

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.

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