

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
RODNEY BELLE, SR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 10-0616
)	
TEMECULA/RIVERSIDE/SAN DIEGO)	
SUPERIOR COURT/NEVADA TOWNSHIP)	
COMMISSIONERS & PRESIDING)	
JUDGES, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Rodney Belle, Sr., proceeding *pro se* and purporting to proceed as a “private attorney general,” filed the complaint in this case on April 19, 2010. He names as defendants fifty-five individuals and entities, as well as one thousand “John and Jane Does” and, as a group, the “Temecula/Riverside/San Diego Superior Court/Nevada Township Court & Commissioners & Presiding Judges.” Complaint (“Compl.”) at 1-6. Among the named defendants are variety of alleged employees of the Superior Court of California, numerous employees of the Riverside County “Sheriff Department,” the City of San Diego, and assorted banks and other financial institutions. Id.

The substance of Mr. Belle’s complaint is, frankly, incomprehensible, consisting of long strings of legal terms strung together without apparent logic and without connection to specific factual allegations directed at specific defendants. The following passage is characteristic:

Plaintiff Rodney Belle Sr., Per- Private Attorney General Bill & Statute hereby bring this Petition for the Convening of a Federal Grand Jury of my First Amendment Criminal Complaint Reveal and fully Document Troubling state Temecula Coast Guard Court of Maritime/Military Review, Judicial Misconduct Complaint and Attachments by Certified mail to the United States Attorney General and President Obama, Inquire under the freedom of Information Act, Request of Credential of Presidential Commission and [Title of Nobility] Appointment to Temecula and Riverside/San Diego state Court Judges/Nevada Township Court to Act as a Public official Article III District Court Judge and Article III District Court Prosecutor Per-California States Constitution None Ratification in 1879 and Repealed and the State Constitution Eliminations of Justice Court to this date, Justice Municipal/Superior Court and its Administrative Judicial officer of the Peace, is itself Corrupt and Atrocity against the General Public at Large has and will continue to be in Jeopardy as long as None Appointed Article III Court Judge & Article III Court Proceeding Guaranteed Rules of the Common Law by the 7th Amendment of the Constitutions for united States of America.

Compl. at 11. Mr. Belle's complaint is also accompanied by numerous exhibits, including a copy of a very similar complaint filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. See id., Ex. A. That complaint was dismissed as frivolous on November 24, 2009. See Belle v. Deutsche Bank Trust Co., Civil Action No. 09-2563, 2009 WL 4253101 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 24, 2009).

Since the filing of his complaint in this Court, Mr. Belle has never filed an affidavit of service, as is required by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. He has, however, filed a string a documents, each entitled a "notice of joinder" and purporting to consolidate this action with what appear to be judicial proceedings in state court. See, e.g., Notice of Joinder, Docket No. 2, at 6. Only one set of defendants, consisting of Catherine Cortez Masto, Patrick Ferguson, Ted Pribnow, Brett Allen, John Munoz, Diane Comeaux, Fernando Serrano, and Mike Willdon ("the moving defendants"), has responded to the plaintiff's

complaint; they have moved to dismiss the claims against them. See State of Nevada Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint at 1. The Court advised Mr. Belle by Order dated June 4, 2010, that the motion would be granted as conceded if he failed to oppose it as required by Local Civil Rule 7(b). Since Mr. Belle nevertheless failed to respond, the motion will be granted as conceded, and all claims against the moving defendants will be dismissed.

The Court is also empowered to dismiss claims *sua sponte* pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure where a plaintiff's claims are such that "the plaintiff cannot possibly win relief." Boritz v. United States, 685 F. Supp. 2d 113, 126 (D.D.C. 2010) (quoting Best v. Kelly, 39 F.3d 328, 331 (D.C. Cir. 1994)) (internal quotation marks omitted). Such is the case here. Even when construing the complaint as liberally as possible, the Court is unable to extract from the complaint any coherent claims against any of the defendants. Consequently, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion shall issue this same day.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ _____
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN
United States District Judge

DATE: March 31, 2011