

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 CHLOE LUCERO,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00683-RAJ-BAT

ORDER DENYING MOTION

15 On October 13, 2021, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice
16 and directed the Clerk to close this case. Dkt. 23. On November 8, 2021, Plaintiff filed a
17 "Motion to Begin Proceedings for Denaturalization & Expatriation." Dkt. 24. The Court
18 denies this motion.

19 Plaintiff's motion is largely nonsensical. It appears that Plaintiff wishes this Court
20 to make her a "non-citizen." While Plaintiff has the right to renounce citizenship, this
21 Court is not the proper forum for the requested "denaturalization & expatriation".
22 Plaintiff must appear at a US Consular Office in a foreign country in person. Plaintiff also
23 requests issuance of a refugee travel document so that she can travel to a country willing

1 to accept her asylum claim. Again, this Court is not the proper forum for the relief sought
 2 by Plaintiff. Plaintiff is free to leave this country at any time, renounce her citizenship,
 3 and seek asylum elsewhere. Whether another country will grant her asylum is a decision
 4 for that country – not this Court.

5 Plaintiff's motion must be denied because it was filed in a dismissed action and
 6 fails to state a justiciable claim for relief. For a plaintiff's claim to be justiciable, she
 7 "must have standing to bring the claim, and the claim must not be moot." *Jacobs v. Clark*
 8 *Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 526 F.3d 419, 425 (9th Cir. 2008). To establish standing, a plaintiff must
 9 show "(1) an injury in fact, (2) a sufficient causal connection between the injury and the
 10 conduct complained of, and (3) a likelihood that the injury will be redressed by a
 11 favorable decision." *Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus*, 573 U.S. 149, 157–58, 134 S.Ct.
 12 2334, 189 L.Ed.2d 246 (2014) (citation, alterations, and punctuation omitted). A case is
 13 moot if there is no "present controversy as to which effective relief can be granted." *Doe*
 14 *No. 1 v. Reed*, 697 F.3d 1235, 1238 (9th Cir. 2012) (citation omitted).

16 This case was closed because Plaintiff failed to state a viable claim for relief. By
 17 this latest motion, Plaintiff has presented nothing to show a likelihood that her claimed
 18 injuries can be redressed by a favorable decision of this Court. Accordingly, the motion
 19 (Dkt. 24) is **DENIED**.

20 DATED this 18th day of November, 2021.

21
 22 

23 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
 United States District Judge