

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Bonilla v. Judge Gonzalez-Rogers

Bonilla · No. 25-cv-11083-PJH; 26-cv-0150-PJH; 26-cv-0682-PJH · Decided January 28, 2026

OPINION

Bonilla

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA, Case Nos. 25-cv-11083-PJH Plaintiff, 26-cv-0150-PJH 8 26-
cv-0682-PJH v. 9 10 JUDGE GONZALEZ-ROGERS et. al.,

ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE

11 Defendants. CASES WITH PREJUDICE 12 13 14 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed multiple pro
se civil rights complaints under 42 15 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also
has a pending federal habeas 16 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See Bonilla v. Ayers,
Case No. 08-0471 17 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas
proceedings. See In 18 re Bonilla, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7. 19 Plaintiff presents
nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as 20 defendants various federal judges and
state court officials. He seeks relief regarding his 21 underlying conviction or how his other cases
were handled by the state and federal 22 courts. 23 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed in
forma pauperis (IFP) in these cases, 24 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28
U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is 25 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he
filed his complaint. 28 26 U.S.C. 1915(g); In re Steven Bonilla, Case No. 11-3180 CW; Bonilla v.
Dawson, Case 27 No. 13-0951 CW. 1 The allegations in these complaints do not show that
plaintiff was in imminent 2 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP.
Moreover, even if an 3 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under Heck v.
Humphrey, 512 4 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), Demos
v. U.S. 5 District Court, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy
Court, 6 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with 7
prejudice. The court notes that plaintiff has an extensive history of filing similar frivolous 8
cases.1 9 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge’s impartiality 10 might
be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings. 11 See United
States v. Holland, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate 12 reasons to recuse
himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases 13 assigned to that judge).2 14

The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk 15 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases. 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: January 28, 2026 18 19

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON

20 United States District Judge 21 22 23 24 25 26 1 The undersigned is the fourth judge assigned cases filed by plaintiff. This is the 83rd order issued by the undersigned since April 30, 2020, pertaining to 1,309 different cases. 27 Plaintiff filed 962 other cases with the three other judges since 2011. 2 Plaintiff names the undersigned as a defendant in one of these cases, though presents