

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

Terence C. Davis v. General Atomics

Case No. 2:25-cv-09430-WLH-JDE · No. 2:25-cv-09430-WLH-JDE · Decided November 14, 2025

OPINION

Terence C. Davis v. General Atomics, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WESTERN DIVISION

9 10 TERENCE C. DAVIS, Case No. 2:25-cv-09430-WLH-JDE 11 Plaintiff, ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE 12 v. 13

GENERAL ATOMICS, ET AL.,

14 15 Defendants. 16 The Court, on its own motion, hereby ORDERS Plaintiff Terence D. 17
Davis (“Plaintiff”), to show cause in writing no later than December 5, 2025, 18 why this action
should not be dismissed with prejudice as barred by res 19 judicata (claim preclusion) and
collateral estoppel (issue preclusion). 20 On October 1, 2025, Plaintiff, a California resident
proceeding pro se, 21 filed the Complaint in this matter against General Atomics, General Atomics
22 Aeronautical Systems, Inc., Rosenberg Sphall and Zeigen, Onslow Bay 23 Financial LLC, Mr.
Cooper/Nationstart, and DOES 1 – 50, inclusive 24 (collectively “Defendants”) for: (1)
discrimination, (2) “breach of employment 25 contract – at-will”; unlawful termination; (3)
“unequal pay / treatment”; and 26

(4) “defamation/blacklisting and in violation of due process rights – 14th

27 Amendment.” (Dkt. No. 1). Prior to this lawsuit, however, Plaintiff brought 1 an action against
General Atomics, General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, 2 Inc., Rosenberg Sphall and Zeigen, as
well as numerous other defendants in

3 No. 8:23-cv-00132-WLH-JDE for employment-related violations and other

4 various claims. The Court dismissed that action in its entirety with 5 prejudice on June 20, 2025.
(No. 8:23-cv-00132-WLH-JDE, Dkt. No. 352). 6 Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion to proceed
in forma pauperis and 7 appealed the case. (No. 8:23-cv-00132-WLH-JDE, Dkt. No. 353). The
Ninth 8 Circuit denied the motion to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the 9 appeal as
frivolous. (No. 8:23-cv-00132-WLH-JDE, Dkt. No. 361). Now, 10 Plaintiff attempts to file
another suit in this federal court seeking to 11 relitigate the termination of his employment, among
other things. 12 Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants General Atomics, General 13 Atomics

Aeronautical Systems, Inc., and Rosenberg Sphall and Zeigen 14 appear to be barred by the doctrine of res judicata because they were 15 previously adjudicated on the merits in the prior litigation in No. 23-cv- 16 00132-WLH-JDE. “Res judicata, or claim preclusion, prohibits lawsuits on 17 any claims that were raised or could have been raised in a prior action.” 18 Stewart v. U.S. Bancorp, 297 F.3d 953, 956 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal 19 quotation marks and citations omitted; emphasis in original). In addition, 20 the doctrine of res judicata precludes not only claims that were actually 21 brought, but also “all claims that ‘could have been asserted’ in the prior 22 action,” i.e., claims which arise “out of the same transactional nucleus of 23 facts.” Int’l Union of Operating Eng’rs-Emp’rs Constr. Indus. Pension, etc. v. 24 Karr, 994 F.2d 1426, 1429 (9th Cir. 1993). Res judicata applies when there 25 is “(1) an identity of claims, (2) a final judgment on the merits, and (3) 26 identity or privity between the parties.” Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health 27 Plan, Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 713 (9th Cir. 2001). Plaintiff’s response to this 1 dismissed based on the doctrine of res judicata as to Defendants General 2 Atomics, General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, Inc., and Rosenberg Sphall 3 and Zeigen. 4 The employment-related and defamation issues in this case have also 5 been litigated in this Court previously. “Collateral estoppel bars relitigation 6 of issues actually litigated in a prior lawsuit.” Santos v. Todd Pac. 7 Shipyards Corp., 585 F. Supp. 482, 486 (C.D. Cal. 1984); see also Int’l Union, 8 994 F.2d at 1429 (“The dismissal of the action with prejudice constitutes a 9 final judgment on the merits.”); Headwaters Inc. v. U.S. Forest Serv., 399 10 F.3d 1047, 1052 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding that a stipulated dismissal of an 11 action with prejudice constitutes a final judgement on the merits). Collateral 12 estoppel “bars relitigation of issues adjudicated in an earlier proceeding if 13 three requirements are met: (1) the issue necessarily decided at the previous 14 proceeding is identical to the one which is sought to be relitigated; (2) the 15 first proceeding ended with a final judgment on the merits; and (3) the party 16 against whom collateral estoppel is asserted was a party or in privity with a 17 party at the first proceeding.” Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc., 442 18 F.3d 741, 746 (9th Cir. 2006). Plaintiff’s attempt to relitigate his 19 employment related and defamation issues in a separate case appears to be 20 barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel. Because Plaintiff’s Complaint 21 seeks to relitigate a decision from a previous federal case, No. 23-cv-00132- 22 WLH-JDE, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why this case should 23 not be dismissed as barred by collateral estoppel.

24 Within 21 days of the entry of this order, i.e., December 5, 2025,

25 Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause in writing why this suit is not barred 26 /// 27 /// 1 || as res judicata and collateral estoppel by the prior litigation in No. 23-ev- 2 | 00132-WLH-JDE. 3 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 6 || Dated: 11/14/2025 4

7 HON. WESLEY L. HSU

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/terence-c-davis-v-general-atomics-df01wjz>