

# Russell Rope vs. CaIVCP

1 Name: Russell Rope  
2 Address: PO Box 1198  
3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
5 Plaintiff In Pro Per  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 CV14-04002

(VBK)

10 Russell Rope,

) Case No.: \_\_\_\_\_

11 PLAINTIFF,

12 vs.

) Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant To

13 California Vicitim Compensation

) 42 U.S.C. § 1983

14 Program and John Does 1 to 10

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

18 DEFENDANT(S).

20 I. JURISDICTION

21  
22 1. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 & 28 U.S.C. § 1343.  
23 Federal question jurisdiction arises pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

RUSSELLROPE.COM/BLOG

# Introduction

## DISCLAIMER & LEGAL AGREEMENT

By continuing to read the documents contained in this book, you agree to respect and honor the intellectual property of Russell Rope. Additionally, this information is more than copyright and fraud protected for all forms of media (with the exception of authorized publicity). Please help set a good example for society by showing support for this peaceful pursuit of justice is a most civil reaction to serious and long endured injustice.

This work in progress is being published at present for public record, because the information has been stolen and leaked, and the judge publicized this case in the court system despite a request to file under seal. The cases disappeared from the system right before some corrupt pigs who neglected Russell's legitimate plead for justice failed at trying to make him and his work disappear.

Prior to filing in pro per, Russell Rope did not receive proper guidance from the Pro Se Clinic in the courthouse, which said the judge would be lenient towards pro per filing. Russell went back to the clinic for reconsideration and refiling information, understands his first time filing errors, but is still seeking qualified legal assistance for both refiling and whatever may arise; however, it is still of preference to settle without spending anymore time wasting time that should be used for development etc. Consider this a final opportunity for opposition to take responsibility and surrender before feeling the full force of a legitimate legal wrath including both possible prosecution and civil war.

1 Name: Russell Rope  
2 Address: PO Box 1198  
3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
5 Plaintiff In Pro Per  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 CV14-04002

(VBK)

10 Russell Rope, ) Case No.:  
11 PLAINTIFF, )  
12 vs. ) Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant To  
13 California Vicitim Compensation ) 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
14 Program and John Does 1 to 10 )  
15 )  
16 )  
17 )  
18 DEFENDANT(S). )  
19 )

LODGED

2014 MAY 23 PM 4:24

BY:

20 I. JURISDICTION

21  
22 1. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 & 28 U.S.C. § 1343.  
23 Federal question jurisdiction arises pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

**II. VENUE**

2. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the defendants are a government program plus its officials and cosnpirators whose locations are are unknown, and more importantly, the plaintiff/victim lives in this district.

**III. PARTIES**

3. Plaintiff's name is Russell Rope. Plaintiff resides at: address protected by Safe at Home program (C.G.C. 6205-6210) within the county of Los Angeles

4. Defendant is California Vicitim Compensation Program, a state run and federally funded program, which is operated by government employees who reside in unkown locations.

5. Defendant John Does 1 to 10 are the suspected conspirators involved in this complaint. Defendants reside in unknown locations.



#### IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

6 . Plaintiff is both a brilliant entrepreneur and a pioneering influencer of industry. Unfortunately, plaintiff is also the victim of more than civil conspiracy. Plaintiff reported relevant crimes to all authorities and was directed towards civil action, Safe at Home and California Victim Compensation Program. Plaintiff has made several attempts at both applying and appealing for his legal entitlement to victim compensation only to be denied by a fraudulent misrepresentation of the facts and discrimination against his person. Plaintiff has both demanded his civil liberty and threatened legal action. The most recent appeal is still being processed.

7 . Defendants conspired to deny both compensation and the plaintiff's civil rights. In "the board's" acts of denying victim compensation and civil rights, defendants obstructed justice, stalled the legal process, consumed much valuable time, caused additional stress, and contributed to the exacerbation of both professional issues and personal health related problems; with demonstrable injury to and scarring of the plaintiff's face. Dated documents and audio records most of which match up with paper/snail mail communication, serve as clear and convincing evidence to the authenticity and accuracy of the plaintiff's claims.

8 . Plaintiff seeks justice not limited to victim compensation as requested and entitled to him by the law. Additionally, plaintiff seeks compensation for further damages and inconvenience caused by defendants lack of punctuality and integrity. Finally, plaintiff seeks punitive damages and any other remedy the court sees fit including the possibility of but not currently requesting both termination of employment and court ordered criminal prosecution of John Does 1 to 10.

**V. CAUSES OF ACTION**

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

(Conspiracy to Interfere with Civil Rights & Conspiracy Against Rights)

(As against Defendant(s): California Vicitim Compensation Program  
and John Does 1 to 10 )

9 . Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 8

10 . 42 U.S.C. § 1985 - Conspiracy To Interfere With Civil Rights

(2) Obstructing Justice - "if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of  
impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of  
justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal  
protection of the laws"

11 . 18 U.S. Code § 241 - Conspiracy Against Rights "If two or more  
persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State  
Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or  
enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of  
the United States... They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned"

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

( Fraud Misrepresentation & Deceit Concealment )

(As against Defendant(s): California Vicitim Compensation Program  
and John Does 1 to 10 )

12 . Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 11

13 . 18 U.S.C. § 1001 “(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section,  
whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or  
judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully—  
(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact”

14 . California Civil Code Section 1710 - Deceit “(3) The suppression of  
a fact, by one who is bound to disclose it, or who gives information of other facts  
which are likely to mislead for want of communication of that fact;”

**VI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff requests:

15. Immediate and full payment of victim compensation requested and  
pursuant to both C.G.C. § 13957 and U.S.C Title 42 Chapter 112

16. Compensatory damages, including punitive, general and special  
damages, according to proof.

17. Injunctive relief to prevent defendants from creating more problems.

18. Any further relief which the court may deem appropriate.



**VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial on all issues raised in this complaint.

Dated: 5-21-2014

Sign:

Print Name: Russell Rope

Plaintiff in pro per

FILED

2014 MAY 23 PM 4:23

CLERK OF COURT  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

BY: 

1 Name: Russell Rope  
2 Address: PO Box 1198  
3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
5 Plaintiff In Pro Per

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9  
10 Russell Rope,  
11 **PLAINTIFF,**  
12 **vs.**  
13 California Vicitim Compensation  
14 Program and John Does 1 to 10  
15  
16  
17  
18 **DEFENDANT(S).**

CV14-04002

(VBK)

Case No.: CV14-04002


**Request To File Under Seal**

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

**PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE**

**ORDER DATED**

20 1. Plaintiff requests to file under seal for several reasons: First, the Plaintiff is  
21 an active member of the Safe at Home Program with justifiable concern for his  
22 safety and security based on stalking, harrasment, and threats, which entitles him  
23 to confidential name and address provisions according to C.G.C. 6205-6210.  
24 Second, there is reason to believe suspected John Does 1 to 10 seek undeserved  
25 public recognition for their crimes. Third, publicly labeling the plaintiff a  
26 "victim" can further damage the plaintiff's reputation by making him look weak.  
27 In conclusion, plaintiff believes the reasons to seal this case outweigh the  
28 alternative; therefore, plaintiff humbly requests the court's approval.

 5-23-2014

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

<b>I. (a) PLAINTIFFS</b> ( Check box if you are representing yourself <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> )  Russell Rope		<b>DEFENDANTS</b> ( Check box if you are representing yourself <input type="checkbox"/> )  California Victim Compensation Program and John Does 1 to 10	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff <u>Los Angeles</u> <small>(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)</small>		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>Sacramento</u> <small>(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)</small>	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.  In Pro Per <u>Russell Rope #1607</u> <u>PO Box 1198</u> <u>Sacramento, CA 95812</u>		Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.  Legal and Appeals Office PO Box 350 Sacramento, CA 95812	

<b>II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION</b> (Place an X in one box only.)  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width:48%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. U.S. Government Plaintiff         </div> <div style="width:48%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)         </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width:48%;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. U.S. Government Defendant         </div> <div style="width:48%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)         </div> </div>	<b>III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES</b> -For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant)  <table style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:33%;">Citizen of This State</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;"><b>PTF</b></td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;"><b>DEF</b></td> <td style="width:33%;">Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;"><b>PTF</b></td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;"><b>DEF</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of Another State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td>Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td>Foreign Nation</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> </tr> </table>	Citizen of This State	<b>PTF</b>	<b>DEF</b>	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	<b>PTF</b>	<b>DEF</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1			<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Citizen of This State	<b>PTF</b>	<b>DEF</b>	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State	<b>PTF</b>	<b>DEF</b>																				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1			<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4																				
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5																				
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6																				

<b>IV. ORIGIN</b> (Place an X in one box only.) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width:16%;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Original Proceeding         </div> <div style="width:16%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Removed from State Court         </div> <div style="width:16%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Remanded from Appellate Court         </div> <div style="width:16%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Reinstated or Reopened         </div> <div style="width:16%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Transferred from Another District (Specify)         </div> <div style="width:16%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Multi-District Litigation         </div> </div>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

**V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND:** ☐ Yes ☒ No (Check "Yes" only if demanded in complaint.)

**CLASS ACTION under F.R.Cv.P. 23:** ☐ Yes ☒ No **MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT:** \$ 100,000,000.00

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION** (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)  
 Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant To 42 U.S. Code § 1983 - This is a civil action for deprivation of rights. Defendants are conspiring and obstructing justice based on their fraudulent misrepresentation of the facts plus their unjustified discrimination against the plaintiff seeking damages for claims supported by clear and convincing evidence.

**VII. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an X in one box only.)

OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT.	IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS
<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc. <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Org. <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Info. Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Vet. Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>TORTS</b></div> <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>PERSONAL INJURY</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Fed. Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury-Med Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>TORTS</b></div> <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>BANKRUPTCY</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b></div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 American with Disabilities-Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 American with Disabilities-Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Habeas Corpus:</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Other:</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus/Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>FORFEITURE/PENALTY</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>LABOR</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Ret. Inc. Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405 (g)) <div style="background-color: #f2f2f2; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b></div> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case Number:

CV-71 (11/13)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 1 of 3

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

**VIII. VENUE:** Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

<b>Question A: Was this case removed from state court?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If "no," go to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN THE COUNTY OF:		INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles		Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo		Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange		Southern
	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino		Eastern

<b>Question B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a party to this action?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If "no," go to Question C. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	If the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, is a party, is it:		INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
	A PLAINTIFF?	A DEFENDANT?	
	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of DEFENDANTS reside.	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of PLAINTIFFS reside.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles	Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange	Southern
	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino	Eastern
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Western	

Question C: Location of plaintiffs, defendants, and claims? (Make only one selection per row)	A. Los Angeles County	B. Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties	C. Orange County	D. Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	E. Outside the Central District of California	F. Other
Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.1. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:**

- ☐ 2 or more answers in Column C  
☐ only 1 answer in Column C and no answers in Column D

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
SOUTHERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Southern" in response to Question D, below.  
If none applies, answer question C2 to the right. →

**C.2. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:**

- ☐ 2 or more answers in Column D  
☐ only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
EASTERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.  
If none applies, go to the box below. ↓

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
WESTERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Western" in response to Question D below.

<b>Question D: Initial Division?</b>	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD
Enter the initial division determined by Question A, B, or C above: →	Western



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

**IX(a). IDENTICAL CASES:** Has this action been previously filed **in this court** and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**IX(b). RELATED CASES:** Have any cases been previously filed **in this court** that are related to the present case? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:**

(Check all boxes that apply)

- ☐ A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or
- ☐ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☐ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- ☐ D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.

**X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  
(OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):** \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 05/21/2014

**Notice to Counsel/Parties:** The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet).

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))

FILED

Russell Rope #1607  
 PO Box 1198  
 Sacramento, CA 95812  
 916-400-5592

2014 MAY 23 PM 4:23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Russell Rope

CASE NUMBER

CV 14-04002

(VBK)

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER,

v.

California Victim Compensation Program  
 and John Does 1 to 10

DEFENDANT(S).

REQUEST TO PROCEED  
 IN FORMA PAUPERIS WITH  
 DECLARATION IN SUPPORT

I, Russell Rope, declare under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct; that I am the petitioner/plaintiff in the above entitled case; that in support of my motion to proceed without being required to prepay fees, costs or give security therefore, I state that because of my poverty I am unable to pay the costs of said proceedings or to give security therefore and that I am entitled to redress.

I further declare under penalty of perjury that the responses which I have made to the questions and instructions below are true, correct and complete.

1. Are you presently employed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

a. If the answer is yes, state the amount of your salary or wages per month, and give the name and address of your employer. The plaintiff is self-employed, does not currently have any income, and can not afford court fees.

Plaintiff's personal and business credit card debit exceeds checking accounts as a result of this and related cases.

b. If the answer is no, state the date of last employment and the amount of the salary and wages per month which you received. \_\_\_\_\_

2. Have you received, *within the past twelve months*, any money from any of the following sources?

a. Business, profession or form of self-employment? ☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Rent payments, interest or dividends? ☐ Yes ☒ No

c. Pensions, annuities or life insurance payments? ☐ Yes ☒ No

d. Gifts or inheritances? ☒ Yes ☐ No

e. Any other income (other than listed above)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

f. Loans? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If the answer to any of the above is yes, describe such source of money and state the amount received from each source during the past twelve (12) months: Little income from self-employment and some gift money from family.  
Less than \$10,000 most of which has been used to keep the plaintiff and his business alive.

REQUEST TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS WITH DECLARATION IN SUPPORT

3. Do you own any cash, or do you have money in a checking or savings account? (Include any funds in prison accounts, if applicable.) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is yes, identify each account and separately state the amount of money held in each account for each of the six (6) months prior to the date of this declaration.

