

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDREA C. WOOD,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04266-MMC
**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**
Re: Dkt. No. 13

United States District Court
Northern District of California

The Court is in receipt of a "Motion for Order for a Preliminary Injunction," filed August 23, 2019, by plaintiff Andrea C. Wood, who proceeds pro se. Having read and considered the motion, the Court rules as follows.¹

In her Amended Complaint ("AC"), plaintiff alleges the named defendants, including Judge Lois Haight ("Judge Haight") of the Superior Court of California, in and for the County of Contra Costa (see AC ¶ 7), deprived plaintiff of her federal constitutional rights in connection with "DFCS proceedings" conducted in state court (see AC ¶ 16). By the instant motion, plaintiff seeks an order "void[ing] the March 5, 2018 and August 14, 2018 determinations of [Judge] Haight" (see Pl.'s Mot. at 4),² on the asserted basis plaintiff was denied "procedural due process" and other federal rights in the course of the state court proceedings (see, e.g., id. at 8-9).

As set forth below, the motion will be denied.

¹To date, none of the defendants has appeared.

²Although the AC contains no specific reference to any determinations made on March 5, 2018, or on August 14, 2018, the Court understands said orders to have been issued in the course of the state court proceedings referenced in the AC.

United States District Court
Northern District of California


1 First, a district court "lacks authority" to grant a preliminary injunction where such
2 requested order would not "grant relief of the same character as that which may be finally
3 granted." See Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Medical Center, 810 F.3d
4 631, 636 (9th Cir. 2015). Here, in the AC, plaintiff states she does not seek an order
5 "overturning" any orders issued by the state court. (See AC ¶ 16.) In other words,
6 plaintiff does not seek a judgment that would void any of Judge Haight's orders. Under
7 such circumstances, the requested preliminary injunction seeks relief of a character that
8 plaintiff herself has disavowed, and, consequently, the motion fails for that reason. See
9 Pacific Radiation Oncology, 810 F.3d at 636.

10 Moreover, even if plaintiff had requested in her AC the relief she seeks in her
11 motion for a preliminary injunction, said motion still would fail, as such relief, in light of the
12 "Rooker–Feldman doctrine," cannot be sought in federal district court. See Exxon Mobil
13 Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 283 (2005) (citing Rooker v. Fidelity
14 Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923) and District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman,
15 460 U.S. 462 (1983)). In particular, as discussed in both Rooker and Feldman, federal
16 authority to review state court judgments is vested exclusively in the United States
17 Supreme Court. See Exxon Mobil Corp., 544 U.S. at 291–92; see also 28 U.S.C. § 1257.
18 In both Rooker and in Feldman, the losing party in a state court case filed suit in federal
19 court, complaining of injury caused by an erroneous state court judgment and seeking
20 review of that judgment, see id. at 291, and, in each instance, the Supreme Court held
21 the district court lacked jurisdiction to consider those claims, see id. at 291–92. Here, as
22 in Rooker and Feldman, plaintiff seeks relief from state court orders on the ground those
23 orders were erroneously entered by the state court. Consequently, this Court likewise
24 lacks jurisdiction to consider such claims.

25 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction is hereby DENIED.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated: August 28, 2019


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge