

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Barry Stuart Halajian v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, NA, et al.

Halajian · No. 2:23-cv-01522-DJC-SCR · Decided April 29, 2025

SUMMARY

These Findings and Recommendations address three motions to dismiss the First Amended Complaint in a pro se action arising from a Connecticut prejudgment remedy proceeding and a settlement agreement. The magistrate judge recommends granting the motions without leave to amend, concluding that certain defendants lack sufficient contacts with California and that the claims against JP Morgan Chase Bank fail to state a claim. The document also discusses personal jurisdiction, failure to state a claim, indispensable parties, state action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the effect of the Connecticut settlement.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	April 29, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-01522-DJC-SCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se plaintiff filed an amended federal complaint asserting declaratory and injunctive relief, a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 due-process claim, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and cancellation of instruments. Defendants moved to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), 12(b)(6), and 12(b)(7). The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations rather than a final district-court order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On Rule 12(b)(2), the plaintiff bears the burden of demonstrating personal jurisdiction, but absent an evidentiary hearing need only make a prima facie showing of jurisdictional facts. On Rule 12(b)(6), the court tests the legal sufficiency of the complaint, accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, and construes them in the plaintiff's favor, while disregarding legal conclusions and conclusory allegations. Pro se pleadings are construed under less stringent standards. On

default, entry of default or default judgment is discretionary and does not automatically entitle a plaintiff to judgment.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

nonprecedential

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

section 1983

due process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

constitutional law

civil rights

contracts

commercial litigation

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could exercise personal jurisdiction over Connecticut-based defendants H&G, Trudell, Ostrowski, and CSMS.
2. Whether the amended complaint stated a claim against Chase for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, cancellation of instruments, and a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 due-process violation.
3. Whether plaintiff could maintain an independent claim for declaratory or injunctive relief.
4. Whether default should be entered or default judgment granted against CSMS or Bay Advance.
5. Whether the Connecticut judgment enforcing the settlement agreement had preclusive effect while an appeal remained pending.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint and submitted evidence did not make a prima facie showing of general or specific personal jurisdiction in California over the Connecticut law firm and attorney. Their alleged conduct involved preparing and filing Connecticut process and serving it in Connecticut, which did not establish sufficient California contacts.
2. The amended complaint failed to state claims against Chase for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, cancellation of instruments, and a § 1983 due-process violation.
3. Because the amended complaint failed to state an underlying claim, plaintiff could not maintain an independent claim for declaratory or injunctive relief.
4. Default should not be entered and default judgment should not be granted against CSMS or Bay Advance. CSMS should be dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim, while the claims against Bay Advance should be stayed pending the Connecticut appellate decision concerning the settlement agreement.
5. Under Connecticut law, the Connecticut judgment enforcing the settlement agreement retains preclusive effect while an appeal is pending.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Merely complying with a notice issued under Connecticut state law does not make Chase a state actor.” (at 20)

“The judgment here was issued in Connecticut, and this Court accordingly applies Connecticut law, which makes a judgment preclusive while on appeal.” (at 23)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he entered into a combined receivables-purchase and loan agreement with Bay Advance and that the agreement was unconscionable. Bay Advance pursued a Connecticut prejudgment attachment proceeding involving plaintiff's Chase bank account; H&G and Trudell allegedly prepared the legal documents, and Ostrowski served process in Connecticut. Plaintiff and Bay Advance later entered into a Connecticut settlement agreement that purported to resolve claims relating to the California action, and a Connecticut court found the agreement clear, unambiguous, and enforceable.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on July 25, 2023, and the court previously granted motions to dismiss with leave to amend. Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint, after which H&G, Trudell, Chase, and Ostrowski moved to dismiss. The court recommended granting those motions without leave to amend, dismissing CSMS sua sponte, denying plaintiff's request for entry of default against CSMS and Bay Advance, and staying the action as to Bay Advance pending resolution of a Connecticut appeal concerning the parties' settlement agreement.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Technology Associates, Inc., 557 F.2d 1280, 1285 (9th Cir. 1977)
- Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d 797, 800-02 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Sher v. Johnson, 911 F.2d 1357, 1361 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Caruth v. International Psychoanalytical Ass'n, 59 F.3d 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995)
- N. Star Int'l v. Ariz. Corp. Comm'n, 720 F.2d 578, 581 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676, 678 (2009)
- Hishon v. King & Spalding, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984)
- Love v. United States, 915 F.2d 1242, 1245 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters, 459 U.S. 519, 526 (1983)
- Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 250 F.3d 668, 688-90 (9th Cir. 2001)

