

RODNEY BELLE, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

TEMECULA/RIVERSIDE/SAN DIEGO
SUPERIOR COURT COMMISSIONER &
PRESIDING JUDGE/JUSTICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

On March 31, 2011, the Court dismissed a complaint filed in a separate case by the plaintiff in this matter, Rodney Belle, Sr., against most or all of the same defendants that are named in the instant litigation. See Belle v. Temecula/Riverside/San Diego Superior Court/Nevada Township Commissioners & Presiding Judges, Civil Action No. 10-0616, Order (D.D.D. Mar. 31, 2011). Like the complaint dismissed in Civil Action No. 10-0616, Mr. Belle’s complaint in this case is largely incoherent and presents no comprehensible theory of the defendants’ legal liability. See id., Memorandum Opinion at 1-3 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2011). The Court therefore will dismiss the complaint *sua sponte* pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Boritz v. United States, 685 F. Supp. 2d 113, 126 (D.D.C. 2010) (*sua sponte* dismissal appropriate where plaintiff’s claims are such that he “cannot possibly win

relief” (quoting Best v. Kelly, 39 F.3d 328, 331 (D.C. Cir. 1994)) (internal quotation marks omitted)).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion shall issue this same day.

SO ORDERED.

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

DATE: April 5, 2011