

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 24 2022

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

TINA MARIE BRADFORD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF  
EDUCATION; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-56148

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS  
Central District of California,  
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: TALLMAN, RAWLINSON, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

The panel has voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 35.

Bradford's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 21) are denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

Appendix A

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 15 2021

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

TINA MARIE BRADFORD,

No. 20-56148

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

v.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF  
EDUCATION; et al.,

MEMORANDUM\*

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Philip S. Gutierrez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 12, 2021\*\*

Before: TALLMAN, RAWLINSON, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Tina Marie Bradford appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing her action alleging claims arising from an infection suffered while she was employed as a substitute teacher. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument and denies Bradford's request for oral argument, set forth in her opening and reply briefs. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Appendix B

We review for an abuse of discretion a dismissal for failure to comply with local rules. *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Bradford's action because Bradford failed to file a timely opposition to defendants' motions to dismiss. *See C.D. Cal. R. 7-9* (requiring the filing of an opposition or statement of non-opposition to a motion to dismiss not later than twenty-one days before the hearing date); *C.D. Cal. R. 7-12* (providing that the failure to file any required document within the deadline may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the motion); *see also Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53-54 (discussing factors to guide the court's evaluation of dismissal for failure to comply with local rules).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Bradford's motion to reopen for new trial because Bradford failed to demonstrate any grounds for relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and grounds for relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(a).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief, or arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

///

///

Bradford's motions "for defendant(s) to forward deposition and deposition video" are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date October 19, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education, et al

Present: The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez, United States District Judge

Wendy Hernandez

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):

Not Present

Proceedings (In Chambers): The Court DENIES the motion to reopen.

Before the Court is a motion to reopen the case filed by pro se Plaintiff Tina Marie Bradford ("Plaintiff"). *See* Dkt. # 35 ("Mot."). Defendant Los Angeles County Office of Education ("Defendant LACOE" or "LACOE") opposed, *see* Dkt. # 41 ("Opp."), and Plaintiff did not reply. The Court finds the matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; L.R. 7-15. Having read and considered the motion and the opposition, the Court DENIES the motion.

Plaintiff filed the complaint in this action on April 22, 2020, alleging that she was injured when she was exposed to staph bacteria while working as a substitute teacher for Defendant LACOE. *See generally* Complaint, Dkt. # 1 ("Compl."). On May 28, LACOE and Defendant York Risk Services Group, Inc. moved to dismiss the complaint on various grounds. *See* Dkts. # 13, 16. On July 28, the Court granted the motions to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint because Plaintiff had failed to timely and substantively oppose the motions. *See* Dkt. # 31. The Court also denied Defendant LACOE's motions for sanctions, *see* Dkt. # 37, and Plaintiff's ex parte application requesting permission to proceed with discovery and join another, unrelated claim regarding social security benefits, *see* Dkt. # 39.

Now, Plaintiff requests that the Court reopen the case "for new trial" under Rules 56, 59, and 60 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See generally* Mot. Rule 56, which governs summary judgment proceedings, is irrelevant because there was no summary judgment motion filed in this action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Likewise, Rule 59, which governs motions for a new trial, does not apply because no trial occurred here. Fed. R. Civ. P. 59.

Rule 60(b) permits relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for various reasons, including "mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect" or "any other reason that

Appendix C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date October 19, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education, et al

justifies relief.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Plaintiff requests relief from dismissal because “Plaintiff did oppose” the motion to dismiss and “requested informal discovery.” *See Mot.* at 2. However, contrary to Plaintiff’s assertion, a request for informal discovery is not a substantive response to a motion to dismiss. Therefore, the Court properly granted Defendant LACOE’s unopposed motion to dismiss the case, and Plaintiff has not provided “any [] reason that justifies” reopening the case.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion to reopen.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

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

Tina Marie Bradford

**CASE NUMBER**

**PLAINTIFF(S)**

2:20-CV-03691-PSG-AS

Los Angeles County Office Of Education al, etc  
v.  
York Risk Services, Inc  
Worker's Compensation Appeals Board DEF

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Tina Marie Bradford hereby appeals to  
the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from:  
*Name of Appellant*

## **Criminal Matter**

- Conviction only [F.R.Cr.P. 32(j)(1)(A)]
- Conviction and Sentence
- Sentence Only (18 U.S.C. 3742)
- Pursuant to F.R.Cr.P. 32(j)(2)
- Interlocutory Appeals
- Sentence imposed:

## Civil Matter

- Order (specify):
- Judgment (specify)
- Other (specify):

Bail status:

Entered on the docket in this action on 4/24/2020

A copy of said judgment or order is attached hereto.

