

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAI‘I

Kelvin Simmons v. Judge Karin L. Holma, et al.

Simmons v. Holma, No. 25-cv-00307-DKW-WRP (D. Haw. Mar. 30, 2026) · No. 25-cv-00307-DKW-WRP ·

Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Hawai‘i revoked Kelvin Simmons’s leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim. The court concluded that the Amended Complaint failed to identify specific defendants, allege meaningful facts, or satisfy basic federal pleading requirements, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Hawai‘i
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Derrick K. Watson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Hawai‘i
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-00307-DKW-WRP
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte revoked Plaintiff's leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the action for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determined whether the pleadings stated a claim for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#)

[pleadings](#)

[civil procedure](#)

[section 1983](#)

[due process](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)

[civil rights](#)

[constitutional law](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Amended Complaint stated a claim upon which relief could be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
2. Whether the court should revoke Simmons's in forma pauperis status after determining that the action failed to state a claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The Amended Complaint failed to state a claim because it did not identify any specific Defendant who violated Simmons's rights, did not provide meaningful factual allegations concerning the alleged conduct, and relied on conclusory and vague assertions.
2. The court revoked Simmons's in forma pauperis status because his pleadings failed to state a claim for relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that...the action or appeal...fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted[.]” (PageID.164)

“Therefore, other than through conclusory assertions, the Amended Complaint does not state what any specific Defendant did or failed to do and when, how any legal right was violated, or any injury Simmons suffered.” (Dkt. No. 220 at 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Simmons filed an action against Judge Karin L. Holma and other Defendants and submitted more than one hundred documents without obtaining relief. His Amended Complaint asserted claims against generalized groups of Defendants, contained no meaningful factual allegations identifying what any specific Defendant did or when, and relied on conclusory and vague assertions concerning alleged wrongdoing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court initially granted Simmons leave to proceed in forma pauperis and directed service of the original Complaint. After Defendants moved to dismiss, the court dismissed the original Complaint with leave to amend; Simmons filed an Amended Complaint, which the court found failed to satisfy basic federal pleading requirements. The court had dismissed the moving Defendants with prejudice and then applied the same deficiencies to all claims and Defendants, revoked IFP status, dismissed the case, directed entry of judgment, and ordered the case closed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Collier v. President of Stanford, 2023 WL 3035392, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2023)

