

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

VERONICA NIXON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-24-928-D
	)	
MARESSA TREAT, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Veronica Nixon, appearing *pro se*, alleges in her complaint that she sued the federal government in 2017; the government has partnerships with the Oklahoma County Commissioner; upon settling, a district judge of this Court stole Plaintiff’s settlement; and the “landmark director over Oklahoma property” filed taxes and stole \$100,000.00 in federal property tax for her election campaign [Doc. No. 1, at 4-8]. Although Plaintiff’s allegations are largely unintelligible, it appears that this action includes the same claims that are alleged in another, earlier-filed action, captioned *Veronica Nixon v. Nancy A. Berryhill, et al.*, Case No. CIV-24-927-D. Sharing overlapping defendants<sup>1</sup> and substantively identical claims, Plaintiff’s complaint in this case appears to duplicate Plaintiff’s complaint in Case No. CIV-24-927-D. *See Ford v. Mischeviz*, 68 F.


---

<sup>1</sup> In Case No. CIV-24-927-D, Plaintiff filed suit against District Judge Scott Palk; Nancy A. Berryhill (former acting commissioner of the Social Security Administration); Carrie Blumert (former Oklahoma County Commissioner); and the Social Security Administration. In the present case, the defendants are District Judge Scott Palk; Martin O’Malley (current commissioner of the Social Security Administration); Maressa Treat (Oklahoma County Clerk); and Doug Linehan (director of the Oklahoma Tax Commission).

App'x 877, at \*1 (10th Cir. 2003) (unpublished) (“The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the instant case. ... The cause of action raised in the instant case is the same as that raised in the other pending lawsuit, and several of the defendants overlap.”).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff is ordered to show cause, within 21 days of this Order, why the Court should not dismiss this case in order to proceed only with Case No. CIV-24-927-D. Plaintiff’s failure to respond may result in the dismissal of this action without further notice to Plaintiff. Further, Plaintiff is reminded that she may amend her complaint in CIV-24-927-D to include all defendants she wishes to name.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 25<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2024.



---

TIMOTHY D. DeGIUSTI  
Chief United States District Judge