

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gregory Scott VanHuissen v. Warner Bros., et al.

VanHuissen v. Warner Bros. · No. 24-cv-05788-PCP · Decided March 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Gregory Scott Van Huissen’s pro se action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Warner Bros., Time Warner, and Leonardo DiCaprio. The court held that the defendants were not alleged to have acted under color of state law and that the complaint failed to provide sufficient factual allegations supporting any claim for relief. The court denied leave to amend as futile, certified that any appeal was not taken in good faith, and ordered the case closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	P. Casey Pitts
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	March 26, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-05788-PCP
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se state prisoner filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed it with prejudice and without leave to amend for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; the complaint must be dismissed if it is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Gregory Scott VanHuissen v. Warner Bros., Time Warner, Leonardo DiCaprio

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

pleadings

civil procedure

cruel and unusual punishment

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

pleading and screening

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 when it did not allege that any defendant acted under color of state law.
2. Whether the complaint stated any cognizable claim for relief when its allegations were unclear, unsupported by factual detail, and failed to identify an actionable injury.
3. Whether the plaintiff should be granted leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a § 1983 claim because it did not allege facts showing that any defendant acted under color of state law.
2. The complaint failed to state a claim for relief because it did not identify a legally cognizable injury or provide factual allegations explaining who injured the plaintiff, how he was injured, where and when the injury occurred, or why the conduct was unlawful.
3. Leave to amend was properly denied because amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law.”

“The Complaint does not inform the Court who injured Mr. Van Huisen, how he was injured, where and when he was injured, and why he believes this injury was unlawful.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff, an inmate at Mule Creek State Prison, sued Warner Bros., Time Warner, and Leonardo DiCaprio under § 1983. He alleged, in difficult-to-decipher terms, Eighth Amendment violations, negligence, theft by deception, and other undefined misconduct, and sought \$27 million. The complaint did not identify facts showing that any defendant acted under color of state law or explain who injured him, how the injury occurred, or why the conduct was unlawful.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

VanHuissen filed a complaint alleging constitutional and miscellaneous tort-related misconduct by Warner Bros., Time Warner, and Leonardo DiCaprio. The court previously gave the plaintiff an opportunity and detailed instructions to amend in other similarly deficient litigation, but concluded that amendment in this action would

be futile because the defendants were not state actors and the complaint contained no comprehensible factual basis for relief. The action was dismissed, pending motions were terminated, and the file was closed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Wilder v. Virginia Hospital Association*, 496 U.S. 498, 508 (1990)
- *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 393-94 (1989)
- *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- *Ketchum v. Alameda County*, 811 F.2d 1243, 1245 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Allen v. City of Beverly Hills*, 911 F.2d 367, 373 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Janicki Logging Co. v. Mateer*, 42 F.3d 561, 566 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *Van Huisen v. Lafrades*, Case No. 23-cv-4800-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Goss*, Case No. 23-cv-4210-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Gates*, Case No. 23-4447-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Central Intelligence Agency*, Case No. 23-4591-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. United States Air Force*, Case No. 23-cv-4753-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Volkswagen Motors*, Case No. 23-cv-4866-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Burns*, Case No. 23-cv-4914-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. DiCaprio*, Case No. 23-cv-5081-PCP
- *Van Huisen v. Chief of Staff Navy*, Case No. 24-cv-7015-PCP

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
GREGORY SCOTT VANHUISSEN, Case No. 24-cv-05788-PCP 8 Plaintiff, ORDER OF
DISMISSAL v. 9 10 WARNER BROS., et al., Defendants. 11 12 13 Gregory Van Huisen, an
inmate at the Mule Creek State Prison, filed this pro se civil rights 14 action under 42 U.S.C. §
1983.1 He sues Warner Brothers, Time Warner, and Leonardo DiCaprio.

15 The Complaint is now before the Court for review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Mr. Van Huisen’s
16 Complaint is dismissed with prejudice because it does not state a claim for relief. 17 I.
Background 18 Mr. Van Huisen accuses defendants of “browbeating and splashing” him in
violation of the 19 Eighth Amendment, *id.* at 3; engaging in “negligence” and “theft by deception”
related to “harvest 20 time” and “dry rot,” *id.* at 7; and some undefined claim related to
“precedence,” *id.* at 9.

He seeks 21 \$27 million dollars for “actions that caused reckless and callous indifference to my rights 22 motivated by evil intent civil disobedience and inchoate crime. Entrapment.” Id. at 3. 23 II. Legal Standard 24 Federal courts must screen any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental 25 entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must 26 27 1 The caption incorrectly identifies the plaintiff as “Gregory VanHuissen.” The plaintiff identifies 1 identify cognizable claims and dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim 2 upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant immune from such 3 relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2).

Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. See *Balistreri v. 4 Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). 5 III. Analysis 6 The first defect in Mr. Van Huisen’s Complaint is that he does not identify a proper 7 defendant. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 “provides a cause of action for the ‘deprivation of any rights, 8 privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws’ of the United States.’” *Wilder v. 9 Virginia Hosp.*

Ass’n, 496 U.S. 498, 508 (1990) (quoting 42 U.S.C. § 1983). Section 1983 is not 10 itself a source of substantive rights, but merely provides a method for vindicating federal rights 11 elsewhere conferred. See *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 393–94 (1989).

To state a claim under 12 § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution 13 or laws of the United States was violated and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a 14 person acting under the color of state law. See *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988); *Ketchum v. 15 Alameda County*, 811 F.2d 1243, 1245 (9th Cir.

1987). Here, Mr. Van Huisen makes no claim and 16 introduces no facts to suggest his targeted defendants acted under color of state law, and so cannot 17 proceed on a § 1983 claim. See generally *Compl.* 18 More generally, Mr. Van Huisen does not state any claim for relief.

Although he mentions 19 treason, trespass, conspiracy, elections, property, and defamation, Mr. Van Huisen does not 20 identify any injury that has been done to him, nor does he provide any facts to support any of his 21 allegations. See generally *id.* Rather, Mr. Van Huisen fills ten pages with difficult-to-decipher 22 statements and quotations from religious sources, films, and some unknown text that appears to be 23 related to Christopher Columbus’s ships.

See *id.* The Complaint does not inform the Court who 24 injured Mr. Van Huisen, how he was injured, where and when he was injured, and why he 25 believes this injury was unlawful. Accordingly, Mr. Van Huisen has failed to state a claim. 26 In the year prior to the instant Complaint, in this District alone, Mr. Van Huisen filed nine 27 civil rights lawsuits with similarly difficult to understand and often impossible allegations, against] improper defendants.” When given an opportunity and detailed instructions on how to amend, Mr. 2 || Van Huisen has failed to correct these defects.

See, e.g., *Van Huisen v. Lafrades*, Case No. 23-cv- 3 4800-PCP. Although district courts generally afford prisoner litigants the opportunity to amend 4 || their complaint, a district court may deny leave to amend if it finds any of: “(1) bad faith, (2) 5 || undue delay, (3) prejudice to the opposing party, (4) futility of amendment; [or] (5) [the] plaintiff 6 || has previously amended his complaint.” *Allen v. City of Beverly Hills*, 911 F.2d 367, 373 (9th Cir.

7 1990). Here, because Mr. Van Huisen sues defendants who are clearly not state actors, and in light 8 of his history of filing frivolous actions, the Court concludes that leave to amend would be futile 9 || and should not be granted. *Janicki Logging Co. v. Mateer*, 42 F.3d 561, 566 (9th Cir. 1994) (leave 10 || to amend need not be given where amendment would be futile).?

11 IV. Conclusion gq 12 This action is dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 13 Because amendment would be futile, dismissal is without leave to amend. Y 14 The Court certifies that any appeal of this order is not taken in good faith. 15 The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close the file. 16 17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 || Dated: March 26, 2025 19 LA Qo 20. P. CASEY PITTS 2] United States District Judge 22 23 4 See *Van Huisen v. Goss*, Case No. 23-cv-4210-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Gates*, Case No. 23-4447-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Central Intelligence Agency*, Case No. 23-4591-PCP; *Van Huisen v. United 25 States Air Force*, Case No. 23-cv-4753-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Lafrades*, Case No. 23-cv-4800-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Volkswagen Motors*, Case No. 23-cv-4866-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Burns*, Case No. 23-26 || ev-4914-PCP; *Van Huisen v. DiCaprio*, Case No. 23-cv-5081-PCP; *Van Huisen v. Chief of Staff Navy*, Case No. 24-cv-7015-PCP.

7 > For Mr. Van Huisen’s benefit, the Court notes that its dismissal means he cannot proceed on these claims and facts. If Mr. Van Huisen re-files the same claims in a new action, on the same 28 facts, that action also will be dismissed for failure to state a claim. Every dismissal for failure to state a claim is a “strike” under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.