

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

Sheila-Jo Hunter Tellez v. Donald J. Proiettii

Hunter Tellez v. Proiettii · No. 1:24-cv-00408-KES-SKO · Decided August 4, 2025

OPINION

Hunter Tellez v. Proiettii

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 SHEILA-JO HUNTER TELLEZ, Case No. 1:24-cv-00408-KES-SKO 11 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING

12 v. CASE WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND

13

DONALD J. PROIETTII, Doc. 4

14 Defendant. 15

16 17 18 19 20 Plaintiff Sheila-Jo Hunter Tellez proceeds pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
action 21 initiated on April 5, 2024. Docs. 1, 3. This matter was referred to a United States
magistrate 22 judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 23 On April 23,
2024, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff’s complaint and issued 24 findings and
recommendations recommending that this action be dismissed without leave to 25 amend for
failure to state a cognizable claim. Doc. 4. On May 8, 2024, plaintiff timely filed 26 objections.
Doc. 5. Plaintiff focuses her objections on three purportedly analogous cases, one of 27 28 1
which appears to be fictitious, and the remaining two of which do not support her argument.¹ In 2
any event, plaintiff’s objections are unpersuasive. Plaintiff contends that this Court has 3
jurisdiction to review constitutional questions regarding a state court “judge signing orders out of
4 capacity or ‘in vacation.’” Doc. 5 at 3. It is unclear exactly what plaintiff is referring to, however
5 to the extent she argues that the order she seeks to appeal was not a judicial action, her
complaint 6 squarely challenges court orders by a state judge regarding an estate’s claim of
ownership to 7 property. See Doc. 1 at 3. As the magistrate judge noted, under the Rooker-
Feldman doctrine, 8 this Court lacks jurisdiction to review such orders. 9 In accordance with 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court conducted a de novo review of this 10 case. Having carefully
reviewed the matter, including plaintiff’s objections, the Court concludes 11 that the findings and
recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. 12 /// 13 /// 14 /// 15 /// 16 /// 17

/// 18 /// 19 /// 20 1 Plaintiff cites “Lockhart v. Fretta, 766 F.3d 505 (8th Cir. 2014),” “Centifanti v. Nix, 865 F.3d 21 384 (3rd Cir. 2017),” and Exxon Mobile Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280

(2005). Lockhart does not appear to be a real case by a search of its name or citation. Centifanti 22 appears to be a real case, but with an incorrect citation, and it was decided in 1989, not 2017. See 23 Centifanti v. Nix, 865 F.2d 1422, 1424 (3rd Cir. 1989). Plaintiff’s objections misrepresent the holding of Centifanti, asserting that the court held that the “Rooker-Feldman doctrine does not 24 apply to a constitutional question regarding a judge signing orders out of capacity or in vacation.” Doc. 5 at 2. Centifanti does not support plaintiff’s claim that she may challenge in federal district 25 court various orders from her state court case. Rather, Centifanti held that the district court had jurisdiction over a constitutional challenge seeking prospective declaratory relief as to a state rule. 26 Exxon is a Supreme Court case discussing the Rooker-Feldman doctrine but provides no support 27 for plaintiff’s argument in this case. Plaintiff is warned that submitting a fictitious case citation and summary to the Court may be grounds for sanctions under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of 28 Civil Procedure. 1 Accordingly: 2 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 23, 2024, Doc. 4, are adopted in 3 full; 4 2. This action is dismissed without leave to amend; and 5 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate all pending motions and close this case. 6 7

g | IT ISSO ORDERED. _

9 Dated: _ August 3, 2025 4h | |

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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