

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

AARON GREENSPAN; THINK
COMPUTER FOUNDATION;
THINK COMPUTER
CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES COURTS;
MICHEL ISHAKIAN, in her official
capacity on behalf of the
Administrative Office of the United
States Courts; WENDELL SKIDGEL,
in his official capacity on behalf of the
Administrative Office of the United
States; UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE NORTHERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA;
RICHARD WIEKING, in his official
capacity on behalf of the United States
District Court for the Northern District
of California; CLAUDIA WILKEN, in
her official capacity on behalf of the
United States District Court for the
Northern District of California; and
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,

Defendants.

CASE No. 14cv2396 JTM

AMENDED ORDER DISMISSING
CORPORATE PLAINTIFFS FOR
FAILURE TO OBTAIN LEGAL
REPRESENTATION; GRANTING
ALL MOTIONS TO DISMISS;
DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
FILE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT; GRANTING LEAVE
TO AMEND

On December 1, 2014, the court entered an Order Dismissing Corporate
Plaintiffs for Failure to Obtain Legal Representation; Granting all Motions to Dismiss;

1 Denying Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint and Granting Leave to
2 Amend (“Order”). Through inadvertence, the court failed to address the American Bar
3 Association’s motion to dismiss the Tenth Claim for Violation of the Cartwright Act.
4 This Amended Order addresses and dismisses the Tenth Claim with prejudice and
5 without leave to amend.¹

6 INTRODUCTION

7 On August 21, 2014, the court issued an Order to Show Cause (“OSC) to
8 Plaintiffs Think Computer Foundation (“Foundation”) and Think Computer
9 Corporation (collectively “Corporate Plaintiffs”) to show cause why they should not
10 be dismissed as parties for failure to obtain counsel. (Ct. Dkt. 44). Having carefully
11 considered Plaintiffs’ response to the OSC, (Ct. Dkt. 48), Plaintiffs’ response to an
12 earlier OSC issued by the Honorable Judge Beth Labson Freeman, (Ct. Dkt. 24), the
13 response to the OSC filed by defendant American Bar Association (“ABA”), (Ct. Dkt.
14 50), the court record and pertinent legal authorities, the court dismisses Corporate
15 Plaintiffs from this action without prejudice for failure to obtain legal representation.
16 Corporate Plaintiffs will be dismissed from this action with prejudice unless, within 60
17 days of entry of this order, (1) Corporate Plaintiffs retain legal representation and (2)
18 retained counsel files a Notice of Appearance.

19 This order also addresses the motions to dismiss filed by Defendants
20 Administrative Office of the United States Courts (“AO”); Michel Ishakian, in her
21 Official Capacity on behalf of the AO; Wendell Skidgel, in his official capacity on
22 behalf of the AO; United States District Court for the Northern District of California
23 (“CAND”); Richard Wieking, in his official capacity on behalf of the CAND; Claudia
24 Wilken,² in her official capacity on behalf of the CAND; and the American Bar
25 Association (“ABA”). Plaintiffs oppose all motions. For the reasons set forth below,

26
27 ¹ The only changes made in this Amended Order relate to the Tenth cause of
action and the addition of footnote 15.

28 ² Although not named in the First Amended Complaint, Chief Judge Wilken is
named in the Second Amended Complaint.

1 the court grants all motions to dismiss, dismisses the First through Seventh, the Ninth,
2 and Tenth causes of action with prejudice, dismisses the Eighth cause of action without
3 prejudice, and grants Plaintiff 30 days leave to amend from the date of entry of this
4 order to file an amended Eighth cause of action in a Third Amended Complaint. The
5 court also denies Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file the proposed Second Amended
6 Complaint.

7 **BACKGROUND**

8 The Plaintiffs

9 On May 23, 2014, Corporate Plaintiffs commenced this action seeking injunctive
10 and declaratory relief.³ Among other things, the operative First Amended Complaint
11 ("FAC"), filed on June 16, 2014, added Aaron Greenspan as a party plaintiff. (Ct. Dkt.
12 23).⁴ Greenspan "is the founder, President, CEO, Chairman of the Board of Directors,
13 and 100% owner of Think Computer Corporation, as well as the founder, President,
14 and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Think Computer Foundation." (FAC ¶17).
15 Think Foundation is an Ohio non-profit corporation recognized by the Internal
16 Revenue Service as a tax-exempt organization under §501(c)(3) of the Internal
17 Revenue Code." (FAC ¶18). Think Foundation operates a website (PlainSite.org)
18 "that compiles government information, including information from the Courts via
19 PACER, in order to make such information more accessible to the general public." Id.
20 Think Corporation is incorporated in Delaware with its principal place of business in
21 Mountain View, California. Think Corporation developed the software used by
22 Foundation in operating PlainSite.org and it "plays an active role in its management."
23 (FAC ¶19).

24
25
26 ³ The court highlights that the term "Corporate Plaintiffs" refers to Think
27 Computer Foundation and Think Computer Corporation, "Greenspan" or "Plaintiff"
28 refers to plaintiff Aaron Greenspan, and "Plaintiffs" to all three plaintiffs.

⁴ The court notes that the Second Amended Complaint, addressed herein, is
virtually identical to the FAC (except as to certain legal theories). The differences
between the complaints are not otherwise relevant to the present order.

1 The Defendants

2 Defendant AO is a federal governmental entity that “overseas PACER in all
3 respects.” (FAC ¶20).⁵ The central PACER website is one of many individual PACER
4 websites “that the various district, bankruptcy, and appellate courts each maintain with
5 some degree of autonomy.” (FAC ¶5). Defendant Michel Ishakian, sued in his official
6 capacity, is an alleged federal employee of the AO, tasked with managing PACER, who
7 personally communicated with Greenspan concerning PACER’s fee structure. (FAC
8 ¶21). Defendant Wendell Skidgel, sued in his official capacity, is an alleged Senior
9 Attorney Advisor for the AO and personally communicated with Greenspan concerning
10 PACER and its fee structure. Defendant CAND “is a federal district court in the Ninth
11 Circuit with control over its own Local Rules.” (FAC ¶23). Defendant Richard
12 Wieking, sued in his official capacity, is the Clerk of Court of the CAND. The
13 Honorable Judge Claudia Wilken, sued in her official capacity, is the Chief Judge of
14 the CAND. She is allegedly responsible for “maintaining and setting the direction of
15 the District Court’s Local Rules.” (FAC ¶25). Defendant ABA is the alleged “sole
16 entity responsible for the accreditation of law schools within the United States” and
17 “has participated jointly and severally with various state bar associations and courts to
18 promulgate, validate, and enforce its anti-competitive policies.” (FAC ¶26).

19 The Claims

20 The First Claim, asserted against Chief Judge Wilken, Clerk of Court Wieking,
21 and the CAND (collectively the “CAND Defendants”), is for the alleged violation of
22 42 U.S.C. ¶1983 based upon the adoption of L.R. 3-9(b), which requires corporations
23 to obtain legal representation, and L.R. 5-1(b), which requires pro se litigants to seek
24 and obtain permission from the judge assigned to their case in order to become an ECF
25 user. Such conduct allegedly violates the equal protection clause of the Fifth
26

27
28 ⁵ Electronic access to public court filings in federal district and appellate courts
is provided by a system known as PACER or Public Access to Court Electronic
Records.

1 Amendment.⁶ (Ct. Dkt. 34 ¶2). The Second Claim, asserted against the CAND
2 Defendants, is based upon the same conduct described in the First Claim but allegedly
3 arises under the Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment. Id. The Third Claim,
4 asserted against the CAND Defendants, is for the alleged violation of 42 U.S.C. §1983
5 based upon the adoption of L.R. 3-9(b). Such conduct allegedly violates the First
6 Amendment under the theory that the Corporate Plaintiffs may represent themselves
7 in court proceedings pro se as “a form of political expression and association.” (FAC
8 ¶123).

9 The Fourth Claim, asserted against Defendants Ishakian, Skidgel, and the AO
10 (collectively the “AO Defendants”), is for the alleged violation of 42 U.S.C. §1983
11 based upon L.R. 5-1(b) and the fee structure imposed by the AO for obtaining copies
12 of the court docket, charging \$0.10 per page. Such conduct allegedly violates the
13 “Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment.”⁷ The Fifth Claim, asserted against
14 the AO Defendants, is based upon the same conduct described in claim four but
15 allegedly arises under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. The Sixth
16 Claim, asserted against the AO Defendants, alleges that they violated his First
17 Amendment rights by “interfer[ring] with Plaintiff’s ability to write and speak about
18 government activities by imposing an unlawful cost structure for PACER data.” (FAC
19 ¶148). The Seventh Claim, asserted against the AO Defendants, alleges that the
20 copying fee of \$0.10 per page violates the “E-Government Act of 2002, which
21 Congress intended to promote access to public domain information, by being
22 unreasonable and far in excess of the extent necessary to operate and improve
23 PACER.” (FAC ¶155). The Eighth Claim, asserted against the AO Defendants, alleges
24 a Federal Tort Claims Act (“FTCA”) claim, 28 U.S.C. §1346, and seeks the return of

25
26 ⁶ The proposed SAC identifies the Fifth Amendment as the constitutional
27 amendment allegedly violated by Defendants, and not the Fourteenth Amendment as
alleged in the FAC. (Ct. Dkt. 34).

28 ⁷ The reference to the “Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment” is
Plaintiffs’ characterization of the nature of this claim. (SAC at p.28:19-21; 33:15-16).
For consistency, the court repeats this phrase throughout this order.

1 the copying costs (\$1,077.56) of PACER documents.

2 The Ninth Claim, asserted against the ABA, alleges a violation of the Sherman
3 Act, 15 U.S.C. §2, based upon allegations that the ABA limits “the number of ABA-
4 accredited law schools issuing degrees,” lobbies for “Restrictive Local Rules,” and
5 “has monopoly power in the submarket for individuals capable of representing
6 corporations before the federal courts, as well as in the market for legal professionals.”
7 (FAC ¶166). As a consequence of the alleged “monopoly power,” otherwise qualified
8 prospective legal professionals allegedly cannot obtain a license to practice law without
9 attending “a small number of extraordinarily expensive ABA-certified law schools.”
10 (FAC ¶168). The ABA also bills at hourly rates ranging from \$250 to \$1,000 per hour,
11 participated in schemes designed to exclude non-attorneys from having access to
12 justice, and limited the legal profession such that the majority of Americans do not
13 have access to affordable and necessary legal assistance. (FAC ¶168). The Tenth
14 Claim, asserted against the ABA, alleges a violation of the Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus.
15 and Prof. Code § 16700 et seq., based upon allegations that the “ABA limits the
16 quantity of ABA-accredited law schools,” “imposes and/or recommends policies
17 intended to artificially increase the market price of legal services,” “encouraged
18 Restrictive Local Rules and policies that amount to refusals to deal with non-
19 attorneys.” (FAC ¶¶187, 188, 191). “Corporate Plaintiffs have been damaged in the
20 amount spent on unnecessary attorney’s fees as a result of Defendant ABA’s unlawful
21 activity, or at least \$50,000.” (FAC ¶192)

22 Plaintiffs allege that they have spent in excess of \$1,000 in expenses related to
23 PACER. In broad brush, Plaintiff argues that the PACER fees

24 are being collected in violation of the E-Government Act of 2002, [and
25 that] PACER is a colossal mess from a technological perspective that
26 routinely overcharges users for errors, failed search results, and
27 documents that the system has recorded as already having been purchased.
Just as importantly, CM/ECF, the e-filing component of PACER, offers
parties to a case one free copy of each document in that case - except
when the party does not have access, which is often.

