

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

Steven Wayne Bonilla v. Alameda County et al.

Bonilla · No. 25-cv-9526-PJH; 25-cv-9936-PJH; 25-cv-9937-PJH; 25-cv-10598-PJH · Decided December 22,
2025

OPINION

Bonilla

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA, Case Nos. 25-cv-9526-PJH Plaintiff, 25-cv-9936-PJH 8 25-cv-
9937-PJH v. 9 25-cv-10598-PJH 10 ALAMEDA COUNTY et. al.,

ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE

11 Defendants. CASES WITH PREJUDICE 12 13 14 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed multiple pro
se civil rights complaints under 42 15 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also
has a pending federal habeas 16 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See Bonilla v. Ayers,
Case No. 08-0471 17 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas
proceedings. See In 18 re Bonilla, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7. 19 Plaintiff presents
nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as 20 defendants various federal judges, state
judges, and other government officials. He 21 seeks relief regarding his underlying conviction or
how his other cases were handled by 22 the state and federal courts. 23 To the extent that plaintiff
seeks to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) in these cases, 24 he has been disqualified from
proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is 25 “under imminent danger of serious
physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28 26 U.S.C. 1915(g); In re Steven Bonilla,
Case No. 11-3180 CW; Bonilla v. Dawson, Case 27 No. 13-0951 CW. 1 The allegations in these
complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent 2 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he
may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an 3 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be
barred under Heck v. Humphrey, 512 4 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37,
43-54 (1971), Demos v. U.S. 5 District Court, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or Mullis v.
U.S. Bankruptcy Court, 6 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are
dismissed with 7 prejudice. The court notes that plaintiff has an extensive history of filing similar
frivolous 8 cases.¹ 9 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge’s
impartiality 10 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the
filings. 11 See United States v. Holland, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate 12
reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases 13 assigned

to that judge). 2 14 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk
15 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases. 16 IT
IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: December 22, 2025 18 19 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON

20 United States District Judge 21 22 23 24 25 26 1 The undersigned is the fourth judge assigned
cases filed by plaintiff. This is the 82nd 27 order issued by the undersigned since April 30, 2020,
pertaining to 1,306 different cases.