Chase Pers. Checking: \$202.01, Credit: \$-370.43, Chase Business Checking: \$257.01, Credit: \$-2016.98, PayPal \$7.3

4. Do you own any real estate, stocks, bonds, notes, automobiles, or other valuable property (excluding ordinary household furnishings and clothing)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is yes, describe the property and state its approximate value: 2004 Jeep Liberty \$7,777 ?

Computers and Technology \$10,000? Intellectual Property \$NA-\$1,000,000,000+

5. In what year did you last file an Income Tax return? 2013/2014

Approximately how much income did your last tax return reflect? Less Than \$10,000

6. List the persons who are dependent upon your for support, state your relationship to those persons, and indicate how much you contribute toward their support:

Plaintiff is currently dependent upon some family for shelter and the Department of Public Social Services for food stamps and MediCal. Plaintiff helps with some household chores and is legally entitled to support from the state.

I understand that a false statement or answer to any question in this declaration will subject me to penalties for perjury. I further understand that perjury is punishable by a term of imprisonment of up to five (5) years and/or a fine of \$250,000 (18 U.S.C. Sections 1621, 3571).

California  
State

Los Angeles County  
County (or City)


I, Russell Rope, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

5-21-2014

Date



Plaintiff/Petitioner (Signature)



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Russell Rope,  PLAINTIFF(S)	CASE NUMBER  2:14-cv-04002 (VBK)
v.  California Victim Compensation Program, et al.,  DEFENDANT(S).	<b>ORDER RE LEAVE TO FILE ACTION WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF FILING FEE</b>

IT IS ORDERED that the complaint may be filed without prepayment of the filing fee.

Further proceedings in this matter are subject to the orders of the Judge to whom the case is assigned.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
United States Magistrate Judge

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the request of plaintiff/petitioner to file the action without prepayment of the filing fee be **DENIED** for the following reason(s):

- ☐ Inadequate showing of indigency  
☐ Legally and/or factually patently frivolous  
☒ Other: See attachment

Comments:

7-30-2014  
Date

[Signature]  
United States Magistrate Judge

IT IS ORDERED that the request of plaintiff to file the action without prepayment of the filing fee is:  
☐ GRANTED      ☒ DENIED (See comments above).

8/6/14  
Date

[Signature]  
United States District Judge



1 Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program,

2 et al.

3 Case No. CV 14-04002-UA (VBK)

4 ATTACHMENT TO ORDER

5 Because Plaintiff is seeking to proceed In Forma Pauperis,  
6 the Court shall review such a complaint "as soon as practicable  
7 after docketing." Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2), the  
8 District Court is required to dismiss a complaint if the Court  
9 finds that the complaint (1) is legally frivolous or malicious,  
10 (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or  
11 (3) seeks monetary relief from a defendant immune from such  
12 relief. 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B) (re: all in forma pauperis  
13 complaints).

14 A complaint may also be dismissed for lack of subject matter  
15 jurisdiction, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1). Neitzke v.  
16 Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 n. 6 (1989) (unanimous decision)  
17 (patently insubstantial complaint may be dismissed under Rule  
18 12(b)(1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. "Whenever it  
19 appears by suggestion of the parties or otherwise that the court  
20 lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter, the court shall dismiss  
21 the action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (emphasis added). A  
22 challenge to the Court's subject matter jurisdiction can be  
23 raised at any time, including sua sponte by the Court. Emrich v.  
24 Touche Ross and Co., 846 F.2d 1190, 1194 n. 2. (9th Cir. 1988).

25  
26 PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL COMPLAINT

27 Russell Rope (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") filed  
28 a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against  
(CV 14-04002)

1 Defendants California Victim Compensation Program and John Does  
2 1-10. (Complaint at p. 2.) Plaintiff alleges he reported relevant  
3 crimes to "all authorities and was directed towards civil action,  
4 Safe at Home and California Victim Compensation Program." (Id. at  
5 p. 3.) Plaintiff alleges he has "made several attempts at both  
6 applying and appealing for his legal entitlement to victim  
7 compensation only to be denied by a fraudulent misrepresentation  
8 of the facts and discrimination against his person." (Id.)  
9 Plaintiff alleges Defendants have conspired to deny him both  
10 compensation and his civil rights. (Id.) Plaintiff seeks justice  
11 not limited to victim compensation but also punitive damages and  
12 the termination of employment and possible criminal prosecution  
13 of Defendants John Does 1-10. (Id.)

14 Plaintiff alleges a conspiracy claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1985  
15 and 18 U.S.C. § 241; and a fraud/misrepresentation and deceit  
16 claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a) and California Civil Code § 1710.  
17 (Id. at 4-5.)

18 On June 4, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge Victor B.  
19 Kenton recommended that Plaintiff's request to file the action  
20 without prepayment of the filing fee be denied without leave to  
21 amend for reasons stated in the attachment. The Court found that  
22 Defendants were entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity, that  
23 Plaintiff failed to state claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42  
24 U.S.C. § 1985 and that Plaintiff could not invoke jurisdiction and  
25 pursue claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 1001, as these are  
26 federal criminal statutes.

27 On June 11, 2014, Chief United States District Judge George  
28 H. King ordered that Plaintiff's request to file action without

(CV 14-04002)

1 prepayment of the filing fee be denied with leave to amend in 30  
2 days to correct the defects noted in the attachment.

3  
4 **PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

5 On July 11, 2014, Plaintiff filed an "Ammendment [sic] to Case  
6 & Additional Requests." Plaintiff requests the Court remove  
7 California Victim Compensation Program as a Defendant. Plaintiff  
8 also requests another chance to amend his Complaint, that the  
9 Court appoint counsel and requests confirmation that all cases are  
10 filed under seal.<sup>1</sup>

11  
12 **A. Plaintiff Has Failed to State a Claim Under 42 U.S.C.**  
13 **§ 1983.**

14 In order to state a claim under § 1983, Plaintiff must allege  
15 that: (1) Defendant was acting under color of state law at the  
16 time the complained-of act was committed; and (2) Defendant's  
17 conduct deprived Plaintiff of rights, privileges or immunities  
18 secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. West v.  
19 Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988); Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527,  
20 535 (1981), overruled on other grounds by Daniels v. Williams, 474  
21 U.S. 327, 330-31 (1986). Generally, private parties are not acting  
22 under color of state law. See Price v. Hawaii, 939 F.2d 702, 707-

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> The Court takes judicial notice of its own files and  
25 records. See Mir v. Little Co. of Mary Hosp., 844 F.2d 646, 649  
26 (9th Cir. 1988). Plaintiff lodged two "Complaints" and two  
27 "Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration in  
28 Support" in the following cases: Russell Rope v. John Does 1-10,  
CV 14-04232-UA (VBK) and Russell Rope v. Facebook, Inc., et al.,  
CV 14-04009-UA (VBK). The Court issued Orders denying Plaintiff's  
requests to file actions without prepayment of filing fee on June  
20, 2014 and July 13, 2014, respectively.