- *Roberts v. City of Fairbanks*, 947 F.3d 1191, 1204 (9th Cir. 2020)
- *Camacho v. Major League Baseball*, 297 F.R.D. 457, 460-61 (S.D. Cal. 2013)
- *Foley v. Interactive Data Corp.*, 47 Cal. 3d 654, 683, 254 Cal. Rptr. 211, 765 P.2d 373 (1988)
- *In re Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, 2017 WL 3727318, at *48 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2017)
- *Lincoln Benefit Life Co. v. Dallal*, 500 F. Supp. 3d 1041, 1068 (C.D. Cal. 2020)
- *Loneragan v. Connecticut Food Store, Inc.*, 168 Conn. 122, 132 (1975)
- *Kendall v. Amster*, 108 Conn. App. 319, 325 (2008)
- *Benavidez v. County of San Diego*, 993 F.3d 1134, 1144 (9th Cir. 2021)
- *Price v. Hawaii*, 939 F.2d 702, 707-08 (9th Cir. 1991)
- *O'Handley v. Weber*, 62 F.4th 1145, 1155-56 (9th Cir. 2023)
- *Heineke v. Santa Clara University*, 965 F.3d 1009, 1013 (9th Cir. 2020)
- *Dailey v. Bank of America*, 106 F. App'x 533 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Fiedler v. Clark*, 714 F.2d 77, 79 (9th Cir. 1983)
- *Stock West, Inc. v. Confederated Tribes*, 873 F.2d 1221, 1225 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Ajetunmobi v. Clarion Mortg. Capital*, 595 F. App'x 680, 685 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Wallis v. Spencer*, 202 F.3d 1126, 1144 (9th Cir. 2000)
- *Ruiz v. Snohomish County Public Utility Dist.*, 824 F.3d 1161, 1165 (9th Cir. 2016)
- *Milton H. Greene Archives, Inc. v. Marilyn Monroe LLC*, 692 F.3d 983, 990 n.6 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *PepsiCo, Inc. v. Cal. Sec. Cans*, 238 F. Supp. 2d 1172, 1174 (C.D. Cal. 2002)
- *Draper v. Coombs*, 792 F.2d 915, 924-25 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *Aldabe v. Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir. 1980)
- *Sato v. Orange Cnty. Dep't of Educ.*, 861 F.3d 923, 928 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Tritz v. U.S. Postal Service*, 721 F.3d 1133, 1141 (9th Cir. 2013)
- *Barash v. Lembo*, 348 Conn. 264, 277 (2023)
- *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1434, 1437, 1439 (9th Cir. 1985)
- *Girolametti v. Michael Horton Assoc.*, 332 Conn. 67, 75 (2019)
- *Dodenhoff v. Cache Creek Foods*, 2015 WL 1638002, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2015)
- *Silverston v. Dep't of Treasury*, 644 F.2d 1341, 1345 (9th Cir. 1981)
- *Abagninin v. AMVAC Chem. Corp.*, 545 F.3d 733, 742 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Akhtar v. Mesa*, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Solutions, Inc.*, 194 F.3d 980, 986 (9th Cir. 1999)
- *Martinez v. Yist*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 9 10 BARRY STUART HALAJIAN, No. 2:23-cv-01522-DJC-SCR 11 12 Plaintiff,
13 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS v. 14 JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, NA, et al., 15
16 Defendants. 17 18 Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this matter, which is referred to the
undersigned pursuant 19 to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636.

Plaintiff is effectively trying to challenge 20 Defendants' actions with respect to a Connecticut
state court legal proceeding that he has since 21 settled. Defendants have filed three Motions to
Dismiss (ECF No. 43, 45 & 51). Plaintiff filed 22 untimely opposition briefs (ECF Nos. 58 & 59)
and Defendants filed replies (ECF Nos. 61 & 62). 23 Magistrate Judge Barnes took the motions
under submission on May 14, 2024.

ECF No. 67. 24 This case was then resassigned to the undersigned on August 6, 2024. The
undersigned 25 recommends that the motions to dismiss be granted without leave to amend. 26 I.
Procedural History and Background 27 Plaintiff Barry Stuart Halajian filed this action on July 25,
2023. ECF No. 1.

The Complaint 28 named as Defendants: 1) JP Morgan Chase Bank ("Chase"); 2) Elizabeth
Ostrowski; 3) Hassett & 1 George, PC ("H&G"); 4) James Trudell; and 5) Connecticut State
Marshals Commission. ECF No. 2 1. Plaintiff alleged he is an electrical contractor who entered
into a "combined receivables purchase 3 agreement and loan agreement" with Bay Advance, LLC
("Bay Advance").

Id. at ¶¶ 6-7. Plaintiff 4 alleged that H&G and Trudell were attorneys working for Bay Advance
and prepared legal 5 documents to seize funds from Plaintiff's account at Chase. Id. at 1-2.
Plaintiff alleged he Id. at ¶ 6 7. Plaintiff complained of a "bait and switch" and that Bay Advance
confused or pressured him 7 into modifying the agreement. Id. at ¶¶ 9-10.

Plaintiff claimed the agreement with Bay Advance 8 was unconscionable and sought to cancel it.
However, Bay Advance was not a named defendant 9 in the original complaint. 10 Plaintiff also
included allegations concerning a legal action that Bay Advance filed against 11 Plaintiff in
Connecticut state court, Case No. FST-CV23-6061957-S (the "Connecticut case").1 12 ECF No.
43-1 at 3.

Ostrowski was alleged to be an employee of the Connecticut State Marshals 13 Service and was
involved in serving a document Plaintiff referred to as a "Notice of ex parte 14 prejudgment
remedy/claim for hearing to dissolve or modify" (the "Notice"). Id. at ¶ 35. 15 After Plaintiff filed
the Complaint in this case, Plaintiff and Bay Advance entered into a 16 settlement agreement in
the Connecticut case on or about August 18, 2023.

Relevant to the instant 17 action, Paragraph 11 of the Settlement Agreement provides in part: 18 In
addition, upon the execution of this agreement, Barry Stuart Halajian and/or Industrial Electric

shall within 3 business days withdraw or dismiss any and all lawsuits filed against 19 the parties to this agreement as well as Beth Ostrowski, J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, Hassett 20 & George, PC or its employees/agents, that was reportedly filed in California that relates to or arises out of the Contract (hereinafter referred to as the “California Action”).

21 22 ECF No. 43-1 at 21. Paragraph 11 further provided: “The Parties agree that this Agreement 23 completely resolves any and all claims between the Parties that were asserted, or that could have 24 been asserted, against any of the Parties named in the Action or relating to or arising out of the 25 26 1 Plaintiff’s pleadings do not clearly identify or explain the Connecticut case.

The Court adds 27 information about that case in order to make the background of the instant action coherent. The Court takes judicial notice of the filings from the Connecticut case, in which Plaintiff was 28 represented by counsel. 1 Contract, as well as claims asserted and parties to the California Action...”. Id. The California 2 Action referred to in this settlement agreement is the instant lawsuit.² Despite the agreement’s 3 term apparently requiring Plaintiff to dismiss the instant lawsuit, he has not done so.

4 Defendants filed motions to dismiss the Complaint in this action (ECF Nos. 7 & 24). On 5 January 22, 2024, the Court granted those motions with leave to amend. ECF No. 37. 6 Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”)³ on February 15, 2024. ECF No. 38. It 7 adds Bay Advance as a party. ECF No. 38 at 1, 19.

