

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

**Albert Bonds, Jr. v. Jennifer Proctor**

Bonds v. Proctor · No. 2:25-cv-02417-DAD-SCR · Decided November 17, 2025

---

**OPINION**

Proctor

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ALBERT BONDS, Jr., No. 2:25-cv-02417-DAD-SCR 12 Plaintiff,

13 v. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

14 JENNIFER PROCTOR,

15 Defendant. 16

17 Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this matter, which is referred to the undersigned pursuant 18 to  
Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court previously granted Plaintiff leave 19  
to proceed in forma pauperis and screened Plaintiff’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e).  
20 ECF No. 3. Plaintiff was advised of the deficiencies with his complaint and given 28 days to  
file 21 an amended complaint. Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, and the undersigned  
22 recommends this action be dismissed for the reasons stated in the prior screening order. 23 I.  
The Complaint 24 Plaintiff’s complaint is only three-pages long and names one defendant, Judge  
Jennifer 25 Proctor of Solano County Superior Court. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 2. The factual allegations are  
sparse, 26 consisting of five sentences. Plaintiff alleges Defendant violated his constitutional  
rights and 27 ignored his claims that he was exempt from “statutory codes.” Id. at ¶¶ 1-2. Plaintiff  
alleges he 28 was held “in custody for 60 days, claiming incompetence.” Id. at ¶ 3. Plaintiff  
further alleges 1 that Defendant refused to accept his affidavits and “ignored relevant case law.”  
Id. at ¶¶ 4-5. 2 Plaintiff then lists 20 different causes of action, with no factual allegations  
described in support of 3 any of them. The counts are simply, for example: violation of due  
process, security fraud, 4 kidnapping, chattel theft, etc. Plaintiff seeks only monetary relief, in the  
form of a judgment of 5 \$100 million. 6 II. The Prior Screening Order 7 The prior order advised  
Plaintiff that judges generally have absolute immunity for judicial 8 acts taken within the  
jurisdiction of their courts. See Lund v. Cowan, 5 F.4th 964, 970 (9th Cir. 9 2021) (“It is well  
settled that judges are generally immune from suit for money damages.”). ECF  
10 No. 3 at 3. The order stated that this immunity applies unless a judge “acts in the clear absence  
of

11 all jurisdiction or performs an act that is not judicial in nature.” Schucker v. Rockwood, 846  
F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988). Id. Plaintiff was also informed that he may not merely list  
potential 13 causes of action without supporting factual content, as his original complaint does. A  
formulaic 14 recitation of the elements of a cause of action does not suffice to state a claim. Bell  
Atlantic Corp. 15 v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007); Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678  
(2009). ECF No. 16 3 at 4. 17 The Court noted that leave to amend may be futile, but given  
Plaintiff’s pro se status and 18 the vagueness of the allegations, the Court allowed leave to amend.  
Id. at 4. Plaintiff was given 19 28 days to file an amended complaint. That time expired on  
November 3, 2025, and no amended 20 complaint was filed. 21 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY  
RECOMMENDED that: 22 1. This action be dismissed for failure to state a claim and for seeking  
monetary damages 23 against a defendant immune from such relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
1915(e); and 24 2. The Clerk be directed to enter Judgment and close this case. 25 These findings  
and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 26 assigned to this case,  
pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen (14) 27 days after being  
served with these findings and recommendations, either party may file written 28 objections with  
the court. Such document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s 1 || Findings and  
Recommendations.” Local Rule 304(d). The parties are advised that failure to file 2 || objections  
within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. 3 || Martinez v.  
Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 4 || DATED: November 17, 2025.

SEAN C. RIORDAN

7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28