28 (Ct. Dkt. 41, *Oppo*. at p.2:12-17). The AO charges users \$0.10 per page for PACER

1 data and \$2.40 per audio file. (FAC ¶27). The FAC alleges that the PACER fee
2 schedule states that “No fee is charged for access to judicial opinions.” This is
3 allegedly false because “PACER very often charged \$0.10 per page for access to
4 judicial opinions.” (FAC ¶30).

5 The FAC generally alleges two broad categories of wrongs, one arising from the
6 PACER system and the other from the requirement that corporate entities must be
7 represented by an attorney as required by federal law and Civil Local Rule 3-9(b). The
8 FAC alleges that the fees collected through PACER violate the E-Government Act of
9 2002. The controlling statute provides “[t]he fees and costs to be charged and collected
10 in each court of appeals shall be prescribed from time to time by the Judicial
11 Conference of the United States. Such fees and costs shall be reasonable and uniform
12 in all the circuits.” 28 U.S.C. §1913. The FAC alleges that the fees charged are
13 excessive and cites a Princeton University Center report which identifies that, in 2010,
14 PACER’s expenses were about \$25 million and its revenues of \$90 million thus
15 resulting in a profit of \$65 million. (FAC ¶¶34 - 35). The FAC alleges that the
16 practice of overcharging for PACER continues to the present date. Greenspan’s
17 request for a refund of PACER fees has been denied by the AO. (FAC ¶54).

18 The other central claim is that corporate entities should be able to represent
19 themselves in federal court. The FAC broadly alleges a First Amendment right to self-
20 representation by fictitious entities. In addition, the requirement for legal
21 representation is financially burdensome to corporations, particularly those classified
22 as “small business.” (FAC ¶¶60 - 66).

23 The essence of the claim against the ABA is that the ABA participates in
24 proposed changes to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules for “the true
25 purposes . . . to attempt to increase demand for and exclude competition with attorneys,
26 whose private interests are collectively represented by Defendant ABA.” (FAC ¶96).
27 Through these actions, the ABA allegedly conspires with its members “to impose
28 restrictive Local Rules.” (FAC ¶97).

Procedural History

On June 11, 2014, Judge Freeman issued an Order to Show Cause why the original complaint, filed by the Corporate Plaintiffs only, should not be dismissed because the Corporate Plaintiffs were not represented by counsel. On June 16, 2014 the FAC was filed, adding Greenspan as a plaintiff. On July 17, 2014, Judge Freeman issued an order, noting that Corporate Plaintiffs could appear only through licensed counsel. However, as Greenspan was now a party to the action, the court left “for another day the determination as to whether the Corporate Plaintiffs may appear without counsel properly licensed to practice law before this Court.” (Ct. Dkt. 33).

On July 23, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a proposed Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) adding Chief Judge Wilken as a party defendant. Shortly thereafter, Judge Freeman recused herself from the case and, on August 5, 2014, the Executive Committee for the Northern District of California ordered that this case be reassigned to an out-of-district judge. (Ct. Dkt. 39). On August 8, 2014, the case was reassigned by the Executive Committee to the undersigned. (Ct. Dkt. 40).

On August 21, 2014, the undersigned granted Greenspan’s request for Permission for Electronic Case Filing pursuant to Northern District Civil L.R. 5.1. The court denied the motion with respect to the Corporate Plaintiffs because they had not retained legal representation. On the same date, the court also issued an OSC to the Corporate Plaintiffs to show cause why they should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to retain legal representation. The court also set a briefing schedule on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to file the SAC and the various motions to dismiss. The present order addresses the OSC and all pending motions.

DISCUSSION

Legal Standards

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) dismissal is proper only in “extraordinary” cases. United States v. Redwood City, 640 F.2d 963, 966 (9th Cir. 1981). Courts should grant 12(b)(6) relief only where a plaintiff’s complaint lacks a

1 "cognizable legal theory" or sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory.
2 Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dept., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). Courts should
3 dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim when the factual allegations are
4 insufficient "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Bell Atlantic Corp.
5 v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (the complaint's allegations must "plausibly
6 suggest[]" that the pleader is entitled to relief); Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
7 (under Rule 8(a), well-pleaded facts must do more than permit the court to infer the
8 mere possibility of misconduct). "The plausibility standard is not akin to a 'probability
9 requirement,' but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted
10 unlawfully." Id. at 678. Thus, "threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action,
11 supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice." Id. The defect must appear
12 on the face of the complaint itself. Thus, courts may not consider extraneous material
13 in testing its legal adequacy. Levine v. Diamantheset, Inc., 950 F.2d 1478, 1482 (9th
14 Cir. 1991). The courts may, however, consider material properly submitted as part of
15 the complaint. Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner and Co., 896 F.2d 1542, 1555
16 n.19 (9th Cir. 1989).

17 Finally, courts must construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the
18 plaintiff. Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493, 1500 (9th Cir. 1995), cert. dismissed, 116
19 S. Ct. 1710 (1996). Accordingly, courts must accept as true all material allegations in
20 the complaint, as well as reasonable inferences to be drawn from them. Holden v.
21 Hagopian, 978 F.2d 1115, 1118 (9th Cir. 1992). However, conclusory allegations of
22 law and unwarranted inferences are insufficient to defeat a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. In
23 Re Syntex Corp. Sec. Litig., 95 F.3d 922, 926 (9th Cir. 1996).

24 **The Order to Show Cause**

25 In response to the OSC, Greenspan contends that legal representation for the
26 Corporate Plaintiffs is too expensive, burdensome, and not necessary in today's legal
27 environment. Further, Greenspan argues that Corporate Plaintiffs, after Citizens United
28 v. Federal Election Com'n, 588 U.S. 310 (2010), have the First Amendment right to

1 self-representation.⁸ These arguments are not persuasive and run counter to well-
2 established and precedential authorities.

3 As noted by the Supreme Court, “[i]t has been the law for the better part of two
4 centuries, for example, that a corporation may appear in the federal courts only through
5 licensed counsel.” Rowland v. California Men’s Colony, Unit II Men’s Advisory
6 Council, 506 U.S. 194, 201-02 (1993) (quoting Osborn v. President of Bank of United
7 States, 9 Wheat. 738, 829, 6 L.Ed. 204 (1824)). This well-established rule applies
8 equally to corporations or to associations. See In re Highley, 459 F.2d 554, 555 (9th
9 Cir. 1972) (corporations); McShane v. United States, 366 F.2d 286, 288 (9th Cir. 1996)
10 (a non-attorney pro se plaintiff may not represent any other party); United States v.
11 High Country Broad Co., Inc., 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (9th Cir. 1993) (“A corporation may
12 appear in federal court only through licensed counsel.”). This same venerable common
13 law rule exists in the State of California. “[A] corporation, unlike a natural person,
14 cannot represent itself before courts of record in propria persona, nor can it represent
15 itself through a corporate officer, director or other employee who is not an attorney. It
16 must be represented by licensed counsel in proceedings before courts of record.” CLD
17 Const. Inc. v. City of San Ramon, 120 Cal.App.4th 1141, 1145 (2004).

18 Absent contrary legal authority, this court is not free to disregard established
19 precedent.⁹ While Greenspan cites several lower court authorities which have
20 permitted certain individuals to make limited appearances on a fictitious entity’s behalf,
21 those authorities have no precedential value and represent aberrant cases. The Supreme
22
23

24
25 ⁸ Plaintiff specifically challenges the constitutionality of L.R. 3-9(b) (“A
26 corporation, unincorporated association, partnership or other such entity may appear
only through a member of the bar of this Court.”) which requires corporate entities to
be represented by legal counsel.

27 ⁹ The court notes that Greenspan dedicates a substantial portion of his response
28 to the OSC to a critique of the legal profession. (Ct. Dkt. 124 at pp. 9:3 - 16:11, Exh.
A). This argument has no bearing on whether a fictitious business entity may appear
in a legal proceeding without legal representation.

1 Court referred to one of the authorities cited in the FAC,¹⁰ In Re Holliday's Tax Serv.,
2 Inc., 417 F.Supp. 182 (E.D.N.Y. 1976), as one of those "aberrant cases" that does not
3 uniformly hold that "corporations, partnerships, or associations" may "appear in federal
4 court" only through a licensed attorney. Rowland, 506 U.S. at 202, n.5.

5 The court also rejects Greenspan's argument that Citizen's United created a First
6 Amendment free speech right for corporations or associations to appear in federal court
7 without legal representation. Greenspan argues that Corporate Plaintiffs may advocate
8 for a change in the law with respect to legal representation and that such corporate
9 political speech "involves issues of federal policy and its impact on businesses and
10 non-profit organizations." (Ct. Dkt. 48 at ¶9). There is no doubt that the Corporate
11 Plaintiffs or Greenspan may advocate issues of federal policy and its impact on
12 businesses and non-profit organizations. Plaintiffs may, among many other things,
13 lobby for changes in the law, write editorials, and organize protests against the law, all
14 on behalf of the Corporate Plaintiffs. However, the issue before the court is a narrower
15 one: Whether a non-lawyer individual appearing pro se in this action may provide legal
16 representation to the Corporate Plaintiffs. The answer to this issue is a resounding no.
17 Citizens United does not undermine this court's determinations.

18 In Citizens United, the Supreme Court held that the First Amendment prohibited
19 the government from restricting independent political expenditures by a nonprofit
20 corporation. Applying this principle to the Corporate Plaintiffs, they are free to spend
21 any amount of money they desire in support of political causes or candidates (although
22 they are limited in the amount of money given directly to candidates). The only legal
23 authority located by the parties or this court which addressed the impact of Citizens
24 United on a pro se's ability to represent corporate entities rejected such a notion.
25 Timberline Builders, Inc. v. Donald D. Jayne Trust, 786 N.W.2d 873 at *3 (Iowa 2010).

27 ¹⁰ The court notes that the FAC does not comply with Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a). Rule
28 8(a) requires a complaint to set forth "a short and plain statement of the claim showing
that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2). Legal argument in a
complaint is not appropriate under federal pleading rules.

1 The Iowa Court of Appeals aptly noted “[w]hen a business accepts the advantages of
2 incorporation, it must also bear the burdens, including the need to hire counsel to sue
3 or defend in court.” Id. (quoting Woodford Mfg. Co. v. A.O.Q., Inc. 772 P.2 652, 654
4 (Colo. App. 1988), cert. denied, 797 P.2 748 (Colo. 1990)). Citizens United is simply
5 not helpful to Corporate Plaintiffs.¹¹

6 In sum, the court dismisses the Corporate Plaintiffs from this action without
7 prejudice. Corporate Plaintiffs will be dismissed from this action with prejudice
8 unless, within 60 days of entry of this order, (1) Corporate Plaintiffs retain legal
9 representation and (2) retained counsel files a Notice of Appearance.

10 **The CAND Defendants**

11 Plaintiff alleges three claims against the CAND Defendants based upon the
12 alleged adoption of L.R. 3-9(b), which requires corporations to obtain legal
13 representation, and L.R. 5-1(b), which requires pro se litigants to seek and obtain
14 permission from the judge assigned to their case in order to become an ECF user. The
15 First Claim arises from the enactment of these Local Rules and allegedly violates the
16 “Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment.” The Second Claim is based upon
17 the same conduct described in the First Claim but allegedly arises under the Due
18 Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. The Third Claim is based upon the adoption
19 of L.R. 3-9(b). These claims fail on many different levels.¹² Each claim challenges the
20 constitutionality of L.R. 5-1(b).

21
22 ¹¹ The court notes that Plaintiff appears to be under a misconception concerning
23 the role of the First Amendment in federal court. Federal courts are not public forums.
24 The Federal Rules of Evidence severely limit speech to “relevant” evidence. Further,
25 legal issues, with certain limited exceptions not applicable in the present case, are
constrained by legal precedent, whether arising under constitutional, statutory, or
common law.

26 ¹² At the outset, the court dismisses those portions of the First through Third
27 causes of action challenging the constitutionality of L.R. 3-9(b), because (1) as set forth
28 above, the requirement that fictitious entities may appear in legal proceedings only
through legal representation is constitutional and (2) Plaintiff lacks standing to bring
a challenge to L.R. 3-9(b) because he is an individual appearing pro se on his own
behalf and not the Corporate Plaintiffs’ legal counsel. L.R. 3-9(b) simply does not
apply to Greenspan.

1 The court dismisses all three causes of action for several reasons. First, Plaintiff
2 does not identify the legal basis for his claims. Plaintiff brings these claims pursuant
3 to 42 U.S.C. §1983. However, as acknowledged by Plaintiff, this section only applies
4 to state actors and the CAND Defendants are federal actors. Id. The claims also do not
5 arise under Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403
6 U.S. 388 (1971) because the CAND Defendants are sued in their official, and not
7 individual, capacities. See FDIC v. Meyer, 510 U.S. 471, 486 (1994) (no Bivens
8 claims against federal agencies); Consejo de Desarrollo Economico de Mexicali v.
9 United States, 482 F.3d 1157, 1173 (9th Cir. 2007) (no Bivens claims against agents
10 in their official capacity). The failure to identify the legal basis for the claims alleged
11 in the complaint warrants dismissal of these claims.

12 Second, the CAND Defendants are entitled to legislative immunity in
13 promulgating local rules. The promulgation of local court rules is a legislative
14 function. In Supreme Court of Virginia v. Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., 446 U.S.
15 719 (1980), the Supreme Court held that the Virginia Supreme Court, and its chief
16 justice, sued in his official capacity, were immune from suit in adopting local bar rules.
17 Id. at 734. While immunity is appropriate where judges act in an authorized legislative
18 capacity, immunity does not extend to “insulate judges from declaratory or injunctive
19 relief with respect to their judicial acts.” Id. 735. Here, there are no allegations that
20 the CAND Defendants have acted in an adjudicative capacity. Accordingly, as
21 currently pleaded, CAND Defendants are entitled to immunity for these causes of
22 action.

23 Finally, Plaintiff would not prevail on the merits. L.R. 5-1(b) provides:

24 A case that involves a pro se party is subject to electronic filing, unless it
25 is a sealed case. However, the pro se party may not file electronically
26 unless the pro se party moves for and is granted permission by the
27 assigned judge to become an ECF user in that case. Parties represented by
28 counsel in a case involving a pro se party must file documents
electronically and serve them manually on the pro se party unless the pro
se party has been granted permission to become an ECF user.

Under either equal protection or due process principles, the rule passes constitutional

1 muster.

2 “The Equal Protection Clause does not forbid classifications. It simply keeps
3 governmental decisionmakers from treating differently persons who are in all relevant
4 respects alike. Evidence of different treatment of unlike groups does not support an
5 equal protection claim.” Wright v. Incline Village General Improvement Dist., 665
6 F.3d 1128, 1140 (9th Cir. 2011) (citations omitted). Where the local rule does not
7 violate constitutionally protected fundamental rights and does not operate to the
8 “detriment of a suspect class, the only requirement of equal protection is that [the local
9 rule] be rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest.” Harris v. McRae, 448
10 U.S. 297, 326 (1980).

11 Here, the CAND, like other judicial districts, could have rationally concluded
12 that a case-by-case review was a reasonable and rational means to account for the
13 diverse backgrounds, technical abilities, and economic realities of pro se litigants.
14 While virtually every attorney has access to computer technology (pursuant to L.R. 5-1
15 all attorneys must file electronically), a number of pro se litigants lack access to a
16 computer (i.e. individuals who may be incarcerated, economically distressed, or
17 intellectually challenged) or the skills needed to maneuver through the electronic case
18 filing system. Seen in this light, there is a reasonable and rational basis to require pro
19 se litigants who desire to file electronically to make a simple application to the court
20 for leave to file electronically. The court concludes that there is no fundamental right
21 to file documents electronically or identifiable suspect class. Accordingly, L.R. 5-1(b)
22 is rationally related to legitimate judicial interests.

