| 1 | | |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 6 | WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | BRUCE E. GAMBILL JR., | |
| 9 | Plaintiff, | CASE NO. C12-6004 BHS |
| 10 | v. | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF |
| 11 | UNITED STATES, | |
| 12 | Defendant. | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Bruce E. Gambill's ("Gambill") | |
| 15 | motion to enjoin his forced eviction from his home and to set aside the fraudulent sale of | |
| 16 | his house (Dkt. 13). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion | |
| 17 | and the remainder of the file. For the reasons stated herein, the Court denies the motion. | |
| | and the remainder of the rice. For the reasons | stated herein, the Court defines the motion. |
| 18 | I. PROCEDURAL & FAC | |
| 18 19 | I. PROCEDURAL & FAC | |
| | I. PROCEDURAL & FAC | TUAL BACKGROUND nis complaint, along with his motions to |
| 19 | I. PROCEDURAL & FAC On November 23, 2012, Gambill filed l | TUAL BACKGROUND nis complaint, along with his motions to restraining order (TRO) to nullify the |

in forma pauperis and for a TRO, and dismissed the case. Dkt. 5. In brief, the Court reasoned that while Gambill included many factual allegations or phrases, they did "not amount to ascertainable causes of action." *Id.* at 3. Nor did Gambill make clear who the defendants were or which allegations Gambill was alleging against whom. *Id.* Based on the Court's review of Gambill's submissions, it found them "almost entirely incomprehensible" and his complaint legally frivolous such that he failed to "adequately assert any ground to invoke this Court's jurisdiction." *Id.* at 3-4.

motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Dkt. 7) as well as a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit (Dkt. 8). On December 26, 2012, the Ninth Circuit issued a briefing schedule.

Dkt. 9. On December 28, 2012, Gambill paid the Ninth Circuit's filing fee. Dkt. 10. On December 31, 2012, this Court issued an order denying Gambill's motion for reconsideration and his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Dkt. 10.

On December 18, 2012, Gambill filed a motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 6) and a

On January 22, 2013, Gambill filed the instant emergency motion. Dkt. 13.

Among other allegations, many of which are repetitious of those made in earlier pleadings relating to the foreclosure sale of his house and forced bankruptcy, Gambill asks this Court to enjoin both what he calls the forced eviction from his home, scheduled for 6:00 a.m. on January 24, 2013, and to set aside the fraudulent sale of his home. *Id.* at 11.

II. DISCUSSION

Once a notice of appeal is filed from a final judgment, the district court is divested of jurisdiction. *Laurino v. Syringa General Hosp.*, 279 F.3d 750, 755 (9th Cir. 2002);

| 1 | Griggs v. Provident Consumer Disc. Co., 459 U.S. 56, 58-59 (1982). In this case, the | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | Court has issued a final judgment, dismissing the case. Dkt. 5. Further, it has heard | |
| 3 | Gambill's motion for reconsideration and denied it. Dkt. 10. Given that a final judgment | |
| 4 | has been issued and this case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit, this Court is divested of | |
| 5 | the jurisdiction and cannot consider Gambill's motion. | |
| 6 | III. ORDER | |
| 7 | Therefore, it is hereby ORDERED that Gambill's emergency motion for relief | |
| 8 | from his forced eviction and his request to set aside the fraudulent sale of his home (Dkt. | |
| 9 | 13) is DENIED because this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the motion. Any further | |
| 10 | relief Gambill seeks in this case must be directed to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth | |
| 11 | Circuit. | |
| 12 | Dated this 23rd day of January, 2013. | |
| 13 | $\langle AC \rangle$ | |
| 14 | Iby \ South | |
| 15 | BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |