

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Bill Lietzke v. Shashy Realty, LLC; and Paul Shashy, LLC

Lietzke · No. 1:25-cv-00732-BLW · Decided April 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho dismissed without prejudice a pro se plaintiff’s complaint concerning an alleged attempted eviction from an Alabama rental property. The court concluded that the complaint did not establish personal jurisdiction over the Alabama defendants or proper venue in Idaho, denied the application to proceed in forma pauperis as moot, and declined to transfer the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
WRITING FOR THE COURT	B. Lynn Winmill
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	April 3, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00732-BLW
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court conducted its initial screening of the nonprisoner pauper complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), which requires dismissal of claims that are frivolous or malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. For personal jurisdiction, the court required a prima facie showing of jurisdictional facts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Bill Lietzke v. Shashy Realty, LLC, Paul Shashy, LLC

TOPICS

- personal jurisdiction
- venue
- civil procedure
- landlord tenant
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint alleged sufficient facts to establish personal jurisdiction over the Alabama defendants in Idaho.
2. Whether venue was proper in the District of Idaho under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
3. Whether the court should dismiss the action without prejudice rather than transfer it to another district in light of the jurisdictional and venue defects and plaintiff's prior vexatious-litigant designation.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to establish personal jurisdiction because it alleged no connection between the defendants or the events underlying the claims and Idaho.
2. Venue was improper in Idaho because the complaint did not allege that any defendant resided there, that a substantial part of the events or property was located there, or that another venue was unavailable while defendants were subject to personal jurisdiction there.
3. The action was dismissed without prejudice, and the court declined to transfer it, requiring plaintiff to petition the proper Alabama court if he wished to proceed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal due process requires that a nonresident defendant have minimum contacts with the forum state such that the exercise of personal jurisdiction does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.”

“Based on the facts alleged in the Complaint, it does not appear that Plaintiff can come forward with any facts showing that this Court has personal jurisdiction over this case or that venue in Idaho is proper.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lietzke, an Alabama citizen, alleged that Alabama-based entities attempted to evict him from a rental property in 2025 despite his assertion that he had paid rent under a written contract. The alleged conduct occurred in Alabama, and the complaint contained no allegations that defendants operated in Idaho or that any incident or transaction connected to the claims occurred there. Lietzke had previously been declared a vexatious litigant in an Alabama federal district court and had filed a related action against the same defendants in Utah.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint alleged that Alabama defendants attempted to evict Lietzke from a rental property in 2025 despite his alleged compliance with the parties' written contract. Before service, the court determined that the complaint did not allege facts establishing personal jurisdiction or proper venue in Idaho. In light of plaintiff's prior vexatious-litigant designation in Alabama and his prior Utah action involving the same defendants, the court denied the in forma pauperis application as moot and dismissed the complaint without prejudice rather than transferring it.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- International Shoe Co. v. State of Washington, International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945)
- Lake v. Lake, 817 F.2d 1416, 1420 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Technology Associates, Inc., 557 F.2d 1280, 1287 (9th Cir. 1977)
- Lietzke v. County of Montgomery, et al., 2:21-cv-00209-RAH-JTA (M.D. Ala. 2007)
- Lietzke v. Shashy Realty, LLC, 2:25-cv-00701-AMA (C.D. Utah 2025)

OPINION

Lietzke

PER CURIAM.

32

\UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

BILL LIETZKE,

Plaintiff, Case No. 1:25-cv-00732-BLW

vs. INITIAL REVIEW ORDER

BY SCREENING JUDGE

SHASHY REALTY, LLC; and PAUL

SHASHY, LLC; Defendants. Pro se Plaintiff Bill Lietzke, a citizen of Montgomery, Alabama, has filed a civil Complaint against various Alabama Defendants who allegedly unlawfully attempted to evict him from a rental property in 2025, despite Plaintiff's assertion that he had paid rent in compliance with the parties' written contract. He desires to proceed in forma pauperis. The Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA)¹ requires the Court to screen all non-prisoner pauper complaints to determine whether they have stated a claim upon which relief can be granted before being served on the defendants. 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Court must dismiss any claims that are frivolous or malicious, that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). 1 Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e, et seq. The following problems prevent Plaintiff from proceeding. First, a federal court must satisfy itself that it has authority to exercise personal jurisdiction over the defendant. Federal due process requires that a nonresident defendant have minimum contacts with the forum state such that the exercise of personal jurisdiction does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945). To avoid dismissal, Plaintiff must make a prima facie

showing of jurisdictional facts. *Lake v. Lake*, 817 F.2d 1416, 1420 (9th Cir. 1987). Personal jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant exists if (1) the nonresident defendant has some connection with the forum state; (2) the claim arises out of the defendant's forum-related activities; and (3) the exercise of jurisdiction is reasonable. See *Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Technology Assoc., Inc.*, 557 F.2d 1280, 1287 (9th Cir. 1977). Plaintiff is a citizen of Alabama, the acts complained of occurred in Alabama, and the Defendants appear to be Alabama-based entities. There are no allegations that the entities operate in Idaho or that any incident or transaction connected to the claims occurred in Idaho. No facts support a conclusion that the Court has personal jurisdiction over the Alabama defendants. Second, venue must also be proper. Legal actions may be brought only in

(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located;

(2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or

(3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). No facts support a conclusion that venue in Idaho is appropriate for the same reason that personal jurisdiction does not lie. Based on the facts alleged in the Complaint, it does not appear that Plaintiff can come forward with any facts showing that this Court has personal jurisdiction over this case or that venue in Idaho is proper. Because Plaintiff previously has been declared a vexatious litigant in the Alabama federal district court, this Court finds it appropriate to dismiss this case and require Plaintiff to petition the proper Alabama court to be able to proceed. The Court will not transfer this case for Plaintiff, who appears to be attempting to dodge the vexatious litigant order in the proper jurisdiction. See, e.g., *Lietzke v. County of Montgomery, et al.*, 2:21-cv-00209-RAH-JTA (M.D. Ala. 2007) (dismissed with prejudice and recognizing Lietzke as a vexatious litigant). This Order is entered without any opinion as to whether this new cause of action is governed by the vexatious litigant order. Plaintiff has filed over 228 cases in the federal court system, many of which are repetitive and a waste of scarce judicial resources funded by taxpayers. He has filed numerous complaints in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. His case against these same defendants brought in Utah was recently dismissed after he failed to prosecute the case in the face of an order to show cause why venue in Utah was proper. See *Lietzke v. Shashy Realty, LLC*, 2:25-cv-00701-AMA (C.D. Utah 2025). Accordingly, Court will dismiss this case without prejudice.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's in Forma Pauperis Application (Dkt. 1) is DENIED as MOOT.

2. The Complaint (Dkt. 2) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

As DATED: April 3, 2026 ns Asx 8B. Lynn Winmill ichg U.S. District Court Judge

INITIAL REVIEW ORDER BY SCREENING JUDGE - 4