

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

6 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 MARIN COUNTY, et. al.,

10 Defendants.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

Case Nos. [21-cv-010015-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010016-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010017-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010018-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010019-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010020-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010021-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010022-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010024-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010025-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010026-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010028-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010030-PJH](#)

[21-cv-010031-PJH](#)

**ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE  
CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

19 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42  
20 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas  
21 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471  
22 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In*  
23 *re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

24 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions.<sup>1</sup> He seeks relief  
25 regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and  
26 federal courts.  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> To the extent a second plaintiff wishes to also proceed in these actions, that plaintiff  
must file his own separate cases.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases,  
2 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is  
3 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28  
4 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case  
5 No. 13-0951 CW.

6 The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent  
7 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an  
8 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512  
9 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*  
10 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,  
11 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with  
12 prejudice.

13 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge’s impartiality  
14 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings.  
15 *See United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate  
16 reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases  
17 assigned to that judge).<sup>2</sup>

18 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk  
19 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: January 7, 2022

22  
23  
24  
25  
26

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton  
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

27 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiff names the undersigned as defendant in one of these cases. Case No. 21-cv-  
28 010031-PJH. The complaint raises no specific allegations against the undersigned and is  
frivolous. Plaintiff does not seek recusal, nor is recusal warranted in light of the frivolous  
nature of the case.