

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

OPINION

Melegh

PER CURIAM.

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 7 ||relief she seeks. The
Complaint states only that the Defendants, named only as “John Does 1- 8 10” and described as
“federal agents/Contractors,” have “engaged in warrantless surveillance, 9 including cameras in
the bathroom, wiretapping, and interception of electronic communications.” 10 || Dkt. #5 at 1.

There are no other factual allegations in the complaint. The complaint says it 11 claims relief under the Fourth Amendment via a Bivens action, but it does not identify any 12. || person acting under cover of law who allegedly committing the wiretapping. See *Bivens v. Six* 13 Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Nor does the complaint provide any 14 || details of the alleged surveillance beyond a bare allegation that it is occurring. 15 Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint, Dkt. # 5, without prejudice 16 || under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(11).. The Court GRANTS Plaintiff leave to amend, if she 17 || wishes, within 14 days of the filing of this Order. If Plaintiff files a timely amended complaint 1g || and it does not meet the pleading standards, the Court will dismiss the matter with prejudice. 19 Dated this 23rd day of January, 2026. otha Cbne 1 John H. Chun United States District Judge 22 23 24