The FAC asserts the same four causes of action 8 as the original complaint: 1) declaratory and injunctive relief; 2) a due process claim under 42 9 U.S.C. § 1983; 3) breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing; and 4) cancellation of 10 instruments. ECF No. 38 at 20-27. Plaintiff attaches to the FAC a copy of the Notice, the contract 11 with Bay Advance, and other exhibits.

ECF No. 38 at 31-118. 12 Defendants Chase, H&G, Trudell, and Ostrowski filed motions to dismiss the FAC. 13 Plaintiff failed to file timely oppositions. On April 2, 2024, Magistrate Judge Barnes issued an 14 Order to Show Cause (“OSC”) why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution, 15 instructing Plaintiff to respond within 14 days. ECF No. 55 at 2.

Plaintiff filed opposition briefs 16 on April 8 and April 17, 2024, and filed a response to the OSC one-day late, on April 17. ECF 17 Nos. 58-60. Plaintiff claims he was not timely served with the motions, that he has been working 18 more than full-time, and has found it “very difficult to set aside time write [sic] these reply briefs 19 and do research.” ECF No. 60 at 2-3.

In light of Plaintiff’s pro se status, the Court accepts the 20 untimely filed opposition briefs and considers the OSC discharged. Plaintiff is cautioned that he 21 must comply with the Local Rules, including Local Rule 230(c) (“A failure to file a timely 22 opposition may also be construed by the Court as a non-opposition to the motion.”). 23 //// 24 25 2 In granting a motion to enforce the

settlement agreement, the Connecticut Superior Court ruled the agreement was “clear, unambiguous, and contained all essential terms.” ECF No. 43-1 at 37.

In making that ruling, the Connecticut Superior Court specifically identified the term in the settlement agreement “relat[ing] to a certain California lawsuit brought by [Halajian],” i.e., the instant lawsuit. This document is erroneously captioned as a Second Amended Complaint. II. Legal Standards for Motions to Dismiss A. Rule 12(b)(2) 3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) provides that “[a] defendant may move, prior to trial, to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction.” *Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Technology Associates, Inc.*, 557 F.2d 1280, 1285 (9th Cir.

1977). “Where a defendant moves to dismiss a complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction, the plaintiff bears the burden of demonstrating that jurisdiction is appropriate.” *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 800 (9th Cir. 2004).

However, “in the absence of an evidentiary hearing, the plaintiff need only make a prima facie showing of jurisdictional facts.” *Sher v. Johnson*, 911 F.2d 1357, 1361 (9th Cir. 1990). B. Rule 12(b)(6) 12 The purpose of a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) is to test the legal sufficiency of the complaint. *N. Star Int’l v. Ariz. Corp. Comm’n*, 720 F.2d 578, 581 (9th Cir.

1983). “Dismissal can be based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory.” *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). A plaintiff is required to allege “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

In determining whether a complaint states a claim on which relief may be granted, the court accepts as true the allegations in the complaint and construes the allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984); *Love v. United States*, 915 F.2d 1242, 1245 (9th Cir. 1989).

In general, pro se complaints are held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972). However, the court need not assume the truth of legal conclusions cast in the form of factual allegations. See *Moss v. U.S. Secret Service*, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009) 1 While Rule 8(a) does not require detailed factual allegations, “it demands more than an unadorned, the defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678.

A pleading is insufficient if it offers mere “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555; see also *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676 5

(“Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.”).

Moreover, it is inappropriate to assume that the plaintiff “can prove facts which it has not alleged or that the defendants have violated the... laws in ways that have not been alleged.” *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters*, 945 U.S. 519, 526 (1983). In ruling on a motion to dismiss brought pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), the court is permitted to consider material which is properly submitted as part of the complaint, documents that are not physically attached to the complaint if their authenticity is not contested and the plaintiff’s complaint necessarily relies on them and matters of public record.

Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 14 F.3d 668, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2001). Rule 12(b)(7) concerns failure to join an indispensable party under Rule 19. In determining whether a party is indispensable, a court must determine: 1) whether an absent party is necessary to the action; and then, 2) if the party is necessary but cannot be joined, whether the party is indispensable such that in equity and good conscience the suit should be dismissed.

Roberts v. City of Fairbanks, 947 F.3d 1191, 1204 (9th Cir. 2020). “The failure to join a party under Rule 19 can only lead to dismissal of a suit where the court cannot obtain jurisdiction over the necessary party and that party is determined to be indispensable to the action.” *Camacho v. Major League Baseball*, 297 F.R.D. 457, 460 (S.D. Cal. 2013).

The movant bears the burden of producing evidence in support of the motion, the Court may consider matters outside the pleadings, and a “motion for failure to join an indispensable party demands a fact specific and practical inquiry.” *Id.* at 460-61 (internal quotation and citation omitted). III. Analysis 2 A. Motion to Dismiss by Hassett & George and Trudell (ECF No. 43) 3 Defendants H&G and Trudell argue the FAC does not establish personal jurisdiction over them as they are a law firm and attorney practicing in the State of Connecticut.

Defendants also argue that Plaintiff has specifically released the claims in this lawsuit against them by executing a settlement agreement in Connecticut state court. ECF No. 43 at 7.4 7 1. Rule 12(b)(2) – Personal Jurisdiction 8 When a defendant moves to dismiss a complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction, the plaintiff bears the burden of demonstrating that jurisdiction is appropriate.

Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d 797, 800 (9th Cir. 2004). Where, as here, the motion is based on written materials rather than an evidentiary hearing, the plaintiff need only make a prima facie showing of jurisdictional facts. *Id.* In such cases, the court inquires into whether the plaintiff’s pleadings and affidavits make a prima facie showing of personal jurisdiction.

Caruth v. 14 International Psychoanalytical Ass'n, 59 F.3d 126, 128 (9th Cir.1995). Plaintiff's FAC alleges in 15 conclusory manner that the "actions taken by Defendants to seize money/personal property from 16 my Bank account" occurred in California. ECF No. 38 at ¶ 1. Plaintiff contends that service of 17 process at a Chase Bank branch in California was a sufficient minimum contact.

Id. at ¶ 3. 18 Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants "availed themselves of the benefits and privileges of 19 conducting activities" in California. Id. at ¶ 9. Plaintiff claims that Defendant Bay Advance 20 hired H&G, and an attorney there, Trudell, signed the Notice. Id. at ¶¶ 46-47. 21 H&G and Trudell support their motion with two declarations. Jared Alfin is a partner at 22 H&G and makes many assertions concerning the issue of personal jurisdiction, such as that H&G 23 is located in Connecticut, incorporated in Delaware, and has no officers, directors, partners, or 24 employees in California.

ECF No. 43-1 at 2. H&G does not market or advertise in California. 25 Id. Alfin further avers that the Notice was filed in Connecticut pursuant to a Connecticut statute. 26 Id. at 3. 27 28 4 The page references herein are to the page number on the CM/ECF generated header. 1 Defendant Trudell also filed a declaration. ECF No. 43-2. It states he is licensed to 2 practice in Connecticut and Massachusetts, does not hold a license in California, and does no 3 work there.

Id. at 2. He avers he does not reside in or own property in California. Id. He further 4 states the Notice was prepared and filed in Connecticut. Id. He declares that the bank attachment 5 was made by a Connecticut State Marshal at a Connecticut bank branch, and he did not direct 6 service to California. Id. at 3. 7 Plaintiff's opposition with attachments is over 150 pages long.

ECF No. 59. Exhibit A 8 appears to be communications between Plaintiff and the attorney representing him in the 9 Connecticut action concerning settlement. ECF No. 59 at 18-28. Plaintiff also attaches copies of 10 the settlement agreement in the Connecticut case (ECF No. 59 at 30-33) and of the agreement 11 with Bay Advance (ECF No. 59-1 at 22). Plaintiff's declaration disputes some of the averments 12 made by H&G and Trudell.

For example, Plaintiff disputes Trudell's assertion that they never 13 had contact. Plaintiff claims he called Trudell. ECF No. 59-1 at ¶ 21. Plaintiff further claims 14 H&G emailed him a proposed settlement document. Id. at ¶¶ 22-23. Plaintiff disputes whether 15 he agreed to a settlement in the Connecticut action. Id. at ¶ 24.

However, Plaintiff's evidence 16 fails to rebut the Alfin and Trudell Declarations as to facts relevant for determining personal 17 jurisdiction. 18 "For a court to exercise personal jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant, the defendant 19 must have at least 'minimum contacts' with the relevant forum such that the exercise of 20 jurisdiction 'does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice'." 21 Schwarzenegger, 374 F.3d at 801 (internal citation omitted).

Personal jurisdiction can be general 22 or specific. For general jurisdiction to exist over a nonresident defendant, such as H&G or 23 Trudell, the defendant must engage in continuous and systematic general business contacts that 24 “approximate physical presence” in the forum state. *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d at 801. H&G is 25 located in Connecticut, incorporated in Delaware, and has no officers, directors, partners, or 26 employees in California.

H&G does not advertise its services in California. Defendant Trudell 27 does not reside in California and is not licensed to practice in California. General jurisdiction is 28 lacking. 1 Specific jurisdiction involves a three-part test to determine if the defendant has sufficient 2 minimum contacts: 3 (1) The non-resident defendant must purposefully direct his activities or consummate 4 some transaction with the forum or resident thereof; or perform some act by which he 5 purposefully avails himself of the privilege of conducting activities in the forum, 6 thereby invoking the benefits and protections of its laws; 7 (2) The claim must be one which arises out of or relates to the defendant’s forum related 8 activities; and 9 (3) The exercise of jurisdiction must comport with fair play and substantial justice, i.e. it 10 must be reasonable.

11 *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d at 802. Applying this test to the relevant facts demonstrates that 12 there is no specific jurisdiction over H&G or Trudell. 13 Defendants’ declarations state the Notice was prepared in Connecticut and filed in 14 Connecticut. ECF No. 43-2 at ¶ 10.

The Notice was provided to a Connecticut State Marshal in 15 Connecticut and served at a Connecticut bank branch. *Id.* at ¶ 14. The documents submitted by 16 Plaintiff, including the Notice, confirm Defendants’ assertion.

The Notice is on a State of 17 Connecticut Superior Court form. ECF No. 59-1 at 35. It is attested to by Defendant Ostrowski 18 of the Connecticut State Marshal’s Office. *Id.* Ms. Ostrowski’s attestation of service shows that 19 the Notice was served on Marlyn Montanez at a Chase Bank location at 109 New London 20 Turnpike, Glastonbury, Connecticut. *Id.* at 77.

H&G and Trudell, a law firm and lawyer in 21 Connecticut, utilized Connecticut state legal process for prejudgment garnishment, engaged a 22 Connecticut state Marshal to serve process, and service occurred in Connecticut.

The fact that the 23 service occurred at a national bank branch and Plaintiff utilizes a branch of that same bank in 24 California, does not subject H&G and Trudell to personal jurisdiction in California. The fact that 25 Plaintiff may have once called Trudell is also not a basis for personal jurisdiction.

The Court 26 finds the exercise of personal jurisdiction over these defendants would not be reasonable and the 27 Court will recommend that Defendants H&G and Trudell be dismissed. 28 1
2. Rule 12(b)(6) – Failure to State a Claim Based on the Connecticut 2 Settlement 3 Defendants H&G and Trudell additionally argue that Plaintiff has released all claims in 4 this action and fails

to state a claim because Plaintiff entered into a settlement agreement in the 5 Connecticut state case.

ECF No. 43 at 10-12. However, the Court need not conclusively 6 determine whether the settlement agreement precludes this action, as the Court has already 7 concluded that H&G and Trudell should be dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction.

The Court 8 will address the status of the Connecticut settlement agreement as to Defendant Bay Advance 9 below. 10 B. Motion to Dismiss by Chase Bank (ECF No. 45) 11 Chase moves to dismiss based on failure to state a claim, but also argues that dismissal is 12 appropriate under Rule 12(b)(7) because “there is no indication that indispensable party Bay 13 Advance—who is a party to the underlying contract and obtained the prejudgment attachment that 14 Plaintiff seeks to rescind and set aside—has been served or appeared in this action.” ECF No. 45 15 at 2.

Chase argues that Plaintiff fails to state a § 1983 claim against it because Chase is a private 16 party, not a state actor. ECF No. 45 at 11. Chase further argues that the allegations of conspiracy 17 under § 1985 are conclusory. Id. at 12.

As to Counts III and IV, Chase contends that Plaintiff’s 18 claims of breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing and for cancellation of instrument 19 fail as to Chase because there was no contract between Plaintiff and Chase. 20 In opposition, Plaintiff argues that the Notice was not a valid court order. ECF No. 58 at 21 5-6. Plaintiff’s argument appears to be that Chase should not have honored or complied with the 22 Notice.

Plaintiff also argues that Chase “is a state actor because they participated with a state 23 government employee” in violating his due process rights. Id. at 8. It appears that Plaintiff 24 contends Ostrowski is the relevant government employee. Id. at 8-9. 25 Plaintiff does not directly address Chase’s indispensable party argument. Plaintiff argues 26 that the contract with Bay Advance should be found unenforceable (ECF No. 58 at 12-13), but 27 does not address whether Bay Advance has been served or why Bay Advance has not appeared.

28 After the briefing on Chase’s motion to dismiss was complete, on May 1, 2024, Plaintiff filed a 1 request that the Clerk enter default against Bay Advance. ECF No. 66-1. Therein, Plaintiff 2 claims to have served Bay Advance on March 7, 2024 via the Connecticut Secretary of State’s 3 office. ECF No. 66-1 at 4. 4 The Court will first address Chase’s argument that Plaintiff failed to state a claim.

Count 5 III of the FAC alleges “breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing.” ECF No. 38 at 25. 6 Plaintiff alleges that “Defendants” collectively have “conspired to present and collect money on a 7 contract that is unconscionable.” Id. at ¶ 62.

The contract alleged to be unconscionable is 8 between Plaintiff and Bay Advance. Id. 9 It is well-established under California law that a covenant of good faith and fair dealing is 10 implicit in every contract. See *Foley v. Interactive Data Corp.*, 47 Cal.3d 654, 683, 254 Cal.Rptr. 11 211, 765 P.2d 373 (1988).

The elements of a claim for breach of the covenant of good faith and 12 fair dealing are: “(1) the parties entered into a contract; 2) the plaintiff fulfilled his obligations 13 under the contract; 3) any conditions precedent to the defendant’s performance occurred; 4) the 14 defendant unfairly interfered with the plaintiff’s rights to receive the benefits of the contract; and 15 5) the plaintiff was harmed by defendant’s conduct.” In re Yahoo!

Inc. Customer Data Security 16 Breach Litigation, 2017 WL 3727318 at *48 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2017). Plaintiff’s claim fails as 17 to Chase at the first element—he does not allege he had a contract with Chase, but rather with 18 Bay Advance. Plaintiff also does not allege that Chase interfered with rights under a contract, but 19 appears to argue that the contract with Bay Advance was unfair, or unconscionable.

Plaintiff fails 20 to state a claim as to Chase on Count III. 21 Plaintiff’s Count IV is entitled “Cancellation of Instruments.” ECF No. 38 at 26. The 22 allegations of this count once again concern the contract between Plaintiff and Bay Advance. Id. 23 at ¶¶ 65-69.

However, it appears the “instrument” that Plaintiff wishes to cancel is the Notice. 24 Id. at ¶ 70. Under California law, to prevail on a claim to cancel an instrument, a plaintiff must 25 show: “(1) the instrument is void or voidable due to, for example, fraud; and 2) there is a 26 reasonable apprehension of serious injury including pecuniary loss or the prejudicial alteration of 27 one’s position.” *Lincoln Benefit Life Co. v. Dallal*, 500 F.Supp.3d 1041, 1068 (C.D.

Cal. Nov. 28 13, 2020). Under Connecticut state law, cancellation of instrument is an equitable remedy and 1 “[a] prerequisite to the court’s exercise of its power to grant the equitable relief of cancellation of 2 a written instrument is that the relief otherwise available be wholly inadequate to do justice.” 3 *Lonergan v. Connecticut Food Store, Inc.*, 168 Conn.

122, 132 (1975). 4 To the extent Plaintiff seeks to cancel the agreement between himself and Bay Advance, 5 Chase is not a party to that agreement, and he fails to state a claim as to Chase. Plaintiff also fails 6 to state a claim to the extent he is seeking to cancel the Notice. “In Connecticut, a prejudgment 7 attachment is a provisional remedy afforded to a claimant to secure satisfaction of a judgment in 8 the future.” *Kendall v. Amster*, 108 Conn.App.

319, 325 (Conn. Ct. App. 2008). This remedy is 9 “founded on and regulated by [Connecticut] statutory law.” Id., citing General Statutes §§ 52- 10 278a to 52-278n. Plaintiff objects to this procedural mechanism of Connecticut state law, but he 11 has not adequately alleged grounds to

cancel the Notice. 12 As to Count II of the FAC, Plaintiff brings a claim under §1983 and contends that Chase 13 violated his due process rights.

Plaintiff asserts the claim broadly against “all Defendants” and 14 claims they “conspired.” ECF No. 38 at ¶ 56. Plaintiff again complains that the contract with 15 Bay Advance is unconscionable (¶ 57) and that the “principal violation of [his] due process 16 rights” was the imposition of the Notice (¶ 58). Plaintiff appears to allege that Chase acted with 17 Ostrowski and the Connecticut State Marshal Service and should have known that the Notice was 18 issued without due process.

ECF No. 38 at ¶ 60. 19 To state a claim under § 1983 a plaintiff must allege that: 1) a defendant acting under 20 color of state law; 2) deprived plaintiff of rights secured by the Constitution or federal statutes. 21 *Benavidez v. County of San Diego*, 993 F.3d 1134, 1144 (9th Cir. 2021) Chase is a private entity, 22 and generally, private parties are not acting under color of state law.

See *Price v. Hawaii*, 939 23 F.2d 702, 707–08 (9th Cir. 1991). Only in “exceptional cases” will a private entity be treated as a 24 state actor for constitutional purposes. See *O’Handley v. Weber*, 62 F.4th 1145, 1155-56 (9th Cir. 25 2023). 26 Plaintiff’s allegations as to how Chase is a state actor are conclusory. Plaintiff uses the 27 word “conspired” and “joint activity”.

ECF No. 38 at ¶¶ 56-60. However, Plaintiff more 28 specifically pleads that Chase “has attorneys who have the same access to law libraries that 1 Plaintiff do [sic] and could have prevented this deprivation of rights under color of authority.” *Id.* 2 at ¶ 60.

Thus, Plaintiff’s argument does not appear to be that Chase and other Defendants were 3 acting jointly to violate Plaintiff’s constitutional rights, but rather Plaintiff is arguing that Chase 4 could have prevented the alleged violation of his rights by the other Defendants, and Chase 5 should not have complied with the Notice. Merely complying with a notice issued under 6 Connecticut state law does not make Chase a state actor.

See *Heineke v. Santa Clara University*, 7 965 F.3d 1009, 1013 (9th Cir. 2020) (“Nor is compliance with generally applicable laws 8 sufficient to convert private conduct into state action.”); see also *Dailey v. Bank of America*, 106 9 F.App’x 533 (9th Cir. 2004) (defendant bank was not state actor nor acting under color of state 10 law as to claim defendant bank deprived plaintiff of property in violation of due process when a 11 lien was placed); *Remsen v. Schoolsfirst Credit Union*, 2024 WL 5275582 at *4 (C.D.

Cal. Aug. 12 19, 2024) (“a bank does not become a state actor when it simply follows state procedures.”). The 13 Court concludes that Plaintiff fails to state a claim against Chase as to Count II because Chase 14 was not a state actor or acting under color of state law. 15 Plaintiff fails to state a claim as to Counts II thru IV against Chase, leaving only Count I 16 which seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.

As Plaintiff fails to state a claim, the Court will decline to entertain an independent/standalone claim for declaratory relief. See *Fiedler v. Clark*, 18 F.2d 77, 79 (9th Cir. 1983) (“The Declaratory Judgment Act does not provide an independent basis for suits in federal court... It only permits the district court to adopt a specific remedy when jurisdiction exists.”).

A declaratory judgment is a remedy, not a cause of action. See *Stock 21 West, Inc. v. Confederated Tribes*, 873 F.2d 1221, 1225 (9th Cir. 1989) (Declaratory Judgment Act “only creates a remedy and is not an independent basis for jurisdiction”); see also *Ajetunmobi 23 v. Clarion Mortg. Capital*, 595 F.App’x 680, 685 (9th Cir. 2014) (“Declaratory and injunctive 24 relief are remedies, not causes of action.”).

25 Because the Court is recommending dismissal for failure to state a claim, it need not 26 address Chase’s Rule 12(b)(7) arguments regarding joinder and Bay Advance. 27 28 1 C. Motion to Dismiss by Ostrowski (ECF No. 51) 2 Ostrowski offers several arguments in support of dismissal.

First, she argues that she has 3 statutory immunity under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 6-38a(b). ECF No. 51 at 10. Second, she alleges 4 that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over her. And third, she argues that the FAC fails to 5 state a claim because she “cannot be held liable for damages stemming from her legal service of 6 facially valid civil process.” ECF No. 51 at 11.

Ostrowski supports her motion with a declaration 7 which states that she is a resident of Connecticut, she does not conduct business in California, and 8 does not own or hold any assets or real property in California. ECF No. 51 at 37-38. Ostrowski 9 also avers that she served the Notice on a Chase Bank branch in Glastonbury, Connecticut, and 10 that she served Plaintiff by serving the Secretary of State of Connecticut as the statutory agent for 11 Plaintiff.

Id. at 37. 12 Plaintiff did not file a separate opposition brief to Ostrowski’s motion. Instead, his 13 opposition is captioned as “opposition to Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, NA’s Motion to 14 Dismiss” and was docketed as being his response to both Chase and Ostrowski’s motion. ECF 15 No. 58.

The brief is largely directed at Chase Bank, although Plaintiff does attach an affidavit in 16 opposition to Ostrowski’s motion to dismiss. ECF No. 58-1. The Affidavit states that Ostrowski 17 served the Notice, and Plaintiff avers that he experienced negative economic effects from the 18 execution of the Notice on his bank account. *Id.* at 1-2. 19 As to Ostrowski’s first argument that she is immune based on Conn.

Gen. Stat. § 6-38a(b), 20 that argument fails. Plaintiff’s primary claim against Ostrowski is a due process claim under 21 U.S.C. § 1983 concerning the execution of the Notice and alleged prejudgment attachment of his 22 bank account. “Immunity under § 1983 is governed by federal law; state law cannot provide 23 immunity from suit for federal civil rights violations.” *Wallis v. Spencer*, 202 F.3d 1126, 1144 24 (9th Cir.

2000), citing *Martinez v. California*, 444 U.S. 277, 284 (1980). Ostrowski may have 25 statutory immunity from the state law claims, but the Court need not reach that issue. The state 26 law claims for breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing and cancellation of instruments 27 arise out of Plaintiff's agreement with Bay Advance, which Plaintiff alleges was unconscionable.

28 Ostrowski was not a party to that agreement. The Court need not further opine on whether 1 Plaintiff has failed to state a claim against Ostrowski because it concludes the Court lacks 2 personal jurisdiction over her. See *Ruiz v. Snohomish County Public Utility Dist.*, 824 F.3d 1161, 3 1165 (9th Cir. 2016) ("Here, the court's non-merits ruling was for lack of personal jurisdiction, 4 depriving the court of the authority to rule on the merits.").5 5 The Court recommends Ostrowski's motion to dismiss be granted based on lack of 6 personal jurisdiction, under largely the same analysis as set forth supra as to H&G and Trudell.