1 08 (9th Cir. 1991).

2 Plaintiff also must establish causation, by demonstrating  
3 that each Defendant personally was involved in the constitutional  
4 violation, or that there was a sufficient causal connection  
5 between the Defendant's wrongful conduct and the constitutional  
6 violation. Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446-47  
7 (9th Cir. 1991) (en banc), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1074 (1992);  
8 Hansen v. Black, 885 F.2d 642, 646 (9th Cir. 1989). "The inquiry  
9 into causation must be individualized to focus on the duties and  
10 responsibilities of each individual defendant whose acts or  
11 omissions are alleged to have caused a constitutional  
12 deprivation." Leer v. Murphy 844 F.2d 628, 633 (9th Cir. 1988).

13 The allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint fail to state  
14 a cognizable claim that Defendants violated Plaintiff's federal  
15 constitutional rights.

16

17 **B. Plaintiff Has Failed to State a Civil Conspiracy Claim.**

18 To state a claim for conspiracy, Plaintiff must allege  
19 specific facts showing two or more persons intended to accomplish  
20 an unlawful objective of causing Plaintiff harm and took some  
21 concerted action in furtherance thereof. Gilbrook v. City of  
22 Westminster, 177 F.3d 839 (9th Cir. 1999); Burns v. County of  
23 King, 883 F.2d 819, 822 (9th Cir. 1989) (conclusory allegations of  
24 conspiracy insufficient to state a valid § 1983 claim); see also  
25 Margolis v. Ryan, 140 F.3d 850, 852 (9th Cir. 1998) (to state a  
26 claim for conspiracy under § 1983, Plaintiff must allege facts  
27 showing agreement of the alleged conspirators to deprive her of  
28 her rights. A conspiracy allegation, even if established, does

(CV 14-04002)



1 not give rise to a liability under § 1983 unless there is a  
2 deprivation of civil rights.).

3 Plaintiff's Complaint and Amended Complaint contain  
4 conclusory allegations but no specific facts to support a claim  
5 of conspiracy.

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

(CV 14-04002)

FILED

Name: Russell Rope #1607


Address: PO Box 1198

Sacramento, CA 95812

Phone: (818) 400-5592

Plaintiff In Pro Per

2014 JUL 11 PM 1:37

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES  
BY 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Russell Rope

PLAINTIFF,

vs.

John Does 1 to 10

DEFENDANT(S).

Case No.: CV14-04002

VB/L

Ammendment to Case

& Additional Requests

Plaintiff is ammending this case by removing CalVCP from the defendant(s) list.  
Plaintiff was going to be nice, but now plans to go after the individuals involved.  
Plaintiff is also requesting reconsideration based upon recent filings and the facts  
that this case was filed with help from the Pro Se Clinic and court staff said  
the court would be leniant towards plaintiffs in pro per. The mail forwarding  
provided by Safe at Home caused a two week delay in receiving communication  
from the courthouse; therefore, plaintiff requests extended time for anything with  
a deadline. Plaintiff has yet to receive anything from the court in reference to  
additional cases and requests a speedy trial and prompt processing where possible.  
Plaintiff requests another chance to ammend this and court appointed legal help,  
preferably from a district attorney, but only if there are further problems with this  
or other filings. Plaintiff requests confirmation that all cases are filed under seal.



7-11-2014

FILED

2014 JUL 11 PM 1:37  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIF  
LOS ANGELES

BY \_\_\_\_\_

1 Name: Russell Rope #1607

2 Address: PO Box 1198

3 Sacramento, CA 95812

4 Phone: (818) 400-5592

5 Plaintiff In Pro Per

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 Russell Rope

11 PLAINTIFF,

12 vs.

13 John Does 1 to 10

14 DEFENDANT(S).

Case No.: CV14-04002

VBK

Ammendment to Case


& Additional Requests

17 Plaintiff is ammending this case by removing CalVCP from the defendant(s) list.  
18 Plaintiff was going to be nice, but now plans to go after the individuals involved.  
19 Plaintiff is also requesting reconsideration based upon recent filings and the facts  
20 that this case was filed with help from the Pro Se Clinic and court staff said  
21 the court would be leniant towards plaintiffs in pro per. The mail forwarding  
22 provided by Safe at Home caused a two week delay in receiving communication  
23 from the courthouse; therefore, plaintiff requests extended time for anything with  
24 a deadline. Plaintiff has yet to receive anything from the court in reference to  
25 additional cases and requests a speedy trial and prompt processing where possible.  
26 Plaintiff requests another chance to ammend this and court appointed legal help,  
27 preferably from a district attorney, but only if there are further problems with this  
28 or other filings. Plaintiff requests confirmation that all cases are filed under seal.

*Russell Rope*

7-11-2014

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**



**NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge KING  
 From: R. HORAN, Deputy Clerk Date Received: 6/5/15  
 Case No.: CV 14-4002-UA-VBK Case Title: Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program  
 Document Entitled: Request to ReOpen & Amend Case

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 5-4.1  | Documents must be filed electronically   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 6-1    | Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7-19.1 | Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7.1-1  | No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.1 | Document not legible   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.8 | Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-4.1 | No copy provided for judge   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-6   | Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-8   | Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 15-1   | Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 16-7   | Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 19-1   | Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-1   | Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-2   | Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 83-2.5 | No letters to the judge  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 | No proof of service attached to document(s)  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: | <u>Case close and JS-6 on 5/29/2014; however, judicial determination required.</u> |

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

**ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be filed and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 7/13/15

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 -ORIGINAL-OFFICE



COPY 2 -JUDGE

COPY 3 -SIGNED & RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 -FILER RECEIPT



1 Name: Russell Rope #1607  
 2 Address: PO Box 1198  
 3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
 4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
 5 Plaintiff In Pro Per



6  
 7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 9

10 <u>Russell Rope</u> ,	) <u>Case No.: LA-CV14-04002 VBK</u>
11 <b>PLAINTIFF,</b>	)
12 <b>vs.</b>	) <u>Request To ReOpen &amp;</u>
13 <u>John Does 1 to 10</u>	) <u>Ammend Case</u>
14 <b>DEFENDANT(S).</b>	)
15	)

16 Statement: It has been less than a year since this case was originally filed. The  
 17 Pro Se Clinic said the statutes of limitations in this court are at least a year from  
 18 the last action on each case. Not only has the reported conflict continued and  
 19 evolved, but it has been impossible to resolve most of these issues peacefully and  
 20 outside of the court. Additionally, justice is still being obstructed, which has  
 21 rendered Plaintiff unable to acquire legal representation or help from law  
 22 enforcement. Plaintiff has done much more research on this case, the law, and  
 23 court rules, which has resulted in a better understanding of the system and legal  
 24 processes. Plaintiff is better equipped to move forward In Pro Per at this point.  
 25 This request to reopen and amend case without refiling should save both time  
 26 and resources, or it can at least provide Plaintiff with another opportunity to  
 27 gather more information from your honor. Please reopen this case or respond in  
 28 detail with more information about what else needs to be corrected. Thanks.

1 of 4

Page Number



1 Amendments:

2  
3 1) Change Statute Filed Under To 18 USC §§ 1962(c), 1964(c) Racketeering &/or  
4 Conspiracy/Fraud

5  
6 Plaintiff testimony plus evidence with or without further discovery should easily  
7 prove beyond a reasonable doubt that defendants, damages, and claims are all  
8 connected through some level of conspiracy with more than the two required  
9 indictable racketeering acts falling under 18 USC sections: 1343) Wire Fraud,  
10 201) Bribery, 1503) Obstruction of Justice, 1510) Obstruction of Criminal  
11 Investigations, 1511) Obstruction of State of Local Law Enforcement, 1512)  
12 Tampering With Victim, Witness, or Informant, 1952) Racketeering (the common  
13 objective is both control and money obtained through illegal acts)

14  
15 2) Change Jurisdiction Invoked From 18 USC §§ 2331, 1831, & 1832  
16 To 18 USC §§ 1962(c), 1964(c) provides for liability in civil suits brought by any  
17 person injured in his business or property by RICO violations.

18  
19 3) Attach & Reference As Evidence/Statements/Testimony  
20 Case #s LA-CV14-04900 & LA-CV14-04323

21 4) Withdraw Irrelevant Causes of Actions

22 5) Withdraw Any Inappropriate "Legal Conclusions"

23 6) Withdraw Request To File Under Seal

24 7) Withdraw Request To Proceed In Forma Pauperis

1 Subject Matter Jurisdiction: "May Be Challenged At Any Time"

2  
3 1) In their attempt to control more than personal relationships and the reach of  
4 Plaintiff's media business, Defendants are violating the first amendment by  
5 interfering with freedom of religion, speech, and press.  
6

7 2) Since the original filings, Plaintiff purchased a small pistol for protection, took  
8 a class, studied gun laws, and applied for carry and conceal permit, which was  
9 delayed so the Sheriffs could defraud and abduct Plaintiff in attempt to frame  
10 Plaintiff's character in order to steal property and probably to excuse their  
11 obstruction of justice/criminal investigation, thus infringing on Plaintiff's second  
12 amendment right to bear arms. Sheriffs undoubtedly conspiring with defendants.  
13

14 3) In their violation of the second amendment, the Sheriffs also engaged in  
15 completely unreasonable searches seizures of both self and property, thus  
16 violating the fourth amendment. Additionally, main defendants have clearly been  
17 spying and arguably took control of/seized social web and intellectual property;  
18 also a fourth amendment violation.  
19

20 4) Defendants have been interfering with the health care process, which violates  
21 the Plaintiff's ninth amendment right to health care and private personal matters.  
22

23 5) RICO/Conspiracy Claims: Causation demonstrating each defendant was  
24 involved in the constitutional violations and sufficient casual connection between  
25 their crimes are established through specific facts and evidence, which supports  
26 arguments that agreement must have been formed between Defendants in order to  
27 conduct these unlawful actions includes:  
28



1 a) Repetitive Patterns in Hacks Before Public Knowledge

2 b) Hacks Contain Personal Information

3 c) All Documented with Clear & Convincing Evidence

4 d) Proximity of Defendants to Each Other, Motives, Actions, & Negligence in  
5 Alignment with Accusations.

6 e) Discovery Will Supplement What Has Basically Been Proven in Plaintiff

7 f) Personal Professional Expert Witness Testimony Just Knows The Truth

8  
9 6) Additional Federal Civil (Deprivation of) Rights Violations

10 a) Liability For Deprivation of Civil Rights: Negligence, Obstruction of Justice

11 b) Equal Employment Opportunity: Age And Religious Discrimination

12 c) Equal Housing Opportunity Based On Fraud And Possibly Religion

13 d) Civil Fraud & Civil Conspiracy & Espionage

14 Deprivation of Equal Protection of the Laws

15  
16 7) This Court Is Also Appropriate Based On Monetary Damages Sought,  
17 Interstate Commerce & Plaintiff Over Defendant Locations

18  
19 Requests:

20  
21 1) Please Reopen & Amend Case

22 2) Reconsider Appointment of Qualified Legal Assistance

23 3) Reconsider Request for Court Ordered Criminal Investigation of Defendants

24 4) Reconsider Request for Parking and Security (From Federal Agency)

25 5) Please Reduce Court Fees &/or Bill Upon Case Resolution

26 6) Please Accept & Thought I Have Prove This To A Jury, Some Of Your

27 Comments Seemed Otherwise

28 7) Should This Not Be Acceptable: Please Provide Better Directions

*Plaintiff Russell / Rose*  
*Russell Rose*  
*06/05/15*

*E-FILED*UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	14-04002-UA (VBK)	Date	July 13, 2015
Title	<i>Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program, et al.</i>		

Presiding: The Honorable	GEORGE H. KING, CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE		
Beatrice Herrera	N/A		N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder		Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:		
None	None		

**Proceedings:** (In Chambers) Order re: Motion to Reopen and Amend Case

Before the Court is Plaintiff Russell Rope's ("Plaintiff") "Request to Reopen and Ammend [sic] Case" (hereinafter referred to as "Motion"), filed on June 5, 2015. We find the matter appropriate for resolution without oral argument.

**I. Background**

On May 23, 2014, Plaintiff lodged a "Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983" ("Complaint") and a "Request to Proceed Without Prepayment of Full Filing Fee" ("IFP Application"). Plaintiff named California Victim Compensation Program and John Does 1-10 as Defendants in his Complaint. Plaintiff alleges that he reported relevant crimes to "all authorities and was directed toward civil action, Safe at Home and California Victim Compensation Program." (Compl. at ¶ 6.) Plaintiff alleges that he "made several attempts at both applying and appealing for his legal entitlement to victim compensation only to be denied by a fraud[ul]ent misrepresentation of the facts and dis[c]rimination against his person." (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges the following claims: (1) "[c]onspiracy to [i]nterfere with [c]ivil [r]ights & [c]onspiracy [a]gainst [r]ights" in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985 and 18 U.S.C. § 241; (2) "[f]raud [m]isrepresentation & [d]eceipt [c]oncealment" in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a) and California Civil Code § 1710. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 9-14.)

On June 11, 2014, the Court denied Plaintiff's IFP Application, with leave to amend. The Court explained that Plaintiff failed to state a claim for relief because Defendants were protected by Eleventh Amendment immunity, Plaintiff could not sue to enforce 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 or 1001 because only the United States Attorney may prosecute a defendant for violations of these criminal statutes, and he failed to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 or 1985.

Plaintiff lodged an "Ammendment [sic] to Case & Additional Requests" ("Amended Complaint") on July 11, 2014. In this filing, Plaintiff stated that he was removing California Victim Compensation Program as a Defendant and requested the following: (1) that the Court grant him leave to amend his Complaint; (2) that he be given additional time to comply with Court-imposed deadlines because of the delay in his mail service at Safe at Home; (3) that the Court appoint Plaintiff legal assistance; and (4) that all of his filings in this action be designated as filed "under seal." (*See* Dkt. No. 4.)



*E-FILED*UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	14-04002-UA (VBK)	Date	July 13, 2015
Title	<i>Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program, et al.</i>		

On August 12, 2014, the Court denied Plaintiff leave to file the Amended Complaint without prepayment of the filing fee. In our Order, we explained that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint had failed to state a claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or a claim for civil conspiracy.

Plaintiff filed the instant Motion on June 5, 2015. We construe the Motion to be brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) ("Rule 60(b)").

## II. Legal Standard

"Rule 60(b) allows a party to seek relief from a final judgment, and request reopening of his case, under a limited set of circumstances including fraud, mistake, and newly discovered evidence." Gonzalez v. Crosby, 545 U.S. 524, 528 (2005). Rule 60(b) provides, in relevant part:

On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party . . . from a final judgment, order or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b).

"A motion under Rule 60(b) must be made within a reasonable time - and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) no more than a year after the entry of the judgment or order or the date of the proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1).

## III. Discussion

In the Motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to reopen his case and allow him to amend his Complaint. Plaintiff states that the conflict giving rise to the original filing of this action persists and that he has "done much more research on this case, the law, and court rules, which has resulted in a better understanding of the system and legal processes. Plaintiff is better equipped to move forward In Pro Per at this point. This request to reopen and amend case without refiling should save both time and resources, or it can at least provide Plaintiff with another opportunity to gather more information from your honor." (Mot. at 1.) Plaintiff seeks leave to amend his Complaint as follows: (1) "[c]hange [s]tatute [f]iled [u]nder [t]o 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(c), 1964(c) [r]acketeering &/or [c]onspiracy/[f]raud;" (2) [c]hange [j]urisdiction [i]nvoked from 18 U.S.C. §§ 2331, 1831, & 1832 [t]o 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(c), 1964(c) provides for liability in civil suits brought by any person injured in his business or property by RICO violations;" (3) "[a]ttach & [r]eference [a]s [e]vidence/[s]tatements/[t]estimony [c]ase #s LA-CV14-04900 & LA-CV14-04323;" (4) "[w]ithdraw [i]rrelevant [c]auses of [a]ction;" (5) "[w]ithdraw [a]ny [i]nappropriate '[l]egal [c]onclusions;" (6) "[w]ithdraw [r]equest [t]o [f]ile [u]nder [s]eal;" and



*E-FILED*UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	14-04002-UA (VBK)	Date	July 13, 2015
Title	<i>Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program, et al.</i>		

(7) “[w]ithdraw [r]equest to [p]roceed [i]n [f]orma [p]auperis.” (*Id.* at 1-2.) Plaintiff also moves to add several factual allegations and legal claims. (*See id.* at 3-4.)

Although the Motion was timely filed pursuant to Rule 60(c), Plaintiff has failed to establish any of the Rule 60(b) factors. Plaintiff states only that his conflict with Defendants remains ongoing and that he is in a better position to represent himself in this action because he has conducted research. (*See* Mot. at 1.) This falls well short of the requirements of Rule 60(b) to reopen this action. For example, Plaintiff has not set forth that the Court’s August 12, 2014 Order was entered due to Plaintiff’s “mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1). He has not established the existence of “newly discovered evidence” to show that the case should be reopened. *Id.* at 60(b)(2). He has not claimed that his opposing party had engaged in “fraud . . . , misrepresentation, or misconduct” that resulted in the entry of the August 12, 2014 Order. *Id.* at 60(b)(3). Moreover, he has not claimed that the Court’s “judgment is void,” “has been satisfied, released, or discharged” or that “applying it prospectively is no longer equitable.” *Id.* at 60(b)(4)-(5). Finally, he has not set forth “any other reason that justifies relief.” *Id.* at 60(b)(6). Accordingly, we must deny Plaintiff’s Motion.

We intimate no opinion as to whether Plaintiff’s proposed amendments to his Complaint state a claim for relief.



**IV. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, we DENY Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen and Amend Case. This matter remains closed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Initials of Deputy Clerk AB for Bea

1 Name: Russell Rope #1607  
 2 Address: PO Box 1198  
 3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
 4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
 5 Plaintiff In Pro Per



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10	Russell Rope	)	Case No.: <u>LA-CV14-04002</u>
11	<b>PLAINTIFF,</b>	)	
12	<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>Motion To Amend Request To</b>
13	<u>John Does 1 to 10</u>	)	<b>ReOpen &amp; Ammend Case</b>
14		)	
15	<b>DEFENDANT(S).</b>	)	

16 Plaintiff was unaware of Rule 60(b) being an issue and is easily able to establish  
 17 the factors. Plaintiff admits he is not professionally qualified to practice the law  
 18 and made several mistakes in original filings. The judgement(s) void according  
 19 to Rule 60(b) because there is every reason to justify relief based on clear and  
 20 convincing evidence, both as reported before and newly discovered, including  
 21 but not limited to: photographic, screen shots, emails, letters, audio recordings,  
 22 phone records, video, and witness testimonies in support of real claims for relief  
 23 as requested, which covers serious problems directly caused by defendants  
 24 including but not limited to: health issues, defrauding of money, defrauding of  
 25 income/work, defrauding of intellectual property, entrapping, terrorizing, or  
 26 neglecting, and victimizing plaintiff by all violations mentioned through  
 27 conspiracy; both literally over metaphorically bleeding the Plaintiff to death by a  
 28 thousand unwarranted cuts in the back, which is not legal. Specific to this case,

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

JUL 29 2015

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPUTYTo: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. KingFrom: Andres, Deputy ClerkDate Received: 07/27/2015Case No.: 2:14-cv-04002-UA-VBKCase Title: Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation ProgramDocument Entitled: Motion to amend request

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 5-4.1  | Documents must be filed electronically                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 6-1    | Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7-19.1 | Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7.1-1  | No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.1 | Document not legible  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.8 | Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-4.1 | No copy provided for judge  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-6   | Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-8   | Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 15-1   | Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 16-7   | Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 19-1   | Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-1   | Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-2   | Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 83-2.5 | No letters to the judge   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 | No proof of service attached to document(s)                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: | <u>Case closed, submitted for further review.</u>                           |

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

## ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be filed and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date

7/28/15

U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date

U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE

COPY 2 - JUDGE

COPY 3 - SIGNED &amp; RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT

CV-104A (06/13)

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

E-FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	14-04002-UA (VBK)	Date	August 10, 2015
Title	<i>Russell Rope v. California Victim Compensation Program, et al.</i>		

Presiding: The Honorable	GEORGE H. KING, CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE	
Beatrice Herrera	N/A	N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:	
None	None	

**Proceedings:** (In Chambers) Order re: Motion to Amend Request to Reopen and Amend Case

Before the Court is Plaintiff Russell Rope’s (“Plaintiff”) “Motion to Amend Request to ReOpen [sic] and Ammend [sic] Case” (hereinafter referred to as “Motion”), filed on July 27, 2015. We find the matter appropriate for resolution without oral argument.

