

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Seelig v. Central Intelligence Agency

Seelig · No. 25-cv-06592-JST · Decided August 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California adopted a magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss Christopher Seelig's claims against the Central Intelligence Agency and other defendants without leave to amend. The court held that the claims were frivolous and denied as moot Seelig's motion for an expedited hearing.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL SEELIG, Case No. 25-cv-06592-JST 8 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING REPORT & RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS 9 v. CASE; ORDER DENYING
AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR 10 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
EXPEDITED HEARING et al., Re: ECF Nos. 5, 9 11 Defendants. 12 13 The Court has reviewed
Magistrate Judge Thomas Hixson's report and recommendation to 14 dismiss this case without
leave to amend.

ECF No. 5. Plaintiff Christopher Seelig filed timely 15 objections to the report and
recommendation, ECF No. 13, as well as a motion for expedited 16 hearing and several exhibits,
ECF Nos. 9, 14, 16. 17 Judge Hixson concluded that Seelig's claims were subject to dismissal on
two independent 18 grounds: that they are brought under federal criminal statutes that do not
provide a basis for civil 19 liability, and that they are frivolous.

ECF No. 5 at 4–6. In response, Seelig argues that several 20 grounds for civil liability exist and
that his claims are not frivolous. ECF No. 13. 21 Having reviewed the entire record, including all
of the documents submitted by Seelig, the 22 Court adopts Judge Hixson's recommendation to
dismiss this case without leave to amend.

The 23 Court does not decide whether Seelig's claims might arise under statutes giving rise to
civil 24 liability because, for the reasons discussed by Judge Hixson, his claims are frivolous and
therefore 25 subject to dismissal. ECF No. 5 at 5–6; see also, e.g., *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S.
528, 536–37 26 (1974) (“[F]ederal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within
their jurisdiction 27 if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit,
wholly 1 modified)); *Ou-Young v. Rudy*, No. 21-CV-07361-BLF, 2022 WL 2343043, at *3 (N.D.

Cal. 2 || June 29, 2022) (“Claims that are too insubstantial to give rise to subject matter jurisdiction include 3 those alleging bizarre or wholly implausible conspiracy theories.”); Feng v. Tripp, No. 24-cv- 4 07539-JST, 2025 WL 1616638, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2025) (dismissing complaint without 5 leave to amend under the substantiality doctrine described in Hagans).

6 Because the Court dismisses Seelig’s complaint, it denies as moot Seelig’s motion for an 7 || expedited hearing. ECF No. 9. 8 The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file. 9 IT IS SO ORDERED. 10 || Dated: August 21, 2025 JON S. TIG 12 United States District Judge 15 16 = 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28