

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ha-Rakhamon Azizi v. United States Dept. of Justice, et al.

No. CV 25-7562-CAS(E) (C.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2025) · No. No. CV 25-7562-CAS(E) · Decided September 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed the pro se plaintiff's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court concluded that the complaint was manifestly insubstantial and that the jurisdictional defect could not be cured by amendment, so it dismissed the action with prejudice and vacated the reference to the Magistrate Judge.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Christina A. Snyder
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	September 4, 2025
DOCKET	No. CV 25-7562-CAS(E)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a paid complaint against numerous defendants. The district court dismissed the action sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently assessed subject matter jurisdiction and whether the complaint was so frivolous and insubstantial that it failed to present a federal controversy.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Ha-Rakhamon Azizi, Yahouda Azizi v. United States Department of Justice, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was so obviously frivolous, insubstantial, and implausible that it failed to confer federal subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Whether the action could be dismissed sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and with prejudice because the jurisdictional defect could not be cured by amendment.

HOLDINGS

1. A paid complaint that is obviously frivolous does not confer subject matter jurisdiction, and dismissal is proper when the asserted federal claim is so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed, or devoid of merit that it does not present a federal controversy.
2. A district court may dismiss an action sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and dismissal with prejudice is appropriate when the jurisdictional defect cannot be cured by amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A paid complaint that is ‘obviously frivolous’ does not confer subject matter jurisdiction”

“dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is proper when the federal claim is “so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of this Court, or otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a voluminous complaint naming the United States Department of Justice, the Beverly Hills Police Department, the Los Angeles Police Department, Torat Hayim Synagogue, and other defendants. The complaint asserted allegations involving mind manipulation, disrespecting the Creator, hostage taking, sabotage of religious articles, theft of inventions, and implantation of hair on Plaintiff's body. Plaintiff appeared to seek millions of dollars and possibly injunctive relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 13, 2025, Plaintiff paid the filing fee and filed a voluminous complaint. The court determined that the complaint was largely incomprehensible, wholly insubstantial, and incapable of conferring federal subject matter jurisdiction. The court vacated the reference to the Magistrate Judge and dismissed the action with prejudice, directing entry of judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Azizi v. American Government, et al., No. CV 09-6677-CAS(CT)
- Azizi v. American Government, et al., No. CV 10-2108-CAS(E)
- Azizi v. The U.S. of America, et al.

- Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n.6 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 n.6 (1989)
- Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. 678, 681-82 (1946)
- Franklin v. Oregon Welfare Division, 662 F.2d 1337, 1342-43 (9th Cir. 1981)
- O'Brien v. United States Department of Justice, 927 F. Supp. 382, 384 (D. Ariz. 1995), aff'd, 76 F.3d 387 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998)
- Fiedler v. Clark, 714 F.2d 77, 78 (9th Cir. 1983)

OPINION

Ha-Rakhmon Azizi v. United States Dept. of Justice

PER CURIAM.

1 O 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 HA-RAKHAMON AZIZI, ET AL., No. CV 25-7562-CAS(E)

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v. ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR LACK

14 UNITED STATES DEPT. OF JUSTICE, ET OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

AL., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 On August 13, 2025, Plaintiff,¹ proceeding pro se, paid the filing fee and filed a 19 voluminous Complaint against numerous Defendants, including “United States Dept. of 20 Justice,” the Beverly Hills Police Department, the Los Angeles Police Department and “Torat 21 Hayim Synagogue.” This Complaint, like complaints previously filed by Plaintiff and previously 22 dismissed with prejudice,² is largely incomprehensible and wholly insubstantial. 23
 /// 24 25 1 The Court references Ha-Rakhamon Azizi as Plaintiff. “Yahouda Azizi,” whose name also appears in the caption, did not sign the Complaint and is indicated in the caption to 26 have “Passed on.” 27 2 See Azizi v. American Government, et al., No. CV 09-6677-CAS(CT), Azizi v. American Government, et al., No. CV 10-2108-CAS(E), Azizi v. The U.S. of America, et al., 1 The present Complaint vaguely asserts, inter alia, ““mind manipulation,” “disrespecting 2 || the Creator,” “hostage taking,” the “sabotaging of religious articles,” the stealing of “inventions” 3 || (including inventions relating to electric cars and trains) and the implantation of hair on 4 || Plaintiff's body. Plaintiff appears to seek millions of dollars, as well as, perhaps, injunctive 5 || relief. 6 “A paid complaint that is ‘obviously frivolous’ does not confer subject matter 7 || jurisdiction [citation]... .” Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n.6 (9th Cir. 1984) (citing 8 || Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)); see also Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 9 || 327 n.6 (1989); Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. 678, 681-82 (1946); Franklin v. Oregon Welfare Div., 10 ||

662 F.2d 1337, 1342-43 (9th Cir. 1981); O'Brien v. United States Dep't of Justice, 927 F. 11 ||
Supp. 382, 384 (D. Ariz. 1995), aff'd, 76 F.3d 387 (9th Cir. 1996). Dismissal for lack of subject 12
|| matter jurisdiction is proper when the federal claim is "so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed
13 || by prior decisions of this Court, or otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a
14 || federal controversy." Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998) (citations
15 || and internal quotations omitted). Dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction may occur
16 || sua sponte. Fiedler v. Clark, 714 F.2d 77, 78 (9th Cir. 1983). 17 The manifest insubstantiality
of the present Complaint deprives this Court of subject 18 || matter jurisdiction. This jurisdictional
defect could not be cured by amendment. Therefore, IT 19 || |S ORDERED that the reference to
the Magistrate Judge is vacated, and this action is 20 || dismissed with prejudice. 21 LET
JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY. 22 || Dated: September 4, 2025. 23 Airtus brydt_
24 ~~ CHRISTINAA. SNYDER
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26 27 28