

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bradshaw v. Office of the Inspector General MI5

Bradshaw · No. 25-cv-03983-SI · Decided June 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed the case sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court concluded that the plaintiffs' allegations concerning decades-long remote torture and related government conspiracies were fictitious and legally frivolous, making amendment futile.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan Illston
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 25, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03983-SI
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The self-represented plaintiffs filed a federal lawsuit, and the district court sua sponte reviewed whether subject matter jurisdiction existed before service of process.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently reviewed whether subject matter jurisdiction existed and applied the rule that an obviously frivolous complaint may be dismissed sua sponte before service of process.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Rebecca L. Bradshaw, et al. v. Office of the Inspector General MI5, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- pleadings
- constitutional law
- foreign affairs

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- civil rights
- federal jurisdiction
- foreign affairs

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint alleged a legally cognizable basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Whether the court could dismiss the complaint sua sponte before service of process because its allegations were obviously frivolous and fictitious.

HOLDINGS

1. An obviously frivolous complaint alleging fictitious claims does not confer federal subject matter jurisdiction and may be dismissed sua sponte before service of process.
2. Dismissal without leave to amend was appropriate because amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A paid complaint that is ‘obviously frivolous’ does not confer subject matter jurisdiction and may be dismissed sua sponte before service of process.” (at 1)

“The allegations are ‘sufficiently fantastical to defy reality as we know it[,]’ and thus the Court need not take the allegations as true.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged that Rebecca Bradshaw had been subjected to decades-long remote torture beginning when she was a minor, purportedly pursuant to an order involving George H.W. Bush and carried out by British intelligence agency MI5. It also alleged forced touchless interrogation, unlawful copying and confiscation of DNA, child trafficking, and various forms of technologically described torture. The court found the allegations sufficiently fantastical and fictitious that they could not support federal subject matter jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rebecca Bradshaw filed the action on May 7, 2025, asserting constitutional and federal and state criminal-law claims against the Office of the Inspector General for MI5 and former President George H.W. Bush. The court independently examined its jurisdiction and dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the complaint's allegations were fictitious and legally frivolous.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Henderson ex rel. Henderson v. Shinseki, 562 U.S. 428, 434
- Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n. 6 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 537
- Newby v. Obama, 681 F. Supp. 2d 53, 56 (D.D.C. 2010)
- Best v. Kelly, 39 F.3d 328, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1994)

- *Bivolarevic v. U.S. C.I.A.*, Case No. 09-4260 SBA, 2010 WL 890147, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2010)

OPINION

Bradshaw v. Office of the Inspector General MI5

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 REBECCA L. BRADSHAW, et al., Case No. 25-cv-03983-SI 8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR

9 v. LACK OF JURISDICTION

10 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

MI5, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 On May 7, 2025, self-represented plaintiff Rebecca Bradshaw filed this lawsuit against the 14 “Office of the Inspector General for MI5, DNA Warfare and Research and Development 15 Acquisition” (“MI5”) and former President George H.W. Bush.¹ It appears from the complaint that 16 Bradshaw filed the lawsuit on behalf of herself and her mother, Patricia Ralph. The complaint 17 alleges that Bradshaw was tortured (or subjected to “counter torture”) pursuant to an order issued 18 by President George H.W. Bush when he was the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and 19 that the torture/counter-torture was carried out remotely by the British intelligence agency MI5. The 20 complaint alleges, among other things, that Bradshaw was subjected to “forced touchless enhanced 21 interrogation of intelligence surveillance records,” and that her and her mother’s DNA “was copied 22 unlawfully (and later confiscated) from large private libraries in Israel and Rome” Compl. at 23 p. 5-6. Bradshaw alleges that the torture began when she was a minor in 1978 and “is a crime-in- 24 progress, and present obstructions to investigative processes are originating via a joint British and 25 U.S. order with the employment of criminal torture from at least five other states who have self- 26 identified through assaults.” Id. at 5. Although difficult to understand, the complaint appears to 27 1 claim that President Bush was involved in child trafficking and employed “former Nazis as counter- 2 torture.” Id. at 6. The forms of torture/counter-torture include but are not limited to “Hibernation 3 of neuro-regenerative cutaneous repair to increase injury and prevent repair”; “Use of deep sleep 4 states for unlawful operative blood removal and cosmetic procedures that can misrepresent 5 identity”; and “Use of Particle-level warfare to cloak pain and resistance during electrocution 6 assaults.” Id. at 1. The complaint alleges claims under the United States Constitution and federal 7 and state criminal statutes. 8 The Court has the independent obligation to ensure that it has jurisdiction over this lawsuit. 9 See *Henderson ex rel. Henderson v. Shinseki*, 562 U.S. 428, 434 (2011). “A paid complaint that is 10 ‘obviously frivolous’ does not confer subject matter jurisdiction and may be dismissed sua sponte 11 before service of process.” *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n. 6 (9th Cir. 1984) (quoting 12 *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 537 (1974)).

“Claims that are essentially fictitious include those 13 that allege ‘bizarre conspiracy theories, any fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind 14 [or] any sort of supernatural intervention.’” Newby v. Obama, 681 F. Supp. 2d 53, 56 (D.D.C. 2010) 15 (quoting Best v. Kelly, 39 F.3d 328, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (dismissing as frivolous and fictitious 16 claims that the President and government agents stalked the plaintiff, interfered with her job to 17 prevent her from attending confirmation hearings, illegally classified her as a national security risk, 18 and illegally surveilled her through a “Home guard surveillance network”); see also Bivolarevic v. 19 U.S. C.I.A., Case No. 09-4260 SBA, 2010 WL 890147, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2010) (dismissing 20 as frivolous and fictitious claims that the CIA subjected the plaintiff to “voice to skull technology” 21 used as a “mind control weapon”). 22 The Court has reviewed the complaint and concludes that it does not demonstrate a basis for 23 federal subject matter jurisdiction. Similar to the plaintiffs’ claims in Newby and Bivolarevic, the 24 allegations of the complaint are fictitious and legally frivolous. Plaintiffs allege a decades-long 25 campaign of “remote torture” conducted by a foreign government and orchestrated by former 26 President George H.W. Bush when he was at the CIA. The allegations are “sufficiently fantastical 27 to defy reality as we know it[,]” and thus the Court need not take the allegations as true. Ashcroft] that leave to amend would be futile. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES this case for lack of 2 || jurisdiction. 3 4 IT ISSO ORDERED. Sen SLi 6 Dated: June 25, 2025

SUSAN ILLSTON

7 United States District Judge 8 9 10 1] 13 16 Oo Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28