

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.

OPINION

Ha-Rakhamon 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 Airotus brydt_ 24 ~~ CHRISTINAA. SNYDER 25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 26 27 28