We discussed the background of this action in detail in our July 13, 2015 Order and do not repeat it here.


In the Motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to allow him to amend his previous request to reopen the case with what he considers to be a showing on some Rule 60(b) factors. The entirety of the Motion states as follows:

Plaintiff was unaware of Rule 60(b) being an issue and is easily able to establish the factors. Plaintiff admits he is not professionally qualified to practice the law and made several mistakes in original filings. The judgment(s) void according to Rule 60(b) because there is every reason to justify relief based on clear and convincing evidence, both as reported before and newly discovered, including but not limited to: photographic, screen shots, emails, letters, audio recordings, phone records, video, and witness testimonies in support of real claims for relief as requested, which covers serious problems directly caused by defendants including but not limited to: health issues, defrauding of money, defrauding of income/work, defrauding of intellectual property, entrapping, terrorizing, or neglecting, and victimizing plaintiff by all violations mentioned through conspiracy; both literally over metaphorically bleeding the Plaintiff to death by a thousand unwarranted cuts on the back, which is not legal. Specific to this case, there is at least one final fraudulent decision letter that came way after this case was closed. Please do the right thing and grant the requests made by this honest Plaintiff in Pro Per.

(See Mot. at 1-2 ([sic] as to all).)

Although Plaintiff argues that several Rule 60(b) factors apply, Plaintiff does not provide any evidence in support of his arguments. Without any supporting evidence, Plaintiff’s arguments are insufficient to demonstrate any of the relevant Rule 60(b) factors would apply here. Again, as we stated in our July 13, 2015 Order denying Plaintiff’s last motion:

1 Name: Russell Rope #1607  
 2 Address: PO Box 1198  
 3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
 4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
 5 Plaintiff In Pro Per



RECEIVED  
 BUT NOT FILED  
 SEP 10 2015  
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10	Russell Rope	)	Case No.: LA-CV14-04002-GHK (VBK)
11	PLAINTIFF,	)	Date: 10-26-2015
12	vs.	)	Time: 9:30 am Room 650
13	John Does 1 to 10 aka CalVCP Board	)	Motion To Amend Request To
14		)	ReOpen & Amend Case
15	DEFENDANT(S).	)	GHK / VBK

16 This is a motion to amend motions and requests to open this case with the lodging  
 17 of several pages referred to as Exhibits 1 to 10. Exhibits 1 to 10 are/represent  
 18 recent evidence of violations in the form of sets of statements, photos, screen  
 19 shots, and graphics. These exhibits are supported by more physical evidence  
 20 including official documents and witnesses. Exhibits 2 to 10 and the events  
 21 surrounding that evidence support claims regarding fraudulent activity related to  
 22 denial of the plaintiff's fair request for victim compensation. Exhibit 10 is being  
 23 filed seperately in a motion to lodge evidence under seal. Violations are  
 24 connected as observed through repetetive patterns defined by clear and  
 25 convincing facts and evidence. These claims are real, getting worse, and have  
 26 been neglected by authority. Please open this case and reconsider all previous  
 27 requests and motions including for cases #s LA-CV14-04900 & LA-CV14-04232.

1 of 1


Page Number

Russell Rope  
 09-09-2015



## CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. KingFrom: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy ClerkDate Received: September 10, 2015Case No.: 14-4002 VBKCase Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.Document Entitled: Motion to Amend Request to ReOpen & Amend Case

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- ☐ Local Rule 5-4.1 Documents must be filed electronically
- ☐ Local Rule 6-1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect
- ☐ Local Rule 7-19.1 Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address
- ☐ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge
- ☐ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages
- ☐ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents
- ☐ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover
- ☐ Local Rule 16-7 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel
- ☐ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties
- ☐ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 83-2.5 No letters to the judge
- ☐ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 No proof of service attached to document(s)
- ☒ Other: Case closed. Judicial determination required.

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

## ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be filed and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

9/14/15  
Date

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have not been filed with the Court.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 -ORIGINAL-OFFICE


COPY 2 -JUDGE

COPY 3 -SIGNED &amp; RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 -FILER RECEIPT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES



To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. King  
 From: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy Clerk Date Received: September 10, 2015  
 Case No.: 14-4002 VBK Case Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.  
 Document Entitled: Exhibits 1 to 8

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- ☐ Local Rule 5-4.1 Documents must be filed electronically
- ☐ Local Rule 6-1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect
- ☐ Local Rule 7-19.1 Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address
- ☐ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge
- ☐ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages
- ☐ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents
- ☐ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover
- ☐ Local Rule 16-7 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel
- ☐ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties
- ☐ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 83-2.5 No letters to the judge
- ☐ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 No proof of service attached to document(s)
- ☒ Other: No face page. Case closed. Judicial determination required.

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- Lodged AFB*
- ☒ The document is to be ~~filed~~ and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

9/14/15  
Date

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have not been filed with the Court.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.



COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE

COPY 2 - JUDGE

COPY 3 - SIGNED & RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT

1 Name: Russell Rope #1607  
2 Address: PO Box 1198  
3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
4 Phone: (818) 400-5592  
5 Plaintiff In Pro Per



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  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Russell Rope

) **Case No.: LA-CV14-04002-GHK(VBK)**

) **PLAINTIFF,**

) Date: 10-26-2015

12 **vs.**

) Time: 9:30am

Room 650

13 John Does 1 to 10

) **Motion To Amend Recent Motions**

14  
15 **DEFENDANT(S).**

) **With Correction of Discrepancies**

16 This is a motion to amend recent motions on this case with the correction of the  
17 following discrepancies:

18  
19 1. Extra Face Sheet for Exhibits in Recent Motion is Attached


20 2. Another Copy of Exhibits for the Judge is Attached  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
Russell Rope

09-10-2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. KingFrom: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy ClerkDate Received: September 11, 2015Case No.: 14-4002 VBKCase Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.Document Entitled: Motion to Amend Recent Motion With Correction of Discrepancies

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- ☐ Local Rule 5-4.1 Documents must be filed electronically
- ☐ Local Rule 6-1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect
- ☐ Local Rule 7-19.1 Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address
- ☐ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge
- ☐ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages
- ☐ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents
- ☐ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover
- ☐ Local Rule 16-7 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel
- ☐ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties
- ☐ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 83-2.5 No letters to the judge
- ☐ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 No proof of service attached to document(s)
- ☒ Other: Case closed. Judicial determination required.

