

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Patrick Roy Harper v. Rita Lin, et al.

Harper v. Lin · No. 25-cv-09488-RS · Decided November 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Patrick Roy Harper’s claims against two federal district court judges with prejudice. The court concluded that the claims were duplicative of claims in another action, that plaintiff could not obtain the requested relief, and that judicial immunity applied to claims based on judicial acts.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard Seeborg
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	November 6, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-09488-RS
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The pro se plaintiff filed an action asserting ill-defined claims against two federal district court judges and seeking an injunction requiring an immediate admiralty bench trial. The district court dismissed the action sua sponte under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Rule 12(b)(6) standard permitting sua sponte dismissal without notice where the claimant cannot possibly win relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is unknown and the opinion does not appear to have a reporter citation.
PARTIES	Patrick Roy Harper v. Rita Lin, et al.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- admiralty
- injunctions
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

admiralty

constitutional law

judicial immunity

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could dismiss the complaint sua sponte under Rule 12(b)(6) without notice because the plaintiff could not possibly obtain relief.
2. Whether claims seeking to hold federal judges liable for acts performed in their judicial capacity were barred by judicial immunity.
3. Whether the plaintiff's claims arising from prior district court adjudications could succeed in this action.

HOLDINGS

1. A trial court may dismiss a claim sua sponte and without notice under Rule 12(b)(6) when the claimant cannot possibly win relief.
2. Judicial immunity bars claims seeking to hold a judge liable for performance of judicial acts.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“where the claimant cannot possibly win relief.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Patrick Roy Harper sued Rita Lin and another federal district court judge, asserting violations involving 28 U.S.C. § 1916, the Supremacy Clause, Article III, fraud on the court, and alleged hate crimes. He sought an injunction allowing him to proceed immediately to an admiralty bench trial and acknowledged that his demand arose from proceedings in prior district court adjudications.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Harper's claims were identical to claims he had asserted in *Harper v. Lin*, No. 25-cv-8068. The court relied on the same reasons stated in that earlier matter and dismissed the present action with prejudice because the plaintiff could not possibly obtain relief.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Omar v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc.*, 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Wong v. Bell*, 642 F.2d 359, 361-62 (9th Cir. 1981)
- *Franceschi v. Schwartz*, 57 F.3d 828, 830 (9th Cir. 1995)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 9 PATRICK ROY HARPER, 10 Case No. 25-cv-09488-RS Plaintiff, 11 v. ORDER
OF DISMISSAL 12 RITA LIN, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 16 Pro se Plaintiff Patrick Roy
Harper's ill-defined claims against two federal district court 17 judges are identical to his claims
before this Court in Harper v. Lin, No. 25-cv-8068.

For the same 18 reasons as there, his claims here are dismissed. A trial court may dismiss a claim
under Rule 19 12(b)(6) sua sponte and without notice "where the claimant cannot possibly win
relief." Omar v. 20 Sea-Land Serv., Inc., 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987) (citing Wong v. Bell,
642 F.2d 359, 361– 21 62 (9th Cir.1981); 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure
§ 1357 at 593 22 (1969)); Fed.

R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). 23 Plaintiff here seeks an "injunction to proceed immediately to an admiralty
bench trial," 24 averring violations of the jurisdictional statute 28 U.S.C. Section 1916, the
Supremacy Clause, and 25 Article III of the Constitution as well as fraud on the court and "hate
crimes." Dkt. 1. Even if 26 Plaintiff's averments gave rise to cognizable causes of action, Plaintiff
cannot succeed because, as 27 he concedes, his "demand arises out of proceedings in" prior district
court adjudications before the 1 immunity where a plaintiff seeks to hold a judge liable for
performance of judicial acts.

See 2 Franceschi v. Schwartz, 57 F.3d 828, 830 (9th Cir.1995). Since Plaintiff cannot succeed, the
3 above-captioned civil action is dismissed with prejudice. 4 5 6 || ITISSO ORDERED. 4 8 Dated:
November 6, 2025 9 ICHARD SEEBORG 10 Chief United States District Judge 11 12 © 15 16 =
17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 98 ORDER OF DISMISSAL CASE No. 25-cv-09488-RS