10/26/2020

Date

Tina Marie Bradore

---

**Signature**

Appellant/ProSe     Counsel for Appellant     Deputy Clerk

**Note:** The Notice of Appeal shall contain the names of all parties to the judgment or order and the names and addresses of the attorneys for each party. Also, if not electronically filed in a criminal case, the Clerk shall be furnished a sufficient number of copies of the Notice of Appeal to permit prompt compliance with the service requirements of FRAP 3(d).

NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER OF ATTORNEY(S)  
Plaintiff:

Tina Marie Bradford  
2838 South Sycamore Ave, Apt. 1  
Los Angeles, CA 90016  
323 239-0830

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Tina Marie Bradford

V.

Los Angeles County Office Of Education  
etc, al; York Risk Services, Inc; Worker's  
Compensation Appeals Board

**PLAINTIFF(S)**

**CASE NUMBER**

2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

**PROOF OF SERVICE - ACKNOWLEDGMENT  
OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, certify and declare that I am over the age of 18 years, employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and not party to the above-entitled cause. On October 26, 2020, I served a true copy of NOTICE OF APPEAL by personally delivering it to the person (s) indicated below in the manner as provided in FRCivP 5(b); by depositing it in the United States Mail in a sealed envelope with the postage thereon fully prepaid to the following (list names and addresses for person(s) served. Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Vibiana M. Andrade, Los Angeles County Office of Education, 9300 Imperial Highway, Downey CA 90241  
Margaret Parke, York Risk Services Group, Inc, 638 West Fifth Street, SU H-1, LA CA 90041

Place of Mailing: United States Postal Service

Executed on 10/26, 20 20 at Los Angeles, California

Please check one of these boxes if service is made by mail:

I hereby certify that I am a member of the Bar of the United States District Court, Central District of California.

I hereby certify that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

I hereby certify under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Tina Marie Bradford, 10-26-2020  
Signature of Person Making Service

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SERVICE**

L \_\_\_\_\_ received a true copy of the within document on

Signature:

Party Served

MIME-Version:1.0 From:cacd\_ecfmail@cacd.uscourts.gov To:ecfnef@cacd.uscourts.gov  
Message-Id:<30746693@cacd.uscourts.gov>Subject:Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Tina  
Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al Order on Motion to Reopen Case  
Content-Type: text/html

**This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT  
RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.**

**\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy  
permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free  
electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by  
the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of  
each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the  
free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 10/19/2020 at 4:36 PM PDT and filed on 10/19/2020

**Case Name:** Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al

**Case Number:** 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

**Filer:**

**WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 07/28/2020**

**Document Number:** 43

**Docket Text:**

**MINUTES (IN CHAMBERS) The Court DENIES the motion to reopen by Judge Philip S. Gutierrez. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion to reopen. IT IS SO ORDERED. (See minutes for further details) (yl)**

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

Vibiana Andrade andrade\_vibiana@lacoed.edu

Margret G Parke shalvorsen@gordonrees.com, mparke@grsm.com, msalinas@grsm.com

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been delivered by First Class U. S. Mail or by other means BY THE FILER to :**

Tina Marie Bradford

2838 South Sycamore Avenue Apt 1

Los Angeles CA 90016

Appendix C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

JS-6

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

Present: The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez, United States District Judge

Wendy Hernandez

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):

Not Present

Proceedings (In Chambers): The Court GRANTS the motions to dismiss and DENIES the motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant

Before the Court is Defendants Los Angeles County Office of Education (“LACOE”), and York Risk Services Group, Inc.’s (“York”) (collectively, “Defendants”) motions to dismiss the complaint. *See* Dkts. # 13, 16. Also before the Court is Defendant LACOE’s motion to deem Plaintiff Tina Marie Bradford (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, a vexatious litigant. *See* Dkt. # 17 (“MVL”). Plaintiff has not opposed. The Court finds the matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; L.R. 7-15. Having considered the moving, opposing, and reply papers, the Court GRANTS the motions to dismiss and DENIES the motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant.

I. Motions to Dismiss

Plaintiff filed the complaint in this action on April 22, 2020, alleging that she was injured while working as a substitute teacher for LACOE. *See* Complaint, Dkt. # 1 (“Compl.”). Among other grounds, Defendants move for dismissal based on insufficient service of process, statute of limitations, res judicata, collateral estoppel, and failure to file a claim pursuant to the Government Tort Claims Act. *See generally* Dkts. # 13, 16.

Defendants’ motions were filed on May 28, 2020, with a hearing scheduled for August 3, 2020. *See id.*; Dkt. # 22. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-9, Plaintiff was required to oppose the motions by July 13, 2020. As of this date, although Plaