

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

5 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,  
6 Plaintiff,  
7 v.  
8 LEONARD L. CASE et. al.,  
9 Defendants.  
10

Case Nos. [23-cv-1672-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-1674-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-1853-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-1854-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-2021-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-2144-PJH](#)  
[23-cv-2551-PJH](#)

11 **ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE**  
12 **CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

13  
14 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42  
15 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas  
16 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471  
17 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In*  
18 *re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

19 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as  
20 defendants various state judges and court employees. He seeks relief regarding his  
21 underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal  
22 courts.

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

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: May 26, 2023



---

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

T:\PJHALL\\_psp\2023\Bonilla '23\Bonilla Dismissals5.docx