

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Kenneth S. Taylor v. Judge Michael C. Martin

555 U.S. 7 (United States District Court for the Central District of California 2025) · No. 5:25-cv-01447-SVW-KES · Decided June 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Plaintiffs Kenneth S. Taylor and Alycia Taylor’s motion for a temporary restraining order seeking to halt enforcement of a state unlawful detainer judgment. The court concluded that the claims improperly sought review of the state-court proceeding under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, were frivolous, and violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. The court dismissed the claims with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen V. Wilson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	June 11, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-01447-SVW-KES
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for a temporary restraining order seeking to prevent eviction and enforcement of a California unlawful detainer judgment. The district court denied the motion and sua sponte dismissed the complaint with prejudice as frivolous and violative of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A temporary restraining order is evaluated under the same four-factor standard as a preliminary injunction. Sua sponte dismissal is permissible when a complaint is frivolous, lacks an arguable basis in law or fact, or cannot possibly support relief; dismissal for failure to satisfy Rule 8 is reviewed under the district court's discretion as described in the cited authority.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown

PARTIES

Kenneth S. Taylor, Alycia Taylor v. Judge Michael C. Martin, FG Temecula Senior Apartments, LP, other defendants

TOPICS

injunctions

motions to dismiss

pleadings

subject matter jurisdiction

landlord tenant

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

landlord-tenant

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to a temporary restraining order preventing eviction and enforcement of the California unlawful detainer judgment.
2. Whether the district court could dismiss the complaint sua sponte as frivolous and for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.
3. Whether the federal action improperly sought review or interference with the state-court unlawful detainer judgment under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs were not entitled to a temporary restraining order because they failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits, and the requested relief improperly sought to challenge the state-court unlawful detainer ruling.
2. The district court could not interfere in or review the state unlawful detainer proceeding or its judgment.
3. The court could dismiss the complaint sua sponte because the claims lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and plaintiffs could not possibly obtain relief.
4. The complaint violated Rule 8 because it was disorganized, confusing, and failed to provide a short and plain statement explaining plaintiffs' entitlement to relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under the ‘Rooker-Feldman doctrine,’ review of state court decisions may only be conducted in the United States Supreme Court.”

“district courts may not interfere in or review state unlawful detainer proceedings, whether ongoing or completed.”

“The Court, upon review of Plaintiffs’ evidence, does not see any evidence of improper conduct by the state court or any related entity.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs leased an apartment from FG Temecula Senior Apartments, LP, but failed to pay their full rent in February 2025 and paid no rent in March. After receiving a three-day notice to pay rent or quit, plaintiffs neither

paid nor vacated. The landlord prevailed in a California unlawful detainer action after a bench trial, and plaintiffs filed this federal case alleging numerous constitutional, statutory, and common-law violations while seeking to stop eviction and enforcement of the state judgment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs entered into a lease with FG Temecula Senior Apartments, LP, failed to pay rent, and remained in possession after receiving a three-day notice to pay rent or quit. The landlord prevailed against them in a California unlawful detainer action after a bench trial. Plaintiffs then filed this federal action and sought emergency injunctive relief challenging the state-court proceedings. The district court denied the temporary restraining order and dismissed the claims with prejudice without advance notice because the claims lacked an arguable basis in law or fact and plaintiffs could not possibly obtain relief.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Winter v. NRDC, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008)
- Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (per curiam)
- West v. PBC Mgmt. LLC, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118204, 2023 WL 4477296, at *2 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 2023)
- Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush & Co., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Partington v. Gedan, 961 F.2d 852, 864 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Perry v. NP Parc Chateaux, LLC, 2022 WL 4486140, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2022)
- Scherbenske v. Wachovia Mortg., FSB, 626 F. Supp. 2d 1052, 1058 (E.D. Cal. 2009)
- Busch v. Torres, 905 F. Supp. 766, 771 (C.D. Cal. 1995)
- Watts v. Santos, 48 F.3d 1230, at *1 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- Omar v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc., 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Gleason v. Gasetlo, 2019 WL 3802188, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2019)