

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON**

Daniella Katalin Melegh v. John Does 1-10

Melegh · No. 2:25-cv-01535-JHC · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington dismissed Daniella Katalin Melegh’s pro se complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court concluded that the complaint’s allegations of warrantless surveillance were conclusory and failed to identify a defendant or provide sufficient factual detail to state a Fourth Amendment Bivens claim, while granting leave to amend within 14 days.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE 7 DANIELLA KATALIN MELEGH, CASE NO. 2:25-cv-01535-JHC 8 Plaintiff,
ORDER 9 v. 10 JOHN DOES 1-10, 11 Defendants. 12 13 This matter comes before the Court sua
sponte on pro se Plaintiff Daniella Katalin 14 Melegh’s Complaint. Dkt. # 5. 15 A complaint filed
by any party that seeks to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) under 28 16 U.S.C. § 1915(a) is subject
to screening.

See *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126–27 (9th Cir. 17 2000) (en banc). If a court determines
that a complaint filed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) is 18 frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim,
or seeks damages from defendants immune from such 19 relief, the court must dismiss the case
sua sponte. *Id.*; see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

To 20 adequately state a claim, a complaint must include “a short and plain statement of the claim
21 showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). A plaintiff need not 22
provide detailed factual allegations, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of 23
action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 24 1
662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell Atl.*

Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). Still, when the 2 || plaintiffis pro se, a court must
“construe the pleadings liberally and afford the petitioner the 3 benefit of any doubt.” *Hebbe v.*
Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Brerz v. 4 || Kelman*, 773 F.2d 1026, 1027 n.1
(9th Cir.1985) (en banc)). 5 Even under a liberal construction of the Complaint, Plaintiff fails to
state a claim for 6 ||Telief.

The Complaint does not include any specific facts that show that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief she seeks. The Complaint states only that the Defendants, named only as “John Does 1-10” and described as “federal agents/Contractors,” have “engaged in warrantless surveillance, including cameras in the bathroom, wiretapping, and interception of electronic communications.” Dkt. #5 at 1.

There are no other factual allegations in the complaint. The complaint says it claims relief under the Fourth Amendment via a Bivens action, but it does not identify any person acting under cover of law who allegedly committing the wiretapping. See *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Nor does the complaint provide any details of the alleged surveillance beyond a bare allegation that it is occurring.

Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff’s Complaint, Dkt. # 5, without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(11).. The Court GRANTS Plaintiff leave to amend, if she wishes, within 14 days of the filing of this Order. If Plaintiff files a timely amended complaint and it does not meet the pleading standards, the Court will dismiss the matter with prejudice.

Dated this 23rd day of January, 2026. otha Cbne 1 John H. Chun United States District Judge