

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

Alison Helen Fairchild v. Brian Chesky

No. CV 25-1747 JGB (PVC) · No. No. CV 25-1747 JGB (PVC) · Decided March 14, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California summarily dismissed Alison Helen Fairchild’s action without prejudice. The court found that Fairchild violated a prior vexatious-litigant order by filing related claims in the Northern District of California to avoid the filing restrictions, and that venue was clearly appropriate in the Central District. The dismissal was entered on March 13, 2025.

OPINION

1 2 JS-6 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 11 12 ALISON HELEN FAIRCHILD, Case No. CV 25-1747 JGB (PVC) 13
Plaintiff, ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING 14 v. ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE 15
BRIAN CHESKY, et al., 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 On October 30, 2019, the Court declared
Arogant Hollywood and Alison Helen 20 Fairchild to be vexatious litigants and ORDERED: 21
22 [A]ny pleading submitted by Plaintiffs, or either of them, for the purpose of 23 initiating a new
civil action in this District is presumptively barred from 24 filing unless: (1) Plaintiffs
concurrently submit with such pleading both a 25 copy of this Order and a motion seeking leave
to commence a new civil 26 action; and (2) a District Judge or Magistrate Judge of this Court
thereafter 27 grants such leave and directs that the pleading be filed and the new civil 28 case be
initiated.

1 Hollywood and Fairchild v. Carrows California Family Restaurants et al., No. 2:18 CV 2 2098
JGB (GLS) (the “Order,” Dkt. No. 82). 3 4 In September 2024, without complying with the Order,
Fairchild filed a civil rights 5 complaint in the Northern District of California against multiple
defendants concerning 6 incidents related to a short-term property rental in Riverside.

Fairchild v. Han et al., No. 7 3:24 cv 6877 (N.D. Cal. filed Sept. 30, 2024); (see also Dkt. No. 1).
On February 28, 8 2025, the case was transferred to this Court. (Dkt. Nos. 33, 34). In so doing, the
Northern 9 District found it “clear that relevant witnesses and information related to this case are
all 10 located in the Los Angeles and Riverside area.” (Dkt.

No. 33 at 4) (citation omitted). 11 Moreover, the only Defendant who has appeared in this matter
resides in the Central 12 District. (Dkt. No. 13). Accordingly, the Northern District concluded that
Plaintiff has 13 engaged in impermissible forum shopping to avoid this Court’s Order. (Dkt. No.

33 at 3– 14 4). 15 16 Plaintiff cannot attempt to circumvent the Order and flaunt threshold venue
17 requirements by initiating claims that arise in this District in neighboring districts.

See, 18 e.g., *Greene v. Alhambra Hosp. Med. Ctr.*, No. 215CV00451JADNJK, 2016 WL 19
3176596, at *1 (D. Nev. May 17, 2016) (finding that the vexatious litigant has 20 impermissibly
“attempted to circumvent that vexatious litigant finding by initiating his 21 cases in two other
neighboring districts”) (collecting cases), report and recommendation 22 adopted, No.
215CV00451JADNJK, 2016 WL 3148389 (D.

Nev. June 2, 2016); see also 23 *id.* at *5 (“[The vexatious litigant] has long been aware that he
cannot circumvent the 24 vexatious litigant order in the Central District of California by simply
bringing claims that 25 arise in that forum in other district courts.”). Indeed, Courts routinely
reject such 26 attempts. See, e.g., *Johnson v. Commonwealth Hosp. LLC*, No.
224CV00590RFBNJK, 27 2024 WL 1554239, at *1 n.2 (D.

Nev. Apr. 10, 2024) (“Quite plainly, a plaintiff is not 28 permitted to bring suit in a distant district
as a means to avoid a vexatious litigant order.”); 1 || *Magee v. Clark*, No. CV 09-5784-ABC (RC),
2009 WL 2488040, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 2 || 11, 2009) (“Since being declared a vexatious litigant
in this district court, petitioner has 3 || filed at least three habeas corpus petitions in other district
courts challenging his 1965 4 || conviction and sentence in Los Angeles County Superior Court
case no. 272227, ina 5 || blatant attempt to avoid the Order of this Court declaring him a vexatious
litigant and 6 || requiring approval of any habeas filing by petitioner.”).

7 8 Here, for the convenience of the parties, convenience of the witnesses, ease of 9 || access to the
evidence, and local interest in the controversy, venue is clearly appropriate 10 || only in the Central
District.

Therefore, the Court concludes that Plaintiff filed her 11 || Complaint in the Northern District to
deliberately flout the Vexatious Litigant Order. 12 || Accordingly, this action is summarily
DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. 13 14 IT IS SO ORDERED. 15 16 17 18 Of. 19 ||
DATED: March 13, 2025 — Pe ☐☐ 20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 21 22 || Presented
by: 23. 24 hu MNt— 25 26 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 27 28