7 Ostrowski is a non-resident of California and does not conduct business there. Her alleged 8 involvement in this action was to serve process in Connecticut. The Court finds Plaintiff has not 9 made a prima facie showing of personal jurisdiction over Ostrowski.

The Court finds the exercise 10 of personal jurisdiction over her would not be reasonable and the Court will recommend that 11 Ostrowski's motion to dismiss be granted. 12 D. Remaining Defendants and Request for Entry of Default 13 Plaintiff seeks the entry of default as to Defendants Connecticut State Marshals Service 14 ("CSMS") and Bay Advance. ECF No. 66.

Plaintiff claims he served CSMS in August 2023. Id. 15 at 5. Plaintiff claims he served Bay Advance through the Connecticut Secretary of State's office 16 in March 2024. ECF No. 66-1 at 4. The complaint and FAC refer to CSMS as the "Connecticut 17 State Marshals Commission" and it appears CSMS is named as a defendant because it allegedly 18 employed Defendant Ostrowski.

ECF No. 38 at ¶ 46. 19 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55, default may be entered against a party 20 against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought who fails to plead or otherwise defend 21 against the action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a).

However, "[a] defendant's default does not 22 automatically entitle the plaintiff to a court-ordered judgment." *PepsiCo, Inc. v. Cal. Sec. Cans*, 23 238 F.Supp.2d 1172, 1174 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (citing *Draper v. Coombs*, 792 F.2d 915, 924-25 (9th 24 Cir. 1986)); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b) (governing the entry of default judgments). Instead, the 25 26 5 The Court acknowledges that case law is not entirely consistent on this point.

See *Milton H. 27 Greene Archives, Inc. v. Marilyn Monroe LLC*, 692 F.3d 983, 990 n. 6 (9th Cir. 2012) ("A district court may decide that a complaint fails to state a claim even when it does not have personal 28 jurisdiction."). 1 decision to grant or deny an application for default judgment lies within the district court's sound 2 discretion. *Aldabe v. Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir.

1980). 3 Here the Court does not recommend the entry of default or the granting of default 4 judgment as to either CSMS or Bay Advance.⁶ 5 1. CSMS 6 For the same reasons discussed above regarding Ostrowski, the Court lacks personal 7 jurisdiction over CSMS, a Connecticut state agency, which apparently has no involvement in this 8 action other than employing Ostrowski.

Although a defect in personal jurisdiction is a defense 9 that may be waived, “when a court is considering whether to enter a default judgment, it may 10 dismiss an action sua sponte for lack of personal jurisdiction.” *In re Tuli*, 172 F.3d 707, 712 (9th 11 Cir. 1999). Additionally, it appears that Plaintiff fails to state a claim against CSMS. See *Sato v. 12 Orange Cnty.*

Dep’t of Educ., 861 F.3d 923, 928 (9th Cir. 2017) (agencies of the state are immune 13 under the Eleventh Amendment from private damages or suits for injunctive relief brought in 14 federal court); *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989) (“There is no respondeat 15 superior liability under § 1983.”). 16 2. Bay Advance 17 As to Bay Advance, when a court is deciding whether default judgment should be entered, 18 the court may consider the following factors: 19 (1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff; (2) the merits of plaintiff’s 20 substantive claim; (3) the sufficiency of the complaint; (4) the sum of money at stake in the action; (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts; (6) whether 21 the default was due to excusable neglect; and (7) the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the merits.

22 23 *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986). Default judgments are ordinarily 24 disfavored. *Id.* at 1472. In evaluating these factors, the Court considers that Bay Advance and 25 Plaintiff have already engaged in litigation in Connecticut state court, entered into a settlement 26 27 6 The Clerk of the Court never entered default in favor of Plaintiff.

While the proper entry of 28 default is a precondition for granting 1 agreement, and a Connecticut state court has found that settlement agreement to be enforceable. 2 Court approved settlement agreements have res judicata effect. See *Tritz v. U.S. Postal 3 Service*, 721 F.3d 1133, 1141 (9th Cir. 2013).

In order for res judicata to apply, there must be: 1) 4 an identity of claims, 2) a final judgment on the merits, and 3) identity or privity between the 5 parties. *Id.* The Connecticut state court judgment finding the settlement agreement to be 6 enforceable is in the record. ECF No. 43-1 at 37.

The Court can take judicial notice of another 7 court’s record. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 690 (9th Cir. 2001).⁷ 8 Plaintiff has appealed the judgment against him in Connecticut state and argues the 9 settlement agreement was invalid.⁸ Under Connecticut law, “a prior judgment in another case 10 maintains its preclusive effect, even pending appeal of that judgment.” *Barash v. Lembo*, 348 11 Conn.

264, 277 (2023). By contrast, under California law, a judgment is not final for purposes of 12 res judicata during the pendency of and until the resolution of an appeal. See *Eichman v. Fotomat 13 Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1434, 1439 (9th Cir. 1985).

The Supreme Court has “held that the preclusive 14 effect of a state court judgment in a subsequent lawsuit involving [federal claims] is determined 15 by the preclusion law of the state in which the previous judgment was rendered.” *Eichman*, 759 16 F.2d at 1437, citing *Marrese v. American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons*, 470 U.S. 373 (1985). 17 The judgment here was issued in Connecticut, and this Court accordingly applies Connecticut 18 law, which makes a judgment preclusive while on appeal.

19 In the Connecticut case, the Connecticut Superior Court stated as follows: “The court has 20 examined the agreement, and finds that its terms were clear, unambiguous, and contained all 21 essential terms. Further, it did not state or contemplate any condition precedent remaining to be 22 satisfied.” ECF No. 43-1 at 37.

