

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Christopher S. Bennett v. Daniel Juarez, et al.

Bennett v. Juarez · No. 2:25-cv-00930-AH (DEX) · Decided February 28, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Christopher S. Bennett to show cause why his claims against Daniel Juarez should not be dismissed with prejudice under the doctrine of judicial immunity. The court concluded that the allegations appeared to concern actions taken by a judicial officer at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse and set a March 7, 2025 deadline for Plaintiff’s written response.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Anne Hwang
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	February 28, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00930-AH (DEX)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court, acting sua sponte, issued an order to show cause why the claims against Defendant Daniel Juarez should not be dismissed with prejudice based on judicial immunity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Christopher S. Bennett v. Daniel Juarez, et al.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- government liability
- civil rights
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- judicial immunity

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the allegations in the Complaint suggest that Daniel Juarez was acting in a judicial capacity and may therefore be protected by judicial immunity.
2. Whether Plaintiff should be required to show cause why the claims against Juarez should not be dismissed with prejudice on judicial-immunity grounds.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“After reviewing the Complaint, it appears as though Defendant Daniel Juarez (“Juarez”) may be protected by judicial immunity.” (1)

“In accordance with the foregoing, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing, by March 7, 2025, why the Court should not dismiss with prejudice Plaintiff’s claims against Daniel Juarez as barred by judicial immunity.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complaint identified Daniel Juarez as an individual associated with an address that the court judicially noticed as the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, housing the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. The Complaint alleged that Juarez usurped another judicial officer’s order, decided matters based on argument rather than facts, and granted a temporary conservatorship. Based on those allegations, the court inferred that Juarez may have been acting as a judicial officer.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil action in the Central District of California. After reviewing the Complaint, the court concluded that the allegations appeared to concern a judge of the Los Angeles County Superior Court and ordered Plaintiff to show cause in writing by March 7, 2025, why the claims against Juarez should not be dismissed with prejudice. The order stated that failure to respond would result in dismissal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988)
- Ashelman v. Pope, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991)
- Pitts v. Unknown, 2023 WL 7434973, at *3 n.3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2023)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL eee 2-25-cv-00930-AH (DEX) EE February 28,2025 Title Christopher S. Bennett v. Daniel Juarez, et al. Present: The Honorable Anne Hwang, United States District

Judge Yolanda Skipper Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s): Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s): None Present None Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF DEFENDANT PURSUANT TO JUDICIAL IMMUNITY After reviewing the Complaint, it appears as though Defendant Daniel Juarez (“Juarez”) may be protected by judicial immunity.

See *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988) (“judges have long enjoyed a comparatively sweeping form of immunity” for acts that relate to the “judicial process”); *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986) (judicial immunity applies “however erroneous the act may have been”); *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991) (“judicial immunity is not overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice”).

With respect to Juarez, the Complaint alleges that he “is an individual with his address of [sic] 111 N. Hill Street[,] Los Angeles, CA 90012.”!! The Court judicially notices that this is the address of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. See Stanley Mosk Courthouse Location, Parking and Business Hours, The Superior Ct. of Cal.: Cnty. of L.A., <https://www.lacourt.org/courthouse/info/la> (last visited February 27, 2025); *Pitts v. Unknown*, 2023 WL 7434973, at *3 n.3 (S.D.

Cal. Nov. 9, 2023) (judicially noticing the Stanley Mosk Courthouse). Page 1 of 2 CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL Initials of Deputy Clerk YS Compl. ¶ 6. The Complaint also alleges that “Mr. Juarez... usurp[ed] another judicial officer’s order” and “decided on the basis of argumentation and not facts” in his “decision to grant temporary conservatorship.” *Id.* ¶¶ 26–28.

These facts could only be made in reference to a judge at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse. In accordance with the foregoing, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing, by March 7, 2025, why the Court should not dismiss with prejudice Plaintiff’s claims against Daniel Juarez as barred by judicial immunity. No oral argument on this matter will be heard unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); C.D. Cal. R. 7-15. The Order will stand submitted upon the filing of the response to the Order to Show Cause. Failure to respond to the Order to Show Cause will result in the dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED.