



1 On the same day that he filed the complaint, Plaintiff also filed an application to proceed  
2 *in forma pauperis*. On June 20, 2008, the Court denied the application without prejudice on the  
3 ground that Plaintiff had failed to state a cognizable claim under federal law. At a hearing on  
4 June 27, 2008, the Court stayed the case pending Plaintiff's appeal of the order denying leave to  
5 proceed *in forma pauperis*. It appears from the docket that Plaintiff did not file an appeal.

6 On November 21, 2008, Plaintiff filed an "Application for Leave to Present Late  
7 Claim." The application appears to allege a claim for relief under the California Tort Claims Act  
8 ("CTCA") for the conversion of Plaintiff's automobile by the San Jose Police Department. A  
9 claim brought pursuant to the CTCA against a public entity for conversion must be brought no  
10 "later than one year after the accrual of the cause of action." Cal. Gov't Code § 911.2. In his  
11 application, Plaintiff acknowledged that his claim for conversion was late. Noting that a claim  
12 under the CTCA against a public entity must be lodged first with the applicable agency, in this  
13 case the San Jose Police Department, the Court declined to take any action with respect to  
14 Plaintiff's application.

15 Plaintiff then filed the instant motion for reconsideration, incorporating as an attachment  
16 a letter from the San Jose Police Department that indicates that it rejected Plaintiff's request to  
17 present a late claim pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code § 911.4, which grants an agency discretion to  
18 allow a claimant to pursue a cause of action if there is a valid excuse for the tardiness. Plaintiff  
19 now presents this rejection to the Court, and apparently seeks relief pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code  
20 § 911.4(c)(1), which tolls the accrual period for any period of time in which a claimant is  
21 "mentally incapacitated." Shortly after filing his motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff filed  
22 another application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On the same day that Plaintiff filed that  
23 application, he also submitted a letter indicating that he currently was incarcerated. This letter  
24 also stated that Plaintiff had filed an amended complaint that omitted allegations of torture. The  
25 docket contains no record of this amended complaint.<sup>2</sup>

---

26  
27  
28 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiff also stated that the torture claims were the "sole reason" for the Court's denial  
of Plaintiff's prior application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

1 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, a district court may authorize the commencement of a civil  
2 action *in forma pauperis* if the court is satisfied that the would-be plaintiff cannot pay the filing  
3 fees necessary to pursue the action. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). A district court may deny *in forma*  
4 *pauperis* status, however, if it appears from the face of the proposed pleading that the action is  
5 frivolous or without merit. *O’Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir. 1990); *Tripati v.*  
6 *First Nat’l Bank & Trust*, 821 F.2d 1368, 1370 (9th Cir. 1987). As it has previously, the Court  
7 finds that Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a cognizable claim under federal law. In addition,  
8 Plaintiff’s latest request to proceed *in forma pauperis* comes more than six months after the  
9 Court stayed the case to allow Plaintiff to appeal the Court’s prior order. In light of Plaintiff’s  
10 delay and his multiple filings<sup>3</sup> with this Court, Plaintiff shall pay the civil filing fee within thirty  
11 (30) days or the instant case will be dismissed without prejudice.

12 Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of his application to present a late claim also will be  
13 denied because it fails to set forth any basis for federal jurisdiction. A claim for conversion  
14 against a state agency does not create a basis for federal jurisdiction. *See Hensley v. City of San*  
15 *Buenaventura*, No. 07-CV-0398, 2008 WL 768134, at \*4 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2008). Nor is it  
16 clear how such a claim could be brought in conjunction with Plaintiff’s claims for relief pursuant  
17 to § 1983, as the conversion occurred on March 15, 2007, seven months after the incident that  
18 gave rise to the instant action. *See id.* at \*5 (district court may not exercise supplemental  
19 jurisdiction over unrelated state law claims). Accordingly, the Court will deny Plaintiff’s  
20 application to present a late claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.<sup>4</sup>

---

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>3</sup> *See, e.g., Bush v. Sunnyvale Police Dept., et al.* (5:07-CV-0831 JF); *Bush v. Pinto et. al.*  
26 (5:07-CV-4241 JF); *Bush v. Cao et. al.* (5:07-CV-4460 JF); *Bush v. Anton et al.* (5:08-CV-3459).

27 <sup>4</sup> Even if the Court could exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the conversion claim, it  
28 has discretion to decline to hear such a claim if all the federal claims have been dismissed. *See*  
*Hensley*, 2008 WL 768134, at \*5 n.2.

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.

2

3

4 DATED: April 14, 2009

5

6



JEREMY FOGEL  
United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 This Order has been served upon the following persons:

2 James Alan Bush  
3 DWF967-08086698  
4 Santa Clara County Jail  
5 885 N. San Pedro Avenue  
6 San Jose, CA 95110

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28