

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A BRUZZONE,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY OF  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT,

Defendant.

Case No. [22-cv-06412-HSG](#)

**AMENDED ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR A NEW  
TRIAL AND TO ALTER OR AMEND  
THE JUDGMENT<sup>1</sup>**

Re: Dkt. No. 40

On August 15, 2023, this Court granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint without leave to amend. Dkt. No. 38 (“the Order”). The Court determined that because Defendant was immune from suit, the Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction, and that, in any event, the complaint failed to state a cognizable claim for relief. *Id.* The Court additionally granted Defendant’s request to expand the vexatious litigant pre-filing order to cover any cases filed by Plaintiff against Defendant and its employees related to Plaintiff’s claims against Intel or its employees. *Id.* at 10. Pursuant to the Order, the Clerk terminated the case and entered judgment in favor of Defendant. Dkt Nos. 38, 39.

On September 11, 2023, the Clerk’s Office received from Plaintiff a motion purportedly requesting relief under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60, which the Court deems filed. Dkt. No. 40. Not unlike many of Plaintiff’s prior filings, this one is hard to follow, but the Court identifies no new relevant facts or arguments that compel the Court to disturb the judgment entered in favor of Defendant (an immune sovereign), or to otherwise reconsider or revise its prior detailed ruling. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the motion, Dkt. No. 40.

---


<sup>1</sup> The Court’s order at Dkt. No. 45 inadvertently referred to “Defendant” in the caption. The Court files this amended order to address that issue; the body of the order remains unchanged.

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

The Court further **DIRECTS** Plaintiff not to file anything on the docket of this closed case, or to send materials to the Clerk's office in relation to this matter.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 11/8/2023

  
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge