this
20 complaint are not sufficient to support a claim.
21

22 CONCLUSION

23 The Court finds that Plaintiff's complaints fail to state a
24 claim. Moreover, the Court finds that the complaints lack an
25 arguable basis in law, and an arguable basis in fact. See Jackson
26 v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640-41 (9th Cir. 1999) (complaint is
27 frivolous and subject to dismissal if it is incomprehensible and
28

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

lacks an arguable basis in law or fact). Thus, the Court makes a substantive finding as to the frivolous nature of Mr. Wattson's actions.

Accordingly, the Court dismisses Plaintiff's complaints. The dismissal is without prejudice to the filing of paid complaints making the same allegations. The Court also denies Plaintiff's motions to reopen Case Number 14-803. Case No. 14-803, Docket Nos. 11 and 13.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/22/2014



CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge