

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

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