

**FILED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUN 27 2019

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: ANGEL OSORNIO,

No. 19-80039

Respondent.

Central District of California,  
Riverside

ORDER

Before: CLIFTON, N.R. SMITH, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

On April 4, 2019, this court issued an order directing the respondent to show cause why the following pre-filing review order should not be entered, restricting her future filings in this court. Upon review of respondent's response to the order to show cause (Docket Entry No. 3), we hereby direct the Clerk to enter the following pre-filing review order.

No motions for reconsideration, rehearing, clarification, or any other submissions relating to this order shall be filed or entertained in this closed docket.

Respondent's failure to comply with the order shall result in any new appeals or petitions she seeks to file being dismissed or not being filed and other sanctions being levied against respondent, such as a monetary judgment or a judgment of contempt, as the court may deem appropriate.

**Pre-Filing Review Order**

(1) This pre-filing review order shall apply to all notices of appeal filed

by respondent, in whole or in part, if she proceeds pro se. This order shall not apply to appeals in which respondent has counsel or where the district court has expressly certified in its order that the appeal is not frivolous. Should respondent fail to comply with any of the provisions of this pre-filing review order, the Clerk shall not file the document and shall return the document to respondent, informing her of the deficiencies and granting her 14 days to correct the deficiency.

(2) Each notice of appeal filed by respondent shall comply with the requirements of the Ninth Circuit Rules and the Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure, especially Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a), and shall contain the following sentence in capital letters “FILED SUBJECT TO PRE-FILING REVIEW ORDER No. 19-80039” in the body of the notice of appeal.

(3) Each of respondent’s future notices of appeal shall include a copy of the order(s) of the district court from which she is appealing, if applicable, a short and plain statement of the facts or law on which she will rely for the purposes of the appeal, and a statement that she has not previously appealed this order or raised this issue in a prior appeal.

(4) If respondent’s future notices of appeal are submitted in compliance with this order, the Clerk shall file the notice of appeal and accompanying documents in a new docket. The court will review respondent’s submissions to

determine whether they merit further review and whether they will be allowed to proceed. *See In re Thomas*, 508 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2007). No briefing schedule will be set in the new docket, and no motions will be entertained, unless the court determines that the appeal will be allowed to proceed.

(5) This pre-filing review order shall remain in effect until further order of this court. Respondent may, no earlier than August 1, 2021, petition the court to lift this pre-filing review order, setting forth the reasons why the order should be lifted.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 4 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: ANGEL OSORNIO,

No. 19-80039

Respondent.

ORDER

Before: Peter L. Shaw, Appellate Commissioner.

This court's records reflect that, since 2018, respondent Angel Osornio has initiated the following litigation in this court:

18-56439 *Angel Osornio v. United States Supreme Court* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56441 *Angel Osornio v. United States Senate* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56442 *Angel Osornio v. The White House* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56443 *Angel Osornio v. U.S. Department of the Treasury* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56444 *Angel Osornio v. DOD* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56445 *Angel Osornio v. FBI* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56446 *Angel Osornio v. USDOJ* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56447 *Angel Osornio v. Pentagon* – dismissed as frivolous;

18-56450 *Angel Osornio v. United States Capital* – dismissed as frivolous;

19-55011 *Angel Osornio v. Saban Community Clinic* – dismissed as frivolous;

19-55012 *Angel Osornio v. Rana Bahl* – dismissed as frivolous;

19-55015 *Angel Osornio v. Arrowhead Regional Med Center* – dismissed as frivolous;

- 19-55016 *Angel Osornio v. Beverly Tower Wilshire Advance* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55068 *Angel Osornio v. IEHP* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55069 *Angel Osornio v. California Department of Public Health* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55070 *Angel Osornio v. Medi-Cal* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55071 *Angel Osornio v. Playa Vista Medical Center* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55072 *Angel Osornio v. Torrance Memorial Physician Network* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55073 *Angel Osornio v. Marina Del Rey Hospital* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55074 *Angel Osornio v. CLT Providence Little Company* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55075 *Angel Osornio v. San Antonio Regional Hospital* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55076 *Angel Osornio v. Modern Womans Healthcare, Inc.* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55077 *Angel Osornio v. Cedars Sinai Medical Provider* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55080 *Angel Osornio v. Raafat Iskander, et al.* – dismissed as frivolous;
- 19-55081 *Angel Osornio v. St. Mary Medical Center* – dismissed as frivolous;  
and
- 19-55082 *Angel Osornio v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, et al.* – dismissed as frivolous.

Respondent's practice of burdening this court with meritless litigation justifies careful oversight of respondent's future litigation in this court.

The Supreme Court has recognized that "every paper filed with the Clerk of

this Court, no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the institution's limited resources. A part of the [c]ourt's responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice. The continual processing of the [appellants'] frivolous requests . . . does not promote that end." *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989). This court faces the same problems of limited resources in handling its large volume of appellate litigation.

Therefore, the respondent, Angel Osornio, shall respond and show cause within 21 days after the date of this order why this court should not enter the following pre-filing review order. *See Visser v. California*, 919 F.2d 113, 114 (9th Cir. 1990) ("This court has the inherent power to restrict a litigant's ability to commence abusive litigation"); *see also Wolfe v. George*, 486 F.3d 1120 (9th Cir. 2007) (finding no constitutional right to file frivolous litigation, upholding California vexatious litigant statute). If respondent fails to file a timely response to this order, the Clerk shall forthwith enter the pre-filing review order regardless of further filings by respondent.

Should the pre-filing review order be entered, respondent's failure to comply with the order shall result in any new appeal(s) he seeks to file being dismissed or not being filed and other sanctions being levied against respondent, such as a monetary judgment or a judgment of contempt, as the court may deem appropriate.

**Pre-Filing Review Order**

(1) This pre-filing review order shall apply to all notices of appeal filed by respondent, in whole or in part, if he proceeds pro se. This order shall not apply to appeals in which respondent has counsel or where the district court has expressly certified in its order that the appeal is not frivolous. Should respondent fail to comply with any of the provisions of this pre-filing review order, the Clerk shall not file the document and shall return the document to respondent, informing him of the deficiencies and granting him 14 days to correct the deficiency.

(2) Each notice of appeal filed by respondent shall comply with the requirements of the Ninth Circuit Rules and the Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure, especially Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a), and shall contain the following sentence in capital letters "FILED SUBJECT TO PRE-FILING REVIEW ORDER No. 19-80039" in the body of the notice of appeal.

(3) Each of respondent's future notices of appeal shall include a copy of the order(s) of the district court from which he is appealing, if applicable, a short and plain statement of the facts or law on which he will rely for the purposes of the appeal, and a statement that he has not previously appealed this order or raised this issue in a prior appeal.

(4) If respondent's future notices of appeal are submitted in compliance

with this order, the Clerk shall file the notice of appeal and accompanying documents in a new docket. The court will review respondent's submissions to determine whether they merit further review and whether they will be allowed to proceed. *See In re Thomas*, 508 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2007). No briefing schedule will be set in the new docket, and no motions will be entertained, unless the court determines that the appeal will be allowed to proceed.

(5) This pre-filing review order shall remain in effect until further order of this court. Respondent may, no earlier than August 1, 2021, petition the court to lift this pre-filing review order, setting forth the reasons why the order should be lifted.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

May 2 2019

In re ANGEL OSORNIO

Respondent.

No. 19-80039

RECEIVED  
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

RESPONSE

MAY 06 2019

FILED  
DOCKETED  
DATE

In response to Peter L. Shaw, Appellate Commissioner's  
order that was filed April 4 2019 (Record No. .

19-80039  
18-56439 Angel Osornio v United States Supreme Court  
18-56441 Angel Osornio v United States Senate  
18-56442 Angel Osornio v The White House  
18-56443 Angel Osornio v U.S Department of Treasury  
18-56444 Angel Osornio v SOD  
18-56445 Angel Osornio v FBI  
18-56446 Angel Osornio v US DOJ  
18-56447 Angel Osornio v Pentagon  
18-56448 Angel Osornio v United States Capitol  
18-56450 Angel Osornio v Saban Community Clinic  
19-55011 Angel Osornio v Runa Bahl  
19-55012 Angel Osornio v Runa Bahl

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 20 2019

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ANGEL OSORNIO,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE  
TREASURY,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 18-56443

D.C. No. 5:18-cv-02114-PA-DFM  
Central District of California,  
Riverside

ORDER

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

The district court certified that this appeal is not taken in good faith and is frivolous and denied appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). On October 31, 2018, the court ordered appellant to explain in writing why this appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious).

Upon a review of the record, responses to the court's October 31, 2018 order, and the opening brief received on December 14, 2018, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry No. 7), and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

**DISMISSED.**

There is a Dismissed case letter for all Twenty Six cases. I can only put forty papers. They were Dismissed March 19 2019 and March 20 2019. Then Re-opened April 2 2019 cases

18-56441	18-56447	19-55048	19-55075
18-56439	18-56450	19-55069	19-55074
18-56442	19-55011	19-55070	19-55077
18-56443	19-55012	19-55071	19-55080
18-56444	19-55015	19-55072	19-55081
18-56445	19-55014	19-55073	19-55082
18-56446		19-55079	