

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Wendy K. Johnson v. Leslie S. Johnson

Johnson v. Johnson · No. 6:25-cv-02341-MTK · Decided December 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon dismissed Wendy K. Johnson’s pro se complaint against Leslie S. Johnson for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court found no federal question or diversity jurisdiction and held that any request to review or reverse the state-court guardianship decision was barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine; related motions were denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mustafa T. Kasubhai
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	December 30, 2025
DOCKET	6:25-cv-02341-MTK
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On sua sponte review, the district court dismissed the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and denied the plaintiff's pending motions as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court conducted sua sponte review of subject matter jurisdiction and also noted the screening authority under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; precedential status is unknown from the opinion text.
PARTIES	Wendy K. Johnson v. Leslie S. Johnson

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- guardianship procedure
- guardianships
- civil procedure
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- guardianships
- federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint invoked federal-question or diversity subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Whether the district court had jurisdiction to review and reverse the Marion County Circuit Court's guardianship decision under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine.
3. Whether the plaintiff's pending motions should be denied as moot after dismissal of the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint did not establish federal-question jurisdiction because it alleged no federal claims, and it did not establish diversity jurisdiction because both parties resided in Oregon.
2. The district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to review or reverse the Marion County Circuit Court's decision appointing Leslie S. Johnson as Wendy K. Johnson's guardian/conservator because the claim was barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine.
3. The motion for injunction, motion to request a pro bono attorney, and motion to object to the payment of fees were denied as moot after dismissal of the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, this case is *DISMISSED* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s motions (ECF Nos. 2, 3, and 6) are *DENIED* as moot.” (Opinion text, concluding paragraph)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Marion County Circuit Court entered a limited judgment appointing Leslie S. Johnson as Wendy K. Johnson's guardian/conservator after a July 2, 2025 hearing. The state court denied Wendy Johnson's motion to terminate the guardianship on September 30, 2025. Wendy Johnson alleged slavery or false imprisonment, challenged the guardianship decision, and alleged that Leslie Johnson stole her inheritance; she sought damages, property-loss damages, attorney fees, and reversal of the guardianship.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action concerned a Marion County Circuit Court guardianship and conservatorship proceeding in which Leslie S. Johnson was appointed Wendy K. Johnson's guardian/conservator. After the state court denied Wendy Johnson's motion to terminate the guardianship, she filed this federal action seeking damages, attorney fees, and reversal of the guardianship. The federal district court construed the unpaid filing fee as a request to proceed in forma pauperis, screened the complaint sua sponte, dismissed it for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and denied the pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Pistor v. Garcia*, 791 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2015)

- *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923)
- *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON WENDY K. JOHNSON, Case No. 6:25-cv-02341-MTK Plaintiff, OPINION AND ORDER v. LESLIE S. JOHNSON, Defendant. KASUBHAI, United States District Judge: Self-represented Plaintiff Wendy K. Johnson brings this action against Defendant Leslie S. Johnson. Plaintiff also filed a Motion for Injunction (ECF No. 2), a Motion to Request a Pro Bono Attorney (ECF No. 3), and a Motion to Object to the Payment of Fees (ECF No. 6).

On sua sponte review¹, Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and Plaintiff's motions are denied as moot. 1 Review is also appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), under which district courts screen applications to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) and dismiss any case that is frivolous or malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Although Plaintiff did not file an IFP application, she did not pay the filing fee. Accordingly, the Court construes Plaintiff's Complaint as a motion to proceed IFP. This case arises out of the Marion County Circuit Court's entry of a limited judgment appointing Defendant as Plaintiff's guardian/conservator following a July 2, 2025 hearing. ECF No. 1-1 at 11.

The Marion County Circuit Court also denied Plaintiff's motion to terminate the guardianship on September 30, 2025. *Id.* at 81. Defendant's attorney in those proceedings petitioned for attorney fees pursuant to Or. Rev. Stat. § 125.095. ECF No. 1-1 at 15-35. Plaintiff alleges "slavery" or false imprisonment by Defendant, who Plaintiff refers to as her "ex-sister." ECF No. 1 at 3-4.

Plaintiff also alleges that the guardianship proceeding was wrongly decided. *Id.* at 3. Finally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant "stole [her] inheritance." *Id.* Plaintiff seeks \$75,000 in damages, \$120,000 in loss of property, and the \$11,709.08 in attorney fees related to the guardianship proceeding. ECF No. 1 at 2. She also asks this Court to reverse the guardianship.

Id. at 3. Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed because this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. Federal courts have jurisdiction over two primary categories of cases: (1) "federal question" cases; and (2) "diversity of citizenship" cases. A "federal question" case involves the Constitution or a federal law or treaty. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331. A "diversity of citizenship" case involves citizens of different states where the amount of damages is more than \$75,000.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). When a court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, meaning it lacks the statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate a case, it must dismiss the complaint, whether upon the motion of a party or sua sponte. See *Pistor v. Garcia*, 791 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2015); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Here, Plaintiff's Complaint does not allege any federal claims, and there is no diversity of citizenship because both Plaintiff and Defendant reside in Oregon. See ECF No. 1 at 1-2. Second, to the extent Plaintiff asks the Court to review and reverse the guardianship established by the Marion County Circuit Court, that claim is barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine.

Under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, district courts may not review state court decisions. The Rooker-Feldman doctrine derives its name from the Supreme Court cases of *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 44 S. Ct. 149, 68 L. Ed. 362 (1923) and *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 103 S. Ct. 1303, 75 L. Ed. 2d 206 (1983).

In both cases, the Supreme Court held that the district courts did not have subject-matter jurisdiction over claims seeking to reverse state judicial determinations because appellate jurisdiction over state actions is left exclusively to the Supreme Court. *Rooker*, 263 U.S. at 415-16; *Feldman*, 460 U.S. at 482.

In accordance with the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review the Marion County Circuit Court's decision appointing Defendant as Plaintiff's guardian/conservator. Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff's motions (ECF Nos. 2, 3, and 6) are DENIED as moot. DATED this 30th day of December 2025. s/Mustafa T. Kasubhai Mustafa T. Kasubhai (he/him) United States District Judge