

**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

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