23 Whether Plaintiff asserts a substantive or procedural due process claim (the
24 complaint is unclear on this point), the claims do not survive scrutiny. Because
25 Plaintiff cannot identify a fundamental right or suspect classification, he must
26 demonstrate that there is no rational basis for L.R. 5-1(b). See Gallo v. U.S. Dist. Court
27 for Dist. Of Arizona, 349 F.3d 1169, 1181 (9th Cir. 2003) (local rule restricting
28 appearances to members of the forum state’s bar, thus excluding out-of-state attorneys

1 from practicing law in Arizona, does not violate substantive due process); United
2 States v. Alexander, 48 F.3d 1477, 1491 (9th Cir. 2011).

3 In sum, as there are no circumstances under which Plaintiff can state a claim
4 against the CAND Defendants based upon the adoption of L.R. 5-1(b), the court
5 dismisses Claims One, Two, and Three with prejudice and without leave to amend.

6 **The AO Defendants**

7 The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claims

8 The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Claims, brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983,
9 broadly allege that the PACER fee schedule discriminates against the indigent, there
10 is no appeal process to seek a refund for PACER fees paid in violation of due process,
11 and the charging of PACER fees violates Plaintiff's First Amendment rights. These
12 claims fail for multiple reasons.

13 First, Plaintiff's legal theory, brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 (or even if
14 Plaintiff alleged a Bivens violation) affords no relief against the AO or officials in their
15 official capacities. See Meyer, 510 U.S. at 486 (no Bivens claims against federal
16 agencies); Consejo de Desarrollo Economico, 482 F.3d at 1173 (no Bivens claims
17 against agents in their official capacity). Second, the AO Defendants also assert that
18 Plaintiff is not alleged to be an indigent individual and, therefore, he lacks standing to
19 argue that the PACER fee schedule discriminates against the indigent. See Lujan v.
20 Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992). Plaintiff does not dispute this
21 argument. Rather, he contends that one of the Corporate Plaintiffs demonstrated a net
22 loss. This argument is insufficient to demonstrate an actual injury because the
23 Corporate Plaintiffs are no longer parties to this action. Third, with respect to the Fifth
24 Claim for a refund, the complaint fails to allege that Plaintiff personally, and not the
25 Corporate Plaintiffs, paid for copying costs. Fourth, Plaintiff fails to cite any authority
26 that due process requires an agency to provide an appeal process. See In re Burley, 738
27 F.2d 981, 987 (9th Cir. 1984) ("there is no constitutional right to an appeal"). Fifth,
28 Plaintiff's claim that the fee structure violates the First Amendment is baseless.

1 Plaintiff, like any other person, has free access to one copy of any document filed in
2 the case and, with respect to any other case filed in the Northern District of California
3 (or virtually any other judicial district in the country for that matter), Plaintiff can also
4 access any filing, except those documents filed under seal, by accessing the public
5 terminals in the Clerks' offices.¹³ There is little, if any, burden on Plaintiff's First
6 Amendment rights when he has free access to court documents and upon payment of
7 the copying fee he can obtain copies of documents in those cases where he is not a
8 party. See Bacon v. Reyes, 2013 SL 1405843 at *4 (D. Nev. April 4, 2013); Johnson
9 v. Moore, 948 F.2d 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1991) ("A denial of free photocopying does not
10 amount to a denial of access to the courts.").

11 In sum, the court grants the motion to dismiss the Fourth through Sixth claims
12 with prejudice and without leave to amend.

13 The Seventh Claim

14 The Seventh Claim alleges that the PACER fee structure violates the E-
15 Government Act 2002, 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq. (FAC ¶163). This claim also fails for
16 multiple reasons. First, the E-Government Act of 2002 does not provide a private right
17 of action and Plaintiff fails to address this defect in his opposition. In re French, 401
18 B.R. 295, 313 (E.D. Tenn. 2009) ("the E-Government Act of 2002 does not provide a
19 private cause of action"); see Logan v. U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass'n, 722 F.3d 1163, 1169-73
20 (9th Cir. 2013) (dismissing claims where the statute at issue did not provide a private
21 right of action).

22 Even if alleged, the court also notes that this claim is not reviewable under the
23 Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") because the AO is not an agency for purposes
24 of the APA. Courts are authorized to review federal agency action. 5 U.S.C. §551(1).
25 However, it defines the term "agency" to exclude the "courts of the United States." 5
26 U.S.C. §701(b)(1)(B). Muirhead v. Mecham, 427 F.3d 14, 18 (1st Cir. 2005) ("The

27
28 ¹³ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201 the court takes judicial notice that the Clerk's Office provides public access terminals which provide free access to PACER documents, although printing those documents cost \$0.10 per page.

1 Administrative Office of the United States Courts is part of the judicial branch, so the
2 Director's actions are not subject to judicial review under the terms of this waiver.");
3 Tashima v. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 719 F.Supp. 881, 886 (C.D. Cal.
4 1989) (the AO is not an "agency" within the meaning of the APA).

5 In sum, the court grants the motion to dismiss the Seventh Claim with prejudice
6 and without leave to amend because there are no circumstances under which Plaintiff
7 can state a claim for violation of the E-Government Act of 2002.