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

## ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be filed and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 9/14/15[signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE


COPY 2 - JUDGE

COPY 3 - SIGNED &amp; RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. KingFrom: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy ClerkDate Received: September 11, 2015Case No.: 14-4002 VBKCase Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.Document Entitled: Exhibits 1 to 8

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- ☐ Local Rule 5-4.1 Documents must be filed electronically
- ☐ Local Rule 6-1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect
- ☐ Local Rule 7-19.1 Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address
- ☐ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge
- ☐ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages
- ☐ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents
- ☐ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover
- ☐ Local Rule 16-7 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel
- ☐ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties
- ☐ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 83-2.5 No letters to the judge
- ☐ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 No proof of service attached to document(s)
- ☒ Other: Case closed. Judicial determination required.

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

## ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be ~~filed~~ and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 9/14/15[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE

COPY 2 - JUDGE


COPY 3 - SIGNED &amp; RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**



To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. King

From: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy Clerk

Date Received: September 10, 2015

Case No.: 14-4002 VBK

Case Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.

Document Entitled: Proposed Order

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 5-4.1  | Documents must be filed electronically                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 6-1    | Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7-19.1 | Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7.1-1  | No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.1 | Document not legible  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.8 | Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-4.1 | No copy provided for judge  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-6   | Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-8   | Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 15-1   | Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 16-7   | Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 19-1   | Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-1   | Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-2   | Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 83-2.5 | No letters to the judge   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 | No proof of service attached to document(s)                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: | <u>Case closed. Judicial determination required.</u>                        |

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

**ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- Lodged AB
- ☒ The document is to be ~~filed~~ and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 9/14/15

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.



COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE

COPY 2 - JUDGE

COPY 3 - SIGNED & RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT

1 Name: Russell Rope #1607  
2 Address: PO Box 1198  
3 Sacramento, CA 95812  
4 Phone: (916) 400-5592  
5 Plaintiff In Pro Per



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 Russell Rope,

11 PLAINTIFF,

12 vs.

13 John Does 1 to 10

14  
15 DEFENDANT(S).

) Case No.: LA-CV14-04002-GHK (VBK)

) Date: 10-26-2015

) Time: 9:30 am Room 650

) Motion To Lodge Evidence

) Under Seal

) GHK / VBK

16 This is a motion to amend case(s) with lodging of the "Exhibit 10" under seal.  
17 Exhibit 10 is a set of documents, which are recent citizen complaints related to  
18 the plaintiff's cases. Please amend recent motions on this case with the addition  
19 of this motion, lodging under seal, and additionally consider lodging the other  
20 recent Exhibits under seal (for all cases); at least until the plaintiff can relocate  
21 again. The attached documents contain names and personal information, which is  
22 mostly intended for your honorable information gathering and proper decision  
23 making. Publicized information contained within could possibly jeopardize the  
24 security of both parties. This legible evidence is referred to from new exhibits in  
25 this case and cases #s LA-CV14-04900 and LA-CV14-04232. Please use this  
26 information in your ruling on all of the plaintiff's cases, open the cases, and  
27 reconsider all previous requests and motions.  
28

Russell Rope


09-09-2015

1 of 1

Page Number

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES



To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. King

From: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy Clerk

Date Received: September 10, 2015

Case No.: 14-4002 VBK

Case Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.

Document Entitled: Exhibit 10

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- ☐ Local Rule 5-4.1 Documents must be filed electronically
- ☐ Local Rule 6-1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect
- ☐ Local Rule 7-19.1 Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible
- ☐ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address
- ☐ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge
- ☐ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages
- ☐ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents
- ☐ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover
- ☐ Local Rule 16-7 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel
- ☐ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties
- ☐ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking
- ☐ Local Rule 83-2.5 No letters to the judge
- ☐ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 No proof of service attached to document(s)
- ☒ Other: No face page. Case closed. Judicial determination required.

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be <sup>Lodged</sup> ~~filed~~ and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 9/14/15

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 -ORIGINAL-OFFICE


COPY 2 -JUDGE

COPY 3 -SIGNED & RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 -FILER RECEIPT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES



To: ☒ U.S. District Judge / ☐ U.S. Magistrate Judge George H. King

From: Beatrice Herrera, Deputy Clerk

Date Received: September 11, 2015

Case No.: 14-4002 VBK

Case Title: Russell Rope v. California Victims Compensation Board, et al.

Document Entitled: Exhibit 10

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 5-4.1  | Documents must be filed electronically                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 6-1    | Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7-19.1 | Notice to other parties of ex parte application lacking                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 7.1-1  | No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.1 | Document not legible  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-3.8 | Lacking name, address, phone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-4.1 | No copy provided for judge  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-6   | Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 11-8   | Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 15-1   | Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 16-7   | Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 19-1   | Complaint/Petition includes more than 10 Does or fictitiously named parties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-1   | Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 56-2   | Statement of genuine disputes of material fact lacking                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Rule 83-2.5 | No letters to the judge   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 | No proof of service attached to document(s)                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: | <u>Case closed. Judicial determination required.</u>                        |

Please refer to the Court's website at [www.cacd.uscourts.gov](http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov) for Local Rules, General Orders, and applicable forms.

ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☒ The document is to be ~~filed~~ <sup>Lodged</sup> and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stamped "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel\* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.

Date 9/14/15

[Signature]  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

- ☐ The document is **NOT** to be filed, but instead **REJECTED**, and is ORDERED returned to counsel.\* Counsel\* shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have **not** been filed with the Court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge

\* The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

COPY 1 - ORIGINAL-OFFICE

COPY 2 - JUDGE

COPY 3 - SIGNED & RETURNED TO FILER

COPY 4 - FILER RECEIPT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
RUSSELL ROPE  PLAINTIFF(S),  v.  CALIFORNIA VICITIM COMPENSATION PROGRAM, et al.  DEFENDANT(S).	CASE NUMBER:  CV14-04002 UA (VBK)    <b>NOTICE OF REASSIGNMENT OF CASE DUE TO UNAVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL OFFICER</b>

To: All Counsel Appearing of Record

The Magistrate Judge to whom the above-entitled case was previously assigned is no longer available.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that, pursuant to directive of the Chief U. S. District Judge/Magistrate Judge and in accordance with the rules of this Court, the above-entitled case has been returned to the Clerk for random reassignment.

Accordingly, this case has been reassigned to:

Hon. Frederick F. Mumm, Magistrate Judge for:

all proceedings in accordance with General Order 05-07

Please substitute the initials of the newly assigned Magistrate Judge so that the new case number will read: CV14-04002 UA (FFM). This is very important because documents are routed by the initials.

Clerk, U.S. District Court

September 15, 2015  
Date

By: /s/ Madelina Guerrero  
Deputy Clerk



# Justice

Thanks For Reading & Supporting!

What's Next?

- Expect Updates
- More Docs, Images, Videos
- Plans To Refile Correctly
- Seeking Legal Help
- Two More Cases / Books
- Plus Additional Books in Queue
- You Can Not Beat RRP So Join Up
- Follow @RussellRope
- Subscribe @ Blog

<http://russellrope.com/blog>

(c) Copyright & Fraud Protected