UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Tarani-Alike Johnson, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., et al.

Johnson v. Wells Fargo · No. 25-cv-10992-HSG · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiffs' pro se motion for a temporary restraining order seeking to prevent a sheriff's sale of their Pennsylvania property. The Court concluded that Plaintiffs had not shown a likelihood of success on the merits, primarily because the requested relief was likely barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and Plaintiffs had not established a sufficient basis for the asserted fraud and jurisdictional theories.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-10992-HSG
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs sought a temporary restraining order preventing Defendants from conducting a sheriff's sale of their property. The district court denied the application.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A plaintiff seeking a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction must normally show a likelihood of success on the merits, likely irreparable harm, that the balance of equities favors relief, and that an injunction is in the public interest. A threshold showing is required on each element; under the Ninth Circuit's sliding-scale approach, serious questions on the merits may suffice only if the other requirements are met.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Tarani-Alike Johnson, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., et al.

TOPICS

injunctions subject matter jurisdiction foreclosure real estate civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure real estate foreclosure remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs satisfied the standard for issuance of a temporary restraining order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65.
2. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine likely deprived the federal district court of jurisdiction to enjoin enforcement of the Pennsylvania foreclosure judgment and sheriff's sale.
3. Whether Plaintiffs' allegations of extrinsic fraud, exclusive federal jurisdiction under 12 U.S.C. § 632, and the absence or invalidity of a state-court judgment established a likelihood of success on the merits.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to establish a likelihood of success on the merits, or even serious questions going to the merits, and therefore were not entitled to the extraordinary remedy of a temporary restraining order.
2. The court concluded that Plaintiffs' requested relief was likely barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine because it sought federal review and invalidation of a state-court judgment and enforcement proceedings.
3. Even assuming the extrinsic-fraud exception to Rooker-Feldman applied, Plaintiffs did not adequately establish a likelihood of success sufficient to obtain a TRO.
4. Section 632 did not establish Plaintiffs' asserted exclusive federal jurisdiction because it applies to actions arising out of property received, possessed, or disposed of for a recognized foreign state or its central bank, circumstances not shown here.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"Preliminary relief is "an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief.""* (at 2)

> *"The Court has no jurisdiction to review or invalidate the state court's judgment."* (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs challenged a Pennsylvania foreclosure proceeding involving their property and sought to stop a scheduled sheriff's sale. They asserted that the foreclosure verdict was void because no judgment had been entered, the lien had expired, and the proceedings involved fraud and false verification. A Pennsylvania court later entered judgment on April 2, 2025, issued a writ of execution, and denied Plaintiffs' challenges to the judgment and writ on December 11, 2025. Plaintiffs had also filed related federal and bankruptcy actions concerning the same property and foreclosure litigation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a federal complaint challenging a Pennsylvania foreclosure verdict and related enforcement proceedings, asserting numerous claims including fraud, RICO violations, conspiracy, perjury, and due process violations. They moved for a temporary restraining order before a scheduled January 6, 2026 sheriff's sale. After ordering notice and receiving no response from Defendants, the court denied the TRO.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20, 22 (2008)
- Leiva-Perez v. Holder, 640 F.3d 962, 966 (9th Cir. 2011)
- All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Doe v. Mann, 415 F.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Johnson v. De Grandy, 512 U.S. 997, 1005-06 (1994)
- Noel v. Hall, 341 F.3d 1148, 1164 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Tagoia v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., No. 17-CV-06777-YGR, 2018 WL 1156836, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2018)
- Sweeney v. Carringer, No. 25-CV-03148-JST, 2025 WL 2597543, at *3 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2025)
- Kougasian v. TMSL, Inc., 359 F.3d 1136, 1141 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Johnson v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Case No. 23-cv-01376-KBH (E.D. Pa. Apr. 30, 2024), Dkt. No. 36 at 5-6
- Johnson v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Case No. 23-cv-03091-JMY (E.D. Pa.)