8 The Eighth Claim

9 The Eighth Claim alleges that the AO Defendants, by charging PACER fees, are
10 liable for "conversion, theft of funds, wire fraud and/or bank fraud" under the FTCA.
11 The FAC alleges that all Plaintiffs paid \$1,077.56 in copying costs. As with the other
12 claims alleged by Plaintiff, this claim fails on many levels. First, Plaintiff has failed
13 to join the United States as a party. The United States is the only party liable under the
14 FTCA. F.D.I.C. v. Craft, 157 F.3d 697, 706 (9th Cir. 1998). Second, the allegations
15 of "conversion, theft of funds, wire fraud, and/or bank fraud" fail to state a claim. The
16 allegations of overcharging for copying costs do not support a claim for conversion or
17 civil theft. See Williamson v. Reinalt-Thomas Corp., 2012 WL 1438812 at *5 (N.D.
18 Cal. April 25, 2012) (holding that overcharging does not constitute conversion). Third,
19 with respect to "bank fraud" or "wire fraud," Plaintiff must comply with the
20 particularity requirement of Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b), something Plaintiff fails to do. Finally,
21 claims for misrepresentation or fraud are barred by 28 U.S.C. §2680(h). Accordingly,
22 this claim necessarily fails.

23 The court grants the motion to dismiss the Eighth Claim and grants Plaintiff 30
24 days leave to amend to assert a FTCA claim. Plaintiff is advised that the failure to state
25 a claim in an amended complaint may result in the dismissal of this claim with
26 prejudice.

1 **The ABA’s Motion to Dismiss**¹⁴

2 The Ninth Claim

3 The Ninth Claim alleges a violation of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §2, based
4 upon allegations that the ABA limits “the number of ABA-accredited law schools
5 issuing degrees,” lobbies for “Restrictive Local Rules,” and “has monopoly power in
6 the submarket for individuals capable of representing corporations before the federal
7 courts, as well as in the market for legal professionals.” (FAC ¶166). As a
8 consequence of the alleged “monopoly power,” an otherwise qualified prospective
9 legal professional allegedly cannot obtain a license to practice law without attending
10 “a small number of extraordinarily expensive ABA-certified law schools.” (FAC
11 ¶168). The ABA also bills at hourly rates ranging from \$250 to \$1,000 per hour,
12 participated in schemes designed to exclude non-attorneys from having access to
13 justice, and limited the legal profession such that the majority of Americans do not
14 have access to affordable and necessary legal assistance. (FAC ¶168).

15 The ABA argues that Greenspan lacks anti-trust standing. Section 2 of the
16 Sherman Act provides: “Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize,
17 or combine or conspire with any other persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or
18 commerce ... shall be deemed guilty of a felony.” 15 U.S.C. § 2. “To state a plausible
19 monopolization claim under this provision requires plaintiff to show: (a) the possession
20 of monopoly power in the relevant market; (b) the willful acquisition or maintenance
21 of that power; and (c) causal antitrust injury.” Somers v. Apple, Inc., 729 F.3d 953, 963
22 (9th Cir. 2013) (citations and quotations omitted).

23 The critical issue raised by the ABA is whether Plaintiff adequately pleads a
24 plausible antitrust injury. “Antitrust injury” means “injury of the type the antitrust
25 laws were intended to prevent and that flows from that which makes defendants' acts
26 unlawful.” Id. (quoting Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc., 429 U.S. 477,

27
28 ¹⁴ As with the other motions to dismiss, arguments raised by Corporate Plaintiffs
have not been considered since they are no longer parties to this action.

1 489 (1977)). The Ninth Circuit identifies five elements of an antitrust injury: “(1)
2 unlawful conduct, (2) causing an injury to the plaintiff, (3) that flows from that which
3 makes the conduct unlawful, [] (4) that is of the type the antitrust laws were intended
4 to prevent,” and (5) that “the injured party be a participant in the same market as the
5 alleged malefactors, meaning the party alleging the injury must be either a consumer
6 of the alleged violator's goods or services or a competitor of the alleged violator in the
7 restrained market.” Id.; Lucas Automotive Engineering, Inc. v. Bridgestone/Firestone,
8 Inc., 140 F.3d 1228, 1232 (9th Cir. 1998).

9 Here, Plaintiff fails to plead that he suffered any antitrust injury. The FAC fails
10 to articulate any unlawful conduct; any harm to Plaintiff arising from the unidentified
11 unlawful conduct; that the antitrust laws were intended to restrict associations, like the
12 ABA, to comment upon and promote procedural or substantive rules, statutes, or
13 regulations; or that he is a consumer of ABA’s services. Further, certain allegations
14 in the FAC are misinformed. For example, the FAC alleges that the ABA “restrict[s]
15 the number of ABA-accredited law schools issuing degrees, which are necessary as a
16 prerequisite for Bar membership in almost every state in the United States, . . .” The
17 court notes that there are about 23 unaccredited law schools in California whose
18 graduates may sit for the bar and obtain bar membership. See [http://admissions.calbar.](http://admissions.calbar.ca.gov/Education/LegalEducation/LawSchools.aspx)
19 [ca.gov/Education/LegalEducation/LawSchools.aspx](http://admissions.calbar.ca.gov/Education/LegalEducation/LawSchools.aspx). With respect to any alleged
20 injury, Plaintiff alleges that the Corporate Plaintiffs spent money on “unnecessary”
21 attorneys’ fees. (FAC ¶¶181, 192).

