

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 JAMES J. O'HAGAN,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 GREGORY URSICH, et al.,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-5179BHS

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

13
14 This matter comes before the Court on review of Plaintiff James J. O'Hagen's
15 ("O'Hagen") complaint (Dkt. 1).

16 On March 1, 2012, O'Hagen filed a complaint against various defendants. *Id.* The
17 majority of the defendants appear to be private parties, one defendant appears to be a state
18 court judge, and one defendant is a federal bankruptcy judge. *Id.* O'Hagen asserts that
19 the Court has jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; various sections of the federal criminal
20 code, 18 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*; and 11 U.S.C. § 548. *Id.*


21 If the Court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the
22 Court must dismiss the action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). The Court does not have
23 jurisdiction over O'Hagen's civil suit under either the criminal codes or the bankruptcy
24 code. With regard to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, it appears the only defendant acting under color
25 of law is the state court judge. Judges, however, are entitled to absolute immunity.
26 *Taggart v. State*, 118 Wn.2d 195, 203 (1992). Therefore, the Court finds that O'Hagen
27
28

1 has failed to show that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations in his
2 complaint.

3 O'Hagen must show cause why this Court may have subject matter jurisdiction no
4 later than March 24, 2012. Failure to respond will result in **DISMISSAL** of his
5 complaint.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 DATED this 7th day of March, 2012.

8
9 
10 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28