

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Shaun Buck v. Judge Andrew Ellis et al.

Buck · No. 1:26-cv-00177-DCN · Decided May 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho denies Shaun Buck’s motion for a temporary restraining order, motion to disqualify all Article III judges, and grants his requests to file electronically and supplement his disqualification motion. The court orders Buck to show cause why the action should not be dismissed based on Younger abstention, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the Eleventh Amendment, judicial immunity, and lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Defendants may submit briefing on the jurisdictional issues by May 15, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	May 5, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00177-DCN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a civil-rights action challenging Idaho state-court protective-order proceedings and the resulting listing in the National Crime Information Center database. The court ruled on plaintiff's motions for electronic filing, judicial disqualification, leave to file supplemental materials, and a temporary restraining order, and issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and other legal bars.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion to disqualify was evaluated under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455. A temporary restraining order was evaluated under the four-factor preliminary-relief test, including likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, balance of equities, and the public interest. The court also considered whether abstention and jurisdictional doctrines barred the action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Shaun Buck v. Judge Andrew Ellis, Richard Bevan, 其他 named defendants

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

injunctions

section 1983

civil procedure

eleventh amendment immunity

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Federal jurisdiction

Constitutional law

Equitable remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Buck showed sufficient grounds to require disqualification of the presiding judge under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455.
2. Whether Buck was entitled to a temporary restraining order requiring defendants to take mandatory action concerning his NCIC listing.
3. Whether the action appeared barred by Younger abstention, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the Eleventh Amendment, and judicial immunity, warranting an order to show cause before dismissal.
4. Whether Buck should be permitted to file documents electronically and submit supplemental filing materials.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to disqualify the presiding judge was denied because Buck did not provide sufficient evidence of personal bias, prejudice, or an objectively reasonable basis to question the judge's impartiality. Professional acquaintance and generalized allegations of bias were insufficient.
2. The temporary restraining order was denied because Buck failed to establish a likelihood of success on the merits, and the requested mandatory relief was not warranted.
3. The court preliminarily determined that Younger abstention, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the Eleventh Amendment, and judicial immunity likely barred the action, and ordered Buck to show cause why the case should not be dismissed.
4. The court granted Buck permission to file electronically in the action and granted leave to submit his supplemental materials, subject to applicable court rules and procedures.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Put simply, the Court is of the opinion that multiple legal doctrines bar this suit and that it lacks jurisdiction over the same.” (II.C)

“A mandatory injunction goes well beyond simply maintaining the status quo pendente lite and is particularly disfavored.” (II.D)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Buck challenged Idaho state-court proceedings involving a civil protective order that resulted in his listing in the National Crime Information Center database. He alleged that the protective order was void and that the listing caused a federal firearm ban, international-border screening, and increased law-enforcement interactions. He

sought immediate removal of the protective-order listing and disqualification of all Article III judges in the District of Idaho based largely on alleged professional connections among the court, its law clerks, and defendants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Buck filed this action on March 26, 2026. The case was initially assigned to Chief United States Magistrate Judge Raymond E. Patricco, reassigned to Chief District Judge Amanda K. Brailsford, and then reassigned after Judge Brailsford recused herself. The court granted leave to file electronically and leave to file supplemental materials, denied the motion to disqualify all Article III judges and the motion for a temporary restraining order, and ordered Buck to show cause by May 15, 2026, why the case should not be dismissed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Pellegrini v. Merch.*, 2017 WL 735740, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2017)
- *Focus Media, Inc. v. Nat'l Broad. Co. (In re Focus Media, Inc.)*, 378 F.3d 916, 930 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Buck v. Steckel*, 2025 WL 2855279 (D. Idaho Oct. 8, 2025)
- *Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd.*, 420 U.S. 592, 608 (1975)
- *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1163-1165 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983)
- *Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 900-901 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415 (1923)
- *CTIA-The Wireless Ass'n v. City of Berkeley*, 854 F.3d 1105, 1114 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *L.A. Mem'l Coliseum Comm'n v. NFL*, 634 F.2d 1197, 1200 (9th Cir. 1980)
- *Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 879 (9th Cir. 2009)
- *Jimenez v. Barber*, 252 F.2d 550, 554 (9th Cir. 1958)