

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	10 C 6186	DATE	11/4/2010
CASE TITLE	Inara Cedrina vs. Inara Cedrina		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [3] is denied on the merits. Therefore, we dismiss the instant action and deny as moot all pending motions. Civil case terminated.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Inara Cedrina's (Cedrina) motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and motion for appointment of counsel. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), "[n]otwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action . . . is frivolous or malicious . . . [or] fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" *Id.* Cedrina indicates in her *pro se* complaint, which includes two supplements, that she is bringing an action against a judge (Judge) that allegedly presided over a civil action in state court in which Cedrina was a party. Cedrina is suing the Judge alleging malicious prosecution, abuse of process, and judicial misconduct. Cedrina is seeking as relief damages and a stay or revocation of a warrant allegedly issued for Cedrina's arrest. Cedrina appears to be dissatisfied with the rulings by the Judge in the civil action, but such dissatisfaction is not a valid basis for a legal claim in this court. In addition, Cedrina's complaint is barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. See *Johnson v. Orr*, 551 F.3d 564, 568 (7th Cir. 2008)(stating that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine acts to strip federal courts of jurisdiction on claims where "the injury the plaintiff complains of resulted from, or is inextricably intertwined with, a state-court judgment"). Even when liberally construing Cedrina's *pro se* complaint, Cedrina has failed to allege facts that plausibly suggest a valid

STATEMENT

claim. *McCormick v. City of Chicago*, 230 F.3d 319, 325 (7th Cir. 2000). Therefore, we dismiss the instant action and deny as moot all pending motions. We note that Cedrins previously filed a complaint against the Judge (case number 10 C 5865), which included claims identical to those alleged in the complaint in the instant action, and that Cedrins' previously filed action was dismissed on the same grounds.