2 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 No. C 14-80199M CW JEROME L. GRIMES, Plaintiff, 6 v. 7 SERRAMONTE CENTER, et al., 8 Defendants. 9 10 JEROME L. GRIMES, No. C 14-80200M CW 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. 13 SERRAMONTE CENTER, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 JEROME L. GRIMES, No. C 14-80201M CW 17 Plaintiff, 18 v. 19 EDWIN (DOE), et al., 20 Defendants. 21 22 JEROME L. GRIMES, No. C 14-80202M CW 23 Plaintiff, 24 v. 25 JOHN DOE, et al., 26 Defendants. 27 28

25

26

27

28

1	JEROME L. GRIMES,	No. C 14-80203M CW
2	Plaintiff,	
3	V.	
4	EDWIN (DOE), et al.,	
5	Defendants.	
6	/	
7	JEROME L. GRIMES,	No. C 14-80204M CW
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	DALY CITY POLICE OFFICER K. MATTOS, et al.,	
11	Defendants.	
12	/	
13	JEROME L. GRIMES,	No. C 14-80205M CW
14	Plaintiff,	ORDER RETURNING
15	v.	COMPLAINTS TO PLAINTIFF
16	OFFICER K. MATTOS, et al.,	
17	Defendants.	
18	/	
19	On December 9, 2005, this Court entered a pre-filing order	
20	regarding the cases filed by Plaintiff Jerome Grimes. The pre-	
21	filing order states that if Mr. Grimes files a complaint that is	
22	"related to any of the following matters:	
23	(1) a diversified group of individuals who commit acts	
24	of terror against Mr. Grimes, his family and other	

- - (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;

(4) covert terrorism

it will not be filed unless it presents cognizable claims that are not based on merely conclusory allegations. Second, no other complaints filed by Mr. Grimes while he is not incarcerated or detained will be filed unless they contain intelligible factual allegations and claims for relief."

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

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

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

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

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

III. Case No. 14-80205

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

CONCLUSION

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/7/2014

CLAUDIA WILKEN

United States District Judge