

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

6 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 HUMBOLDT COUNTY SUPERIOR  
10 COURT et. al.,

11 Defendants.  
12

Case Nos. [22-cv-5122-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5124-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5132-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5133-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5134-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5185-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5186-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5187-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5210-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5211-PJH](#)

13  
14 **ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE  
15 CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

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

21 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as  
22 defendants several state courts, state judges and other state and federal officials. He  
23 seeks relief regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by  
24 the state and federal courts.

25 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases,  
26 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is  
27 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 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

U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case No. 13-0951 CW.

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

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

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: September 19, 2022

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