

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM OLSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHELLE OLSEN, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-5281RBL

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Olson’s Motion for Leave to proceed in forma pauperis, supported by his proposed complaint. Olson is incarcerated in Walla Walla. He seeks to sue what appear to be family members and everyone who lives in a neighborhood near Lakebay, Washington, for a vast conspiracy to abuse him, repress his memories, and take his property, dating back to at least 1995.

This list of those he claims have wronged him is long:

1 C. Additional Defendant(s)

2 Bruce & Debbi Doe Olsen, Jeffrey Ray Olsen, Sally F. Olsen,  
3 Cynthia Olsen, Beverly Olsen, Karen Olsen, John(s) & Jane(s)  
4 Doe Olsen, Palmer & Edyth Olsen-Taylor(deceased), Paul  
5 Taylor, Thomas Taylor, Jennifer Taylor, Randy Taylor,  
6 John(s) & Jane(s) Doe Taylor, Randy Munske, Erna Munske,  
7 Jack Whiteman, John Whiteman, Paul Whiteman, John(s) &  
8 Jane(s) Doe Whiteman, Tom Moore, John(s) & Jane(s) Doe  
9 Moore, Steven Seitsintr, Doe's Seitsintr, Daniel Mrosla,  
10 Doe's Mrosla, Loyd E. Miller, Doe's Miller, Tom & Shirley  
11 May , Doe's May, Ronald George, Jennifer George, Doe's  
12 George, Carl Kirchofer, Doe's Kirchofer, Donald J. & Pearl  
13 Carroll & Doe's, Robert Robinson, Doe's Robinson, Willard  
14 Ray Causey, Doe's Causey, Eric Paffenroth, Doe's Paffenroth,  
15 Christopher Ritter, Doe's Ritter, John Stuttheim, Doe's  
16 Stuttheim, John Hinkley, Doe's Hinkley, Colleen Easterwood  
17 Trust, John Hogberg, Doe's Hogberg, Joseph Henderson, Doe's  
18 Henderson, J.W. Farms, Longbranch Learning Academy,  
19 Longbranch School, All Residences surrounding Little Palmer  
20 Lake Including but not Limited to- 3321 Whiteman Rd. KPS  
21 Lakebay, WA 98349, 2607 Whiteman RD, KPS,  
22 2521 184th/Whiteman (Large White Manse), 2313 Whiteman  
23 RD. KPS, 2212 Whiteman RD. KPS, 2011 Whiteman RD. KPS,  
24 1621 Whiteman RD. KPS, 8963 McBrein LN., All other Homes  
Around Little Palmer Lake, All Owners & Taxpayers of Pierce  
County Parcel Number(s) 0020101032, 0020101033, 0020101034,  
0020101035, 0020101036, 0020113039, 0020113016, 0020112023,  
0020112025, 0020101011, 0020101004, 0020101012, 0020103034,  
Residents of 160 Madrona Vista Rd. Pl. Port Ludlow, WA,  
161 Madrona Vista Rd. Pl., 162 Madrona Vista Rd. Pl., 163  
Madrona Vista Rd. Pl., 164 Madrona Vista Rd. Pl., William  
Halvorson, Thomas Halvorson, Thomas SR. JR. III. Halvorson,  
Daine Halvorson, Edward Halvorson, Sally & Hugh Andrew,  
Kevin Andrew, Jordy Andrew, Shelly Andrew, Doe's Andrew,  
Doe's Halvorson, Madrona Vista LLC., Madrona Engineering  
Inc., Agasgas Inc. Madrona Inc., Rohlinger Enterprises,  
Kevin Olsen-Universal Management-Nevada, WA, H. Halvorson  
Inc., Futurewei Technologies Inc., Huawei Device USA Inc.,  
Whiteman Tire Inc., Craig & Belinda Holdren, Chris & Andrea  
Holm, Central Intelligence Agency, The "Madrona Vista Boys"  
Tommy, Eddy, Jordy, Kevin, Levi, Eric, Michael, Chris,  
Marshall, Elizabeth, John(s) & Jane(s) Doe, "The Butcher".,  
Mr. Wei

22 [Dkt. #1] Olson appears to have identified at least some of these names and addresses by using  
23 Google Earth and the Pierce County Assessors website. His claims against at least some of the  
24

1 defendants appear to be that they were in a position to stop other from harming him and did not.

2 For example:

3 10 Defendant Rohlinger Enterprise is accused of employing Craig  
4 Olsen and Jose, and Negligent Supervision of its employee's.  
5 It is beleived that Rohlingers is a contractor for the Depart-  
6 ment of Defense and Possibly the Central Intelligence Agency.  
7 Plaintiff alleges that Rohlingers has aided in concealing  
8 the injuries to person and property inflicted upon the  
9 plaintiff and has failed to prevent the assaults and injuries  
10 from happening when it was fully capable of preventing them.  
11 Plaintiff seeks to fully know what Rohlingers does for its  
12 buisness and for the court to be fully informed of what preven-  
13 tative measures could have been taken.

8 [Dkt. #1] Olson also alleges that various defendants worked with or for the CIA

9 25 Defendants United States Government (CIA) are accused of  
10 Negligent Supervision of its Employee's, Contractors and or  
11 Subcontractors that have used the power, training, abilities,  
12 skills, technology chemicals and influence to injure plaintiff  
13 in person, property, and liberty by committing the assaults  
14 and sexual assaults upon the plaintiff and framing and fleecing  
15 him of his inheritance. Plaintiff knows there was a changing  
16 of the system after subsequent hacks revealing agent  
17 identification and Snowdens defection. Plaintiffs uncle came  
18 and told him that things were changing. During the testing  
19 and competition to find the best "SYSTEM" for the western  
20 hemisphere the out going **agent** framed and fleeced the the  
21 plaintiff of his inheritance as they stole and sold everything  
22 off while going around grabbing the best looking and taking  
23 off for the next thing. The infighting within CENTCOM and  
24 CYBER COMMAND and the turn over facilitated all the thefts  
and larceny. Plaintiff accuses you (CIA) of failing to prevent  
the injuries to person, property, and liberty inflicted upon  
the Plaintiff. Plaintiff trys to call the defendants listed  
in this action including the government and no one takes his  
calls. Plaintiff fears his family is in danger and that someth-  
ing has happened to them. Plaintiff has continued beeping  
in his ears and fears he has been either implanted or the  
system he resides in has been hyjacked and he is being tortured  
mentally and has been tortured throughout his past. Plaintiff  
reached out to everyone he could try to contact before filing  
this complaint.

21 A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon  
22 completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court has broad  
23 discretion in resolving the application, but “the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis* in civil  
24

1 actions for damages should be sparingly granted.” *Weller v. Dickson*, 314 F.2d 598, 600 (9th  
2 Cir. 1963), *cert. denied* 375 U.S. 845 (1963). Moreover, a court should “deny leave to proceed  
3 *in forma pauperis* at the outset if it appears from the face of the proposed [pleading] that the  
4 action is frivolous or without merit.” *Tripati v. First Nat’l Bank & Trust*, 821 F.2d 1368, 1369  
5 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An *in forma pauperis*  
6 complaint is frivolous if “it ha[s] no arguable substance in law or fact.” *Id.* (citing *Rizzo v.*  
7 *Dawson*, 778 F.2d 527, 529 (9th Cir. 1985); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir.  
8 1984).

9 A *pro se* plaintiff’s complaint is to be construed liberally, but like any other complaint it  
10 must nevertheless contain factual assertions sufficient to support a facially plausible claim for  
11 relief. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009) (citing *Bell*  
12 *Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007)). A  
13 claim for relief is facially plausible when “the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the  
14 court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”  
15 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678.


16 Olson’s claims do not meet this standard, no matter how liberally his claims are  
17 construed. The claims are facially time-barred and a decades-long conspiracy of the scope he  
18 describes, involving everyone in a given neighborhood, his own entire family and the CIA is not  
19 only not plausible, it is frivolous.

20 The Motion to proceed in forma pauperis is DENIED. Olson shall pay the filing fee or  
21 file a dramatically different proposed complaint within 21 days of this Order or the matter will be  
22  
23  
24

1 dismissed. Any proposed amended complaint should articulate the “who what when where and  
2 why” of a plausible, timely claim within this court’s jurisdiction.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated this 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017.

5   
6

7 Ronald B. Leighton  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24