22 Plaintiff also alleges that for small businesses the price of legal services is
23 prohibitive and “that ultimately the most sensible alternative is to abandon valid legal
24 claims.” (FAC ¶171). This allegation and many others set forth in the Ninth Claim are
25 superfluous and do not address, as currently pled, the elements required to state a 15
26 U.S.C. §2 claim. Plaintiff further alleges that the ABA lobbies for restrictive local
27 rules (like L.R. 3-9(b)) and “promotes the economic interests of lawyers at the expense
28 of all others.” (FAC ¶176). The thrust of this and similar allegations is that “the ABA

1 has undertaken a deliberate campaign designed to strip ordinary Americans -
2 individuals and corporations alike - of their constitutional First Amendment rights to
3 free speech and their right to self-representation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1654.” (Ct.
4 Dkt. at p.21:6-9). This conduct has allegedly resulted in Plaintiff’s loss of personal
5 income because Corporate Plaintiffs spent their revenues on attorneys’ fees which
6 would otherwise have passed through to Plaintiff. (FAC ¶64). To the extent that
7 Plaintiff seeks to assert a claim based upon the alleged harm to Corporate Plaintiffs,
8 such allegations of indirect harm fail to state a claim. See Ass’n of Wash. Pub. Hospt.
9 Dists. v. Phillip Morris, Inc., 241 F.3d 696, 701-04 (9th Cir. 2001).

10 In sum, the court grants the ABA’s motion to dismiss the Ninth Claim without
11 leave to amend and with prejudice as there does not appear to be any circumstances
12 under which Plaintiff will be able to assert a Sherman Act claim.

13 The Tenth Claim

14 “In 1907, the California Legislature enacted the Cartwright Act which ‘generally
15 outlaws any combinations or agreements which restrain trade or competition or which
16 fix or control prices.’” Ashai Kasei Pharma Corp. v. CoTherix, Inc., 204 Cal.App.4th
17 1, 7 (2012) (citations omitted). Like the Sherman Act, the Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus.
18 and Prof. Code §16700 et seq., generally “prohibits conspiracies that unreasonably
19 restrain trade.” SC Manufactured Homes, Inc. v. Liebert, 162 Cal.App.4th 68, 84
20 (2008). Any person injured in his or her business or property may, “by reason of
21 anything forbidden or declared unlawful by” the Cartwright Act bring a private action
22 for treble damages or injunctive relief. Bus. and Prof. Code §16750. Section 16720(a)
23 defines the prohibited kinds of “trusts” (combinations of capital, skill or acts by two
24 or more persons) as including those created for or carrying out unreasonable
25 restrictions in trade or commerce.

26 In order to prevail on Plaintiff’s claim that the ABA “is an unlawful trust
27 designed to restrict trade and market competition in the market for legal services,”
28 (FAC ¶186), he must establish “(1) the formation and operation of the conspiracy; (2)

1 illegal acts done pursuant thereto; and (3) damage proximately caused by such acts.”
2 Asahi, 204 Cal.App.4th at 8. Here, the FAC not only fails to allege the operation of
3 the conspiracy but to identify any illegal activities taken by the ABA. Finally, Plaintiff
4 cannot allege that he suffered any damages because the Corporate Plaintiffs, and not
5 Plaintiff, spent \$50,000 “on unnecessary attorney’s fees as a result of Defendant ABA’s
6 unlawful activity.” (FAC ¶191).

7 In sum, the court grants the ABA’s motion to dismiss the Tenth Claim without
8 leave to amend and with prejudice as there does not appear to be any circumstances
9 under which Plaintiff will be able to assert a Cartwright Act claim.

10 **Plaintiff’s Request for Judicial Notice**

11 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, Plaintiff seeks to have the court take
12 judicial notice of several documents. (Ct. Dkts. 49, 51). While the documents are
13 generally of the type subject to judicial notice, the court denies the request for two
14 reasons. First, evidentiary submissions are generally not required to resolve issues
15 raised under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b) and they have not been considered by the court in
16 relation to the pending motions. Second, many of the documents relate to Corporate
17 Plaintiffs. As the Corporate Plaintiffs are no longer parties to this action, the
18 documents have no relevancy to any issue at bar.

19 **Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend**

20 Plaintiff moves for leave to file the SAC, primarily for the purpose of identifying
21 the correct Constitutional Amendment allegedly giving rise to his claims. (Ct. Dkt.
22 34). Defendants have not opposed the motion. While leave to amend is to be freely
23 given under Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a), the court denies the motion because, for the above
24 stated reasons, the amendment is futile under the legal theories asserted in the proposed
25 SAC. See Saul v. United States, 928 F.2d 829, 843 (9th Cir. 1991). The motion to
26 amend is denied as the proposed SAC fails to state a claim for relief.


27 **CONCLUSION**

28 In sum, the court dismisses the Corporate Plaintiffs without prejudice for failure

1 to obtain legal representation. Corporate Plaintiffs will be dismissed from this action
 2 with prejudice unless, within 60 days of entry of this order, (1) Corporate Plaintiffs
 3 retain legal representation and (2) retained counsel files a Notice of Appearance. The
 4 court also grants the CAND Defendants' motion to dismiss the First through Third
 5 Claims without leave to amend and with prejudice; grants the AO Defendants' motion
 6 to dismiss the Fourth through Seventh Claims without leave to amend and with
 7 prejudice and dismisses the Eighth Claim with leave to amend; and grants ABA's
 8 motion to dismiss the Ninth and Tenth Claims without leave to amend and with
 9 prejudice. The court also grants Plaintiff 30 days leave to amend (from the date of
 10 entry of this order) to file the amended FTCA cause of action (the Eighth Claim).¹⁵

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 DATED: December 4, 2014

13 
 14 _____
 Hon. Jeffrey T. Miller
 United States District Judge

15 cc: All parties

16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26

27 ¹⁵ As Corporate Plaintiffs are no longer parties to this action, the rulings on the
 28 causes of action do not apply to them. However, the analysis supporting the dismissal
 of certain claims with prejudice (Claims One through Seven) would appear to apply
 equally to Corporate Plaintiffs.