

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN G. VECCHIO, et al.,)	CASE NO. 5:11 CV 1988
)	
Plaintiffs,)	JUDGE DAVID D. DOWD, JR.
)	
v.)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
JUDGE ROWLANDS, et al.,)	<u>AND ORDER</u>
)	
Defendants.)	

On September 21, 2011, Plaintiffs *pro se* John G. Vecchio, Elizabeth Vecchio, and the Andro Childrens Trust filed this *in forma pauperis* action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Summit County Court of Common Pleas Judge Rowlands and Ohio Attorney General Mike DeWine. The action arises out of a foreclosure action against Plaintiffs' property. Plaintiffs allege a judgment in foreclosure was granted to Credit Based Asset Servicing and Securitization by Judge Rowlands on September 14, 2010. They further allege the judgment should not have been entered because all parties in interest were not served the legal requirements to obtain foreclosure were not followed, and Judge Rowlands did not properly adhere to rules governing Ohio courts. Plaintiffs have also filed a Motion to Stay Eviction, which indicates eviction is scheduled for September 29, 2011.

Although pro se pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be

(5:11 CV 1988)

granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact.¹ *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); *Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville*, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996).

This Court cannot vacate the Summit County Common Pleas Court Judgment, nor enjoin the execution of the judgment. United States District Courts do not have jurisdiction over challenges to state court decisions even if those challenges allege that the state court's action was unconstitutional. *See District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 483 n. 16 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923). Federal appellate review of state court judgments can only occur in the United States Supreme Court, by appeal or by writ of certiorari. *Id.* Under this principle, generally referred to as the Rooker-Feldman Doctrine, a party losing a state court case is barred from seeking what in substance would be appellate review of the state judgment in a United States District Court based on the party's claim that the state judgment itself violates her federal rights. *Johnson v. DeGrandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1005-06 (1994). Federal jurisdiction cannot be invoked merely by couching the claims in terms of a civil rights action. *Lavrack v. City of Oak Park*, No. 98-1142, 1999 WL 801562, at *2 (6th Cir. Sept. 28, 1999); *see Valenti v. Mitchell*, 962 F.2d 288, 296 (3d Cir. 1992).

¹ A claim may be dismissed *sua sponte*, without prior notice to the plaintiff and without service of process on the defendant, if the court explicitly states that it is invoking section 1915(e) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)] and is dismissing the claim for one of the reasons set forth in the statute. *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608-09 (6th Cir. 1997); *Spruytte v. Walters*, 753 F.2d 498, 500 (6th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1054 (1986); *Harris v. Johnson*, 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1986); *Brooks v. Seiter*, 779 F.2d 1177, 1179 (6th Cir. 1985).

(5:11 CV 1988)

The United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has applied two elements to a Rooker-Feldman analysis. First, in order for the Rooker-Feldman doctrine to apply to a claim presented in federal district court, the issue before the court must be inextricably intertwined with the claim asserted in the state court proceeding. *Catz v. Chalker*, 142 F.3d 279, 293 (6th Cir. 1998) *see Tropsf v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co.*, 289 F.3d 929, 937 (6th Cir. 2002). “Where federal relief can only be predicated upon a conviction that the state court was wrong, it is difficult to conceive the federal proceeding as, in substance, anything other than a prohibited appeal of the state court judgment.” *Catz*, 142 F.3d at 293. The Rooker-Feldman doctrine applies when the party losing her case in state court files suit in federal district court seeking redress for an injury allegedly caused by the state court’s decision itself. *Coles v. Granville*, 448 F.3d 853, 857-59 (6th Cir. 2006). Second, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine precludes a district court’s jurisdiction where the claim is a specific grievance that the law was invalidly or unconstitutionally applied in plaintiff’s particular case as opposed to a general constitutional challenge to the state law applied in the state action. *Id.*

In the present action, Plaintiffs essentially question the State court’s decision granting foreclosure. Any review of federal claims asserted in this context would require the Court to review the specific issues addressed in the State court proceedings. This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to conduct such a review or grant the relief as requested. *Feldman*, 460 U.S. at 483-84 n. 16; *Catz*, 142 F.3d at 293.

(5:11 CV 1988)

Accordingly, this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to the parties at their address of record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/David D. Dowd, Jr.
DAVID D. DOWD, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE