

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Sarah Crebassa,

Plaintiff

v.

Mark Manendo,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02271-JAD-NJK

**Order Adopting Report
and Recommendation**

[ECF Nos. 11, 12]

This is one of eight lawsuits that pro se plaintiff Sarah Crebassa filed in August 2017 against a wide variety of individuals and organizations.¹ Her initial filing consisted of a single, handwritten page on which she alleged that Mark Manendo “stalked” her while in jail and “taunts [her] with his resume.”² Magistrate Judge Koppe dismissed that initial filing for failure to state a claim and with leave to amend.³ Crebassa’s amended complaint is far longer, but little more comprehensible.⁴ Having screened it, Magistrate Judge Koppe characterizes this amended complaint as “an incoherent narrative peppered with various disjointed allegations” with “jumbled references to electromagnetic pulses, extremely low frequency electromagnetic radiation and sonic ‘sounds.’”⁵ It “includes voluminous copies of” of documents and printed out information, but Crebassa’s “description of the documents is unintelligible,” and she does not

20
21
22
23

¹ 2:17-cv-02270-JCM-GWF; 2:17-cv-02271-JAD-NJK; 2:17-cv-02272-APG-NJK; 2:17-cv-02273-JAD-CWH; 2:17-cv-02274-RFB-PAL; 2:17-cv-02276-APG-NJK; 2:17-cv-02277-JAD-NJK; 2:17-cv-02278-JCM-PAL.

² ECF No. 1-1.

³ ECF No. 3.

⁴ ECF No. 10.

⁵ ECF No. 11 at 2 (quoting ECF No. 10).

1 explain “their application to the allegations or [her] narrative.”⁶ Because Crebassa “fails to
2 identify any elements of any cause of action[] and fails to provide, in a comprehensible manner,
3 any specific facts or intelligible narrative associated with these counts,” Magistrate Judge Koppe
4 recommends that I dismiss Crebassa’s amended complaint with prejudice “in light of [its]
5 frivolous and delusional nature.”⁷

6 Crebassa objects.⁸ Like her amended complaint, her objection is nonsensical and consists
7 mainly of hundreds of pages of articles, text messages, website screenshots, and other random
8 attachments, the relevancy of which is unclear. What is important, however, is that Crebassa’s
9 objection does not address—let alone cure—the significant problems with her amended
10 complaint; indeed, it only exacerbates them.⁹ So, after a de novo review,¹⁰ I find that Crebassa’s
11 allegations describe fantastic and delusional scenarios and do not state a claim upon which relief
12 can be granted.¹¹ Accordingly,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation
14 [ECF No. 11] is **ADOPTED** in its entirety, and Crebassa’s objections [ECF No. 12] are
15 **OVERRULED**.

16 . . .

17

18

19 ⁶ *Id.* at 3.

20 ⁷ *Id.* at 2–3.

21 ⁸ ECF No. 12.

22 ⁹ Crebassa’s objection also contains a request for additional time for her to make copies of more documents. *See* ECF No. 12. Because I do not find that additional documents would assist her to make a coherent objection, I deny that request.

23 ¹⁰ *See* LR IB 3-2(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

¹¹ *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327–28 (1989).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED with prejudice as delusional and frivolous. The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE.

Dated: February 5, 2019



U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey