

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

Sanaz Derakhshani Jan v. Donald J. Trump, et al.

Jan · No. 2:26-cv-00148 · Decided February 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah denied Plaintiff Sanaz Derakhshani Jan’s motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for emergency injunctive relief. The court dismissed the action after concluding that venue was improper and that the complaint’s conclusory allegations against 73 defendants failed to state a viable claim for relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. Shelby
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah
DECIDED	February 24, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-cv-00148
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff proceeding pro se moved to proceed in forma pauperis and sought emergency temporary injunctive relief. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), denied both motions, and dismissed the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For IFP screening, the court must dismiss claims that are frivolous or malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. Improper venue may be dismissed sua sponte when the defense is obvious from the complaint and no further factual development is required. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum decision and order from a federal district court
PARTIES	Sanaz Derakhshani Jan v. Donald J. Trump, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- motions to dismiss
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could sua sponte dismiss the action for improper venue based on the face of the complaint.
2. Whether the action should be transferred rather than dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).
3. Whether the complaint stated any plausible claim for relief under the governing pleading standard and survived screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
4. Whether plaintiff was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis or obtain a temporary restraining order.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may sua sponte dismiss for improper venue during IFP screening when the venue defect is obvious from the face of the complaint and no further factual record is needed; the court held that the District of Utah was not a proper venue because the complaint alleged no substantial part of the relevant events or omissions occurred there.
2. When venue is improper, the court may dismiss or transfer the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), but transfer was not in the interest of justice in this case.
3. The complaint failed to state a claim for relief because it relied on conclusory assertions, merely recited legal standards, and did not identify which defendant allegedly committed which conduct supporting each cause of action.
4. The court denied the motion to proceed in forma pauperis and the emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and order to show cause because the action was dismissed for improper venue and failure to state a viable claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court should only do so in “extraordinary instances when the claim’s factual backdrop clearly beckons the defense.”” (at 2)

“A claim is plausible “when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”” (at 3)

“This is wholly insufficient to state a claim for relief.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint concerned a domestic violence restraining order issued by a California state court against private defendants Mehrangiz Shahanian and Cyrus Djan. Jan sued 73 private and governmental defendants, including federal and California officials, alleging violations of rights of access to the courts, due process, and the First Amendment, as well as conspiratorial and related civil-rights violations. The complaint alleged no events in Utah and did not identify which particular defendant committed which conduct underlying each claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jan filed a complaint against 73 defendants arising from a California domestic violence restraining order and asserted constitutional and civil-rights claims. The court concluded sua sponte that venue was improper and that the complaint failed to state a viable claim. It declined to transfer the case because transfer was not in the interest of justice, denied the IFP and temporary restraining order motions, dismissed the matter, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Buchheit v. Green*, 705 F.3d 1157, 1160-61 (10th Cir. 2013)
- *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- *Kay v. Bemis*, 500 F.3d 1214, 1217 (10th Cir. 2007)
- *Triplett v. Triplett*, 166 Fed. App'x 338, 340 (10th Cir. 2006)
- *Scott v. Texas*, No. 24-5124, 2025 WL 15623, at *1 (10th Cir. 2025)
- *Trujillo v. Williams*, 465 F.3d 1210, 1217, 1223 & n.16 (10th Cir. 2006)
- *Fratus v. DeLand*, 49 F.3d 673, 674-75 (10th Cir. 1995)
- *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972)
- *Ogden v. San Juan County*, 32 F.3d 452, 455 (10th Cir. 1994)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 680-81 (2009)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1249-50 (10th Cir. 2008)