

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
5

6  
7 JUAN PIERRE GRIFFIN,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 THE ENTIRE UNITED STATES  
11 CONGRESS,

12 Defendants.  
13  
14

NO. 2:17-CV-00006-JLQ

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT  
AS FRIVOLOUS AND BASELESS,  
DIRECTING ENTRY OF  
JUDGMENT, AND CLOSING FILE

15 On January 4, 2017, Plaintiff submitted another *pro se* Complaint along with an  
16 Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. See (ECF No. 1); (ECF No. 2). On January 5,  
17 2017, Magistrate Judge Rodgers accepted his application and set the matter for screening  
18 by this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

19 In the Complaint, Plaintiff alleged Federal Question jurisdiction and explained: “I  
20 saw on the World Wide Web that Congress is updating the U.S. Constitution.” (ECF No.  
21 4 at 3). He then set forth questions: “[w]hy are non-white Americans right to vote being  
22 changed?” and “[w]hy are some members of Congress moving non-white Americans into  
23 certain [illegible]?” (ECF No. 4 at 3). Because the Supreme Court “has been one judge  
24 short” Plaintiff asserted “[t]he only venue that is appropriate for any legal action is the  
25 international court.” (ECF No. 4 at 4). Plaintiff’s factual allegations set forth his  
26 perspective of historical restrictions on the right to vote, which he asserts, without any  
27 supporting allegations, continue to the present time. (ECF No. 4 at 4). His allegations are  
28 summed up by his allegation of injury: “[a]ll non-white voters were put into a position of

1 sub-human. Why? Who knew what and what did they do about it?” (ECF No. 4 at 7).  
2 Plaintiff sought \$999 trillion dollars in damages “for every non-white voter.” (ECF No. 4  
3 at 7).

4 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), a district court “may authorize the  
5 commencement ... of any suit ... without prepayment of fees... by a person who submits  
6 an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses that the person  
7 in unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.” *See also, Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493  
8 F.3d 1047, 1051 n.1 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) (citing *Lister v. Department of Treasury*, 408 F.3d  
9 1309, 1312 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) stating the statute applies to all persons, not just prisoners).  
10 However, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines ... the  
11 action ... (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be  
12 granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such  
13 relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

14 A complaint “is frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.  
15 [The] term ‘frivolous,’ when applied to a complaint, embraces not only the inarguable  
16 legal conclusion, but also the fanciful factual allegation.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S.  
17 319, 325 (1989), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Lopez v. Smith*, 203  
18 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). The court may dismiss a claim when it is “based on  
19 an indisputably meritless legal theory” or when “factual contentions are clearly baseless.”  
20 *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. The “critical inquiry” is whether any of the claims have “an  
21 arguable basis in law and fact.” *Jackson v. State of Ariz.*, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
22 1989), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Lopez*, 203 F.3d at 1130-31.

23 The facts alleged in a complaint are to be taken as true and must “plausibly give  
24 rise to an entitlement of relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009). Mere legal  
25 conclusions “are not entitled to the assumption of truth.” (*Id.*). A complaint must contain  
26 more than “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Bell Atlantic*  
27 *Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). It must plead “enough facts to state a claim  
28 to relief that is plausible on its face.” (*Id.* at 570).

1 A “finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the  
2 level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially  
3 noticeable facts available to contradict them.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33  
4 (1992). In considering whether a complaint is frivolous, “the *in forma pauperis* statute,  
5 unlike Rule 12(b)(6), ‘accords judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on  
6 an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the  
7 complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are  
8 clearly baseless.” (*Id.*) (quoting *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327).

9 In considering a *pro se* complaint which fails to state a claim as presented, the  
10 court should allow leave to amend unless it is “absolutely clear that the deficiencies of the  
11 complaint could not be cured by amendment.” *Broughton v. Cutter Laboratories*, 622  
12 F.2d 458, 460 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980) (per curiam).

13 Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must prove: (1) a person acting under color of  
14 state law (2) committed an act that deprived the plaintiff of some right, privilege, or  
15 immunity protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. *Leer v. Murphy*, 844  
16 F.2d 628, 632-33 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988). A person deprives another “of a constitutional right,  
17 within the meaning of section 1983, if he does an affirmative act, participates in another’s  
18 affirmative acts, or omits to perform an act which he is legally required to do that causes  
19 the deprivation of which [the plaintiff complains].” *Johnson v. Duffy*, 588 F.2d 740, 743  
20 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978).

21 To establish liability pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the plaintiff must set forth facts  
22 demonstrating how each defendant caused or personally participated in causing a  
23 deprivation of the plaintiff’s protected rights. *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
24 1989); *Arnold v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
25 1981). Even a liberal interpretation of a civil rights complaint may not supply essential  
26 elements of a claim the plaintiff failed to plead. *Ivey v. Board of Regents of University of*  
27 *Alaska*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982).

28 Plaintiff’s allegations are baseless and frivolous. He presents no basis for relief

1 other than vague and fanciful speculation about the Constitution being “updated” and  
2 some citizens being denied the right to vote. Plaintiff’s claims are wholly irrational and  
3 incredible. Plaintiff’s assertion that no court in the United States is a proper venue further  
4 demonstrates the baseless nature of his claims. The court finds the Complaint frivolous  
5 and no amendment would cure the baseless claims contained therein.

6 The court observes Plaintiff has had ten other lawsuits dismissed as frivolous and  
7 baseless in addition to the instant matter and another pending case with similar  
8 allegations. It appears Plaintiff deems it appropriate to file a new lawsuit whenever he is  
9 unhappy or dissatisfied with another person’s actions. This defies the purpose of civil  
10 lawsuits and takes up the court’s time addressing frivolous claims. Plaintiff has been  
11 previously warned a litigant who burdens the court with repetitive and frivolous litigation  
12 runs the risk of being declared a vexatious litigant. *See Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty*  
13 *Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007). This court is strongly considering initiating such a  
14 process in light of Plaintiff’s conduct and allegations in all of his previous cases,  
15 including the instant matter.

16 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 17 1. The Complaint (ECF No. 4) and the claims therein are **DISMISSED WITH**  
18 **PREJUDICE** based on the court’s finding that the claims and factual  
19 allegations contained therein are frivolous and baseless.
- 20 2. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment of dismissal of the Complaint (ECF  
21 No. 4) and the claims therein **WITH PREJUDICE** and without costs or  
22 attorneys’ fees awarded to any party.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk is directed to enter this Order and Judgment,  
24 furnish copies to Mr. Griffin, and close this file.

25 Dated January 5, 2017.

26 s/ Justin L. Quackenbush  
27 JUSTIN L. QUACKENBUSH  
28 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE