

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

RICHARD CORNFORTH,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. CIV-17-888-HE
	)	
TRACI CLARK, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Richard Cornforth’s complaint purports to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The complaint is lengthy and confusing, but appears to assert violations of plaintiff’s constitutional rights arising out divorce proceedings with his former common law wife, domestic violence allegations and victim protection orders issued by a Florida court, arrest warrants and home searches in Oklahoma, an alleged attempt to murder the plaintiff, and a variety of other circumstances. He asserts a conspiracy between his former wife, her lawyers, plaintiff’s former lawyers, judges in Florida, several Oklahoma state judges in Oklahoma and Logan Counties, police officers in Florida and Oklahoma, the district attorney of Oklahoma County, two U. S. District Judges, and various others. The complaint states no facts supporting the existence of such a conspiracy, but does allege that all the conspirators “either walk in fear of or live to serve an unseen power, a regal power, a power above law holding illicit authority to secretly arbitrate all claims in all venues . . . .”

The complaint is frivolous on its face and will be dismissed *sua sponte*. Even where a plaintiff is not proceeding *in forma pauperis*, district courts have inherent authority to dismiss a complaint as frivolous and malicious. See Mallard v. United States Dist. Ct., 490

U.S. 296, 307-08 (1989) (“there is little doubt” that courts have the power to dismiss a frivolous or malicious action even in the absence of [42 U.S.C. § 1915(d)]); *see also Williams v. Madden*, 9 F. App’x 996, 997 n.1 (10th Cir. 2001). This case meets that standard.

Plaintiff’s complaint and this case are **DISMISSED**. Leave to amend is denied.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOE HEATON  
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has filed other similar complaints in this court over the years which have been promptly dismissed. *See e.g. Order, Cornforth v. State of Oklahoma*, CIV-17-1297-D (W.D. Okla. Dec. 8, 2017), ECF 50. Another judge of this court has imposed filing restrictions as to any claims against the defendant in that case. *See Order, Cornforth v. Fidelity Invs.*, CIV-16-173-R (W.D. Okla. May 1, 2017), ECF 58.