

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

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

JEROME L. GRIMES,

No. C 14-80199M CW

Plaintiff,

v.

SERRAMONTE CENTER, et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

No. C 14-80200M CW

Plaintiff,

v.

SERRAMONTE CENTER, et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

No. C 14-80201M CW

Plaintiff,

v.

EDWIN (DOE), et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

No. C 14-80202M CW

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOE, et al.,

Defendants.

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

JEROME L. GRIMES,
Plaintiff,
v.
EDWIN (DOE), et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 14-80203M CW

_____ /

JEROME L. GRIMES,
Plaintiff,
v.
DALY CITY POLICE OFFICER K.
MATTOS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 14-80204M CW

_____ /

JEROME L. GRIMES,
Plaintiff,
v.
OFFICER K. MATTOS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 14-80205M CW

ORDER RETURNING
COMPLAINTS TO
PLAINTIFF

_____ /

On December 9, 2005, this Court entered a pre-filing order regarding the cases filed by Plaintiff Jerome Grimes. The pre-filing order states that if Mr. Grimes files a complaint that is "related to any of the following matters:

- (1) a diversified group of individuals who commit acts of terror against Mr. Grimes, his family and other citizens;
- (2) an injunction against the defendants to prevent them from kidnaping, framing, falsely imprisoning or otherwise terrorizing Mr. Grimes, his family, and other citizens;
- (3) a court order for the defendants to be subjected to a lie detector test;

1 (4) covert terrorism
2 it will not be filed unless it presents cognizable claims that are
3 not based on merely conclusory allegations. Second, no other
4 complaints filed by Mr. Grimes while he is not incarcerated or
5 detained will be filed unless they contain intelligible factual
6 allegations and claims for relief."

7 The Court has reviewed the above-captioned complaints filed
8 by Mr. Grimes and finds that they shall not be filed because they
9 relate to matters described by the pre-filing order or fail to
10 contain intelligible factual allegations and claims for relief.

11 I. Case Nos. 14-80199 and 14-80200

12 The complaints in these cases allege Fourth Amendment claims
13 against the Serramonte Center, Universal Protective Services,
14 Radio Shack and employees of Universal Protective Services and
15 Radio Shack. Each of these Defendants is a private actor.
16 Plaintiff may not bring a Fourth Amendment claim against them
17 unless he can show that they were acting under color of state law.
18 Johnson v. Knowles, 113 F.3d 1114, 1118 (9th Cir. 1997).
19 Plaintiff has made no such allegation. The complaint does not
20 contain intelligible factual allegations and claims for relief.
21 Accordingly, it shall not be filed.

22 II. Case Nos. 14-80201, 14-80202, 14-80203 and 14-80204

23 The Court finds that the complaints in these cases shall not
24 be filed because they allege that Defendants are engaged in covert
25 terrorism. Two of the cases, 14-80201 and 14-80204 also seek a
26 court order for Defendants to be subjected to a lie detector test.
27 Mr. Grimes alleges no cognizable causes of action in these
28 complaints.

1 III. Case No. 14-80205

2 In this case, Plaintiff alleges a Fourth Amendment claim
3 against two Daly City police officers. However, the facts alleged
4 in this complaint concern various Radio Shack employees. The
5 complaint does not contain intelligible factual allegations and
6 claims for relief. Accordingly, it shall not be filed.

7 CONCLUSION

8 Because the above-captioned complaints concern multiple
9 matters mentioned in the pre-filing order, present no cognizable
10 cause of action or fail to contain intelligible factual
11 allegations and claims for relief, the Clerk of the Court is
12 ordered not to file them. Instead, the complaints shall be
13 returned to Mr. Grimes.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16 Dated: 8/7/2014


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge