

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Marian Anthony v. Terrie E. Roberts & Laura Miller

Anthony · No. 3:25-cv-2486-CAB-AHG · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California dismissed with prejudice Marian Anthony’s Section 1983 claims against two California Superior Court judges. The court held that the defendants were entitled to judicial immunity, that the requested relief was barred by or implicated the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and limits on federal interference with state proceedings, and that the complaint’s exhibits were subject to being stricken. The court also denied motions for leave to file a supplemental complaint and for an extension of time, and directed the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cathy Ann Bencivengo
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-2486-CAB-AHG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against two California Superior Court judges based on their conduct in an ongoing family-law proceeding. Defendants moved to dismiss and strike portions of the complaint. Plaintiff moved to file a supplemental complaint and for an extension of time to respond to an order to show cause.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(1) motion, the plaintiff bears the burden of establishing subject-matter jurisdiction, and the court must confirm jurisdiction before reaching the merits. On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, construes them in the plaintiff’s favor, and determines whether the complaint states a legally cognizable and facially plausible claim. The court reviews a Rule 15(d) motion for leave to supplement under a discretionary standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

PARTIES

Marian Anthony v. Terrie E. Roberts, Laura Miller

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

subject matter jurisdiction

section 1983

motion to amend

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

family law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the claims for damages against the state-court judges were barred by absolute judicial immunity.
2. Whether the requested injunctive and declaratory relief was barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and principles precluding federal district-court interference with an ongoing state-court proceeding.
3. Whether leave to amend was warranted when the complaint's jurisdictional and substantive defects could not be cured by amendment.
4. Whether the challenged exhibits should be stricken because they were not certified official state-court transcripts and were not subject to judicial notice.
5. Whether leave to file a supplemental complaint should be denied because the proposed pleading asserted the same futile challenges as the original complaint.
6. Whether the motion for an extension of time should be denied as moot after dismissal of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Judges are absolutely immune from damages liability for acts performed in their official capacities, including allegedly erroneous, malicious, corrupt, or procedurally flawed judicial acts. Because Anthony sought damages for conduct undertaken by the defendants as judges, the damages claims were barred.
2. The federal district court could not grant relief that would directly review or interfere with the ongoing state-court judicial proceeding. Claims inextricably intertwined with the state court's decision were subject to dismissal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, and the court lacked authority to order disqualification of a state-court judge or exercise declaratory jurisdiction having the same practical impact as injunctive relief on the pending state proceeding.
3. Leave to amend was unwarranted because it was clear that the complaint's defects could not be cured by amendment.
4. The motion to strike Exhibits 1, 3, and 4 was granted because the exhibits appeared to be plaintiff-created transcripts that were not certified official transcripts and were not subject to judicial notice under Federal Rule of Evidence 201.
5. Leave to file a supplemental complaint was denied because the proposed supplemental pleading asserted the same futile challenges as the original complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The federal court is one of limited jurisdiction.” (at 2)

“As such, the Court cannot reach the merits of any dispute until it confirms its own subject matter jurisdiction.” (at 2)

“Judges . . . are absolutely immune from damage liability for acts performed in their official capacities.” (at 3)

“This absolute immunity insulates judges from charges of erroneous acts or irregular action, even when it is alleged that such action was driven by malicious or corrupt motives, or when the exercise of judicial authority is flawed by the commission of grave procedural errors.” (at 3)

“the Rooker-Feldman doctrine bars direct federal district court appellate review of state court judicial proceedings.” (at 4)

“If claims raised in the federal court action are inextricably intertwined with the state court’s decision such that the adjudication of the federal claims would undercut the state ruling . . . then the federal complaint must be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” (at 4)

“It is clear to the Court that Plaintiff seeks to have a federal district court improperly interfere with an ongoing state proceeding.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Marian Anthony is a petitioner in a pending California family-dissolution proceeding. Defendants Terrie Roberts and Laura Miller are California Superior Court judges who allegedly overruled Anthony's objections, declined to consider certain arguments, and required him to take an oath before testifying or presenting arguments. Anthony sought damages, an injunction requiring the judges to recuse themselves, and declarations that their conduct violated the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments and the Contract Clause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on September 22, 2025. Defendants moved to dismiss and strike exhibits, while Plaintiff sought leave to file a supplemental complaint and an extension of time. The district court dismissed the action with prejudice, granted the motion to strike, denied leave to supplement and the extension motion, directed the Clerk to close the case, and rejected additional filings.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Anthony v. Sanchez, No. 3:25-cv-1548-CAB-AHG, 2025 WL 3208846 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025)
- Gould v. Mut. Life Ins. Co. of N.Y., 790 F.2d 769, 774 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ass'n of Am. Med. Colls. v. United States, 217 F.3d 770, 778–79 (9th Cir. 2000)

- *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't.*, 523 U.S. 83, 95 (1998)
- *United States v. Cotton*, 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 556–57, 570 (2007)
- *Daniels-Hall v. Nat'l Educ. Ass'n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Knievel v. ESPN*, 393 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005)
- *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *In re Castillo*, 297 F.3d 940, 947 (9th Cir. 2022)
- *S. California Edison Co. v. Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794, 804 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Alexander v. Bonta*, No. ED CV 25-447-DMG-DTB, 2025 WL 1717657, at *1 n.1 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2025)
- *Gilbertson v. Albright*, 381 F.3d 965, 975 (9th Cir. 2004) (en banc)
- *Karim-Panahi v. Los Angeles Police Dep't*, 839 F.2d 621, 623 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rts., Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007)
- *Keith v. Volpe*, 858 F.2d 467, 473 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *LaSalvia v. United Dairymen of Ariz.*, 804 F.2d 1113, 1119 (9th Cir. 1986)