1		
2		**E-Filed 12/15/2009**
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		NOT DIOT COUDT
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11		
12		
13		
14	CARINA F. FLORES,	Case Number C 09-05836 JF (RS)
15	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
16	V.	EMERGENCY EX PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
17	THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, a municipality; THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES OF	ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE PRELIMINARY
18	SANTA CLARA COUNTY, a municipal entity;	INJUNCTION
19	Atty AVRIL VAZQUEZ, an individual; THUY TRAN, an individual; JUDY PATRICK, an	[re: docket no. 1]
20	individual; LESLIE SALMON, an individual; TRICIA SULLIVAN, an individual; LORI	
21	MEDINA, and individual; Atty MIGUEL MARQUEZ, an individual; WILL	
22	LIGHTBOURNE, an individual; RHODA AUSTIN, an individual and DOES 1 TO 100,	
23	Inclusive,	
24	Defendants.	
25]
26	Plaintiff seeks an emergency ex parte temporary restraining order and "order to show	
27	cause re preliminary injunction" to enjoin Defendants from transporting Plaintiff's minor child	
28	("P.") to live with his father in New Mexico. On December 9, 2009, Judge Shawna Schwartz of	
	Case Number C 09-05836 JF (RS) ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (JFLC1)	

the Santa Clara Superior Court determined that it was "safe' for P. to return to New Mexico under his father's care and supervision." P. Mot. at 3. Plaintiff requests expressly that this Court "review" the rulings of the state court. It is well-settled that federal district courts do not have jurisdiction to review state court rulings. District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923). The Rooker-Feldman doctrine bars "cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments." Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005). If Plaintiff wishes to contest the decision of the state court, she must seek relief from the state court of appeal. Accordingly, the request for a temporary restraining order and order to show cause will be denied.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 15 2009

United States I istrict Judge

Case Number C 09-05836 JF (RS) ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (JFLC1)