The court then granted the motion to enforce the settlement. *Id.* 23 The Connecticut state court judgment finding that the settlement agreement is enforceable has 24 25 7 “A court may take judicial notice of matters of public record without converting a motion to 26 dismiss into a motion for summary judgment.” *Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 988, 999 (9th Cir.

2018) (quotation omitted). A court cannot take judicial notice of disputed facts 27 contained in those judicially noticed public records. *Id.* 8 The Connecticut Appellate Court case number is AC 47341. Briefing was recently completed 28 and the case has not been decided. 1 preclusive effect even though the action remains pending on appeal. It appears that Plaintiff has 2 failed to comply with this enforceable agreement as he did not dismiss what is referred to as the 3 “California Action” (the instant lawsuit) in paragraph 11 of the settlement agreement.

ECF No. 4 43-1 at 23. 5 As discussed above, under Connecticut state law the judgment enforcing the settlement 6 agreement has preclusive effect even while on appeal. A former judgment on a claim, if rendered 7 on the merits, is an “absolute bar to a subsequent action” between the same parties or those in 8 privity on the same claim. *Girolametti v. Michael Horton Assoc.*, 332 Conn.

67, 75 (2019). 9 Given that the judgment in the Connecticut state case in favor of Bay Advance precludes 10 Plaintiff from further pursuing relief in this action against Bay Advance, the Court could dismiss 11 Bay Advance from the case, even though it has not appeared. “A District Court may properly on 12 its own motion dismiss an action as to defendants who have not moved to dismiss where such 13 defendants are in a position similar to that of moving defendants or where claims against such 14 defendants are integrally related.” *Dodenhoff v. Cache Creek Foods*, 2015 WL 1638002 at *5 15 (E.D.

Cal. April 13, 2015), citing *Silverston v. Dep't of Treasury*, 644 F.2d 1341, 1345 (9th Cir. 16 1981). This is true even as to a defendant, such as Bay Advance, who has not yet appeared in the 17 action. See *Abagninin v. AMVAC Chem. Corp.*, 545 F.3d 733, 742 (9th Cir. 2008) (“As a legal 18 matter, we have upheld dismissal with prejudice in favor of a party which had not appeared, on 19 the basis of facts presented by other defendants which had appeared.”).

20 However, Plaintiff disputes the validity of the settlement agreement on appeal in 21 Connecticut state court.⁹ The Court takes judicial notice that the appeal in *Bay Advance, LLC v. 22 Halajian*, Case No. AC 47341, appears to be fully briefed and is awaiting decision.

In an 23 abundance of caution, it would be best to defer the question of whether Bay Advance should sua 24 sponte be dismissed from this lawsuit until after the Connecticut Appellate Court rules on this 25 issue. The Court recommends that after issuing rulings on the motions to dismiss, that this action 26 27 9 Plaintiff filed email correspondence between he and his attorney concerning the settlement agreement, which he claims demonstrates that there was never an enforceable agreement.

ECF 28 No. 59 at 18-28. 1 be stayed as to Bay Advance and the parties be directed to file a status report when the 2 Connecticut Appellate Court issues its decision. 3 E. Leave to Amend 4 The Court has considered Plaintiff’s pro se status and whether he should be granted leave 5 to amend. See *Akhtar v. Mesa*, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012) (“[a] district court should not 6 dismiss a pro se complaint without leave to amend unless it is absolutely clear that the 7 deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by amendment.”).

The Court has also considered 8 that Plaintiff was previously granted leave to amend, after Defendants filed motions to dismiss the 9 Complaint that were granted. Thus, Plaintiff previously had notice of deficiencies with the 10 Complaint prior to filing the FAC. Most importantly, the Court has considered futility of 11 amendment. See *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Solutions, Inc.*, 194 F.3d 980, 986 (9th Cir.

12 1999) (“Where the legal basis for a cause of action is tenuous, futility supports the refusal to grant 13 leave to amend.”). The lack of personal jurisdiction over H&G, Trudell, Ostrowski, and CSMS 14 cannot be cured through further amendment.

As to Chase, Magistrate Judge Barnes previously 15 advised Plaintiff that he failed to adequately plead state action. See ECF No. 37 at 9 (“This vague 16 and conclusory assertion fails to explain how any defendant was acting under color of state 17 law.”).

The Court finds further leave to amend would be futile. 18 CONCLUSION 19 The Court concludes that the motions to dismiss filed by Defendants H&G, Trudell, and 20 Ostrowski should be granted as the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over these Connecticut 21 defendants.

The Court further recommends that CSMS be dismissed sua sponte for lack of 22 personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. The Court additionally concludes that Plaintiff 23 has failed to state a claim against Defendant Chase.

As to Defendant Bay Advance, who has not 24 appeared, the other Defendants contend the claims are barred by a settlement agreement, but 25 Plaintiff disputes the validity of the settlement agreement and that issue is before the Connecticut 26 appellate court. 27 //// 28 //// 1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED THAT: 2 1. Defendants H&G and Trudell's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 43) be GRANTED 3 without leave to amend and H&G and Trudell dismissed from the action; 4 2.

Defendant Chase's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 45) be GRANTED without leave to 5 amend and Chase dismissed from the action; 6 3. Defendant Ostrowski's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 51) be GRANTED without leave 7 to amend and Ostrowski dismissed from the action; 8 4. Plaintiff's request for entry of default against Defendants Bay Advance and CSMS 9 (ECF No. 66) be DENIED and Defendant CSMS be dismissed from this action; and 10 5.

The action be stayed as to Bay Advance, the sole remaining Defendant in this action, 11 and the parties directed to file a Status Report, including a copy of the Connecticut 12 Appellate Court's ruling in case AC 47341 within seven days of the issuance of that 13 decision. 14 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 15 || assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Within fourteen (14) 16 | days after being served with these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file written 17 | objections with the court. Such document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's 18 | Findings and Recommendations." Local Rule 304(d). Plaintiff is advised that failure to file 19 | objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.

20 || Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 21 | DATED: April 28, 2025. 22 23) 24 SEAN C. RIORDAN 35 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 26 27 28 19