

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Kuang-Bao Paul Ou-Young v. Patrick D. Robbins, et al.

Ou-Young · No. 25-cv-08983-CRB · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California partially grants Defendants’ motion for entry of a third prefiling order against pro se Plaintiff Kuang-Bao Paul Ou-Young. The order requires Plaintiff to obtain leave before filing additional in propria persona civil actions in that district against the Clerk of Court or employees of the U.S. Attorney’s Office and to attach copies of this order and two prior federal prefiling orders.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles R. Breyer
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-08983-CRB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for entry of a third prefiling order against pro se Plaintiff Kuang-Bao Paul Ou-Young. The court resolved the motion without oral argument and granted it in part.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Ninth Circuit's requirements for issuance of a prefiling order under the All Writs Act: notice and opportunity to be heard, an adequate record for review, narrow tailoring, and substantive findings that the litigant's conduct is frivolous or harassing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Kuang-Bao Paul Ou-Young v. Patrick D. Robbins, Pamela T. Johann, Kelsey Helland, Mark B. Busby

TOPICS

- sanctions
- injunctions
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Federal courts

Vexatious litigant restrictions

Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court had authority under the All Writs Act to impose a third prefiling order against Plaintiff.
2. Whether Plaintiff received notice and an opportunity to be heard before entry of the prefiling order.
3. Whether the record adequately demonstrated numerous or abusive litigation activity and frivolous or harassing conduct.
4. Whether the requested prefiling restriction was narrowly tailored.
5. What filing restrictions and documentation requirements should apply.

HOLDINGS

1. Under the All Writs Act, a district court may enjoin a litigant with an abusive and lengthy litigation history from filing further actions when the litigant receives notice and an opportunity to be heard, the record is adequate for review, the order is narrowly tailored to the specific abuse, and the court makes substantive findings that the litigant's conduct is frivolous or harassing.
2. Plaintiff received adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard because Defendants filed the motion and Plaintiff filed an opposition; an in-person hearing or oral argument was not required.
3. The record was adequate and established that Plaintiff's litigation activity was numerous, repetitive, frivolous, and harassing.
4. The prefiling restriction had to be narrower than Defendants requested and was limited to Plaintiff's in propria persona civil actions in the Northern District of California against Clerk of Court Mark Busby or any employee of the U.S. Attorney's Office.
5. The underlying lawsuit was frivolous because its conspiracy theory was insubstantial or wholly implausible, the claims did not establish waiver of sovereign immunity, and the claims lacked adequate factual and jurisdictional support.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Before entering a prefiling order, the Court must find that (1) the litigant was given notice and an opportunity to be heard, (2) there is an adequate record for review, and (3) the order is “narrowly tailored to closely fit the specific vice encountered.”” (at 1)

“For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff must obtain leave of the Court before filing any additional in propria persona civil actions in the Northern District of California against Clerk of Court Mark Busby or any employee of the U.S. Attorney’s Office.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The record showed that Plaintiff had brought fifty-one cases in the Northern District of California, all of which had been dismissed after judicial review, and had two prior federal prefiling screening orders and at least two California state vexatious-litigant orders. Plaintiff continued filing repetitive and frivolous lawsuits against federal employees, including court staff and federal officials, and allegedly attempted to circumvent prior prefiling orders by amending complaints to add new federal defendants. The underlying action alleged, among other things, a conspiracy concerning service of filings and violations related to Rule 5-1(b).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a federal action against federal officials. Defendants sought a third prefiling order based on Plaintiff's repeated frivolous and harassing litigation and his two prior federal prefiling orders. The court found the requirements for a narrowly tailored prefiling injunction satisfied and imposed a limited leave-to-file procedure.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- De Long v. Hennessy, 912 F.2d 1144, 1147-48 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp., 500 F.3d 1047, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Pac. Harbor Cap., Inc. v. Carnival Air Lines, Inc., 210 F.3d 1112, 1118 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Ou-Young v. Roberts, No. C-13-4442-EMC, 2013 WL 6732118, at *8, *11 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2013)
- Ou-Young v. Stone, No. 5:19-cv-7000, 2019 WL 6619879 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2019)
- Ou-Young v. County of Santa Clara, No. 5:21-cv-7361-BLF, 2022 WL 1471411, at *3, *6 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2022)
- Ou-Young v. Robbins, No. 25-mc-80234-TLT, 2025 WL 2772692, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2025)
- Ou-Young v. California, No. 25-mc-80316-AMO, 2025 WL 2917317, at *2-4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2025)
- Tyler v. Travelers Commercial Ins. Co., 499 F. Supp. 3d 693, 701 (N.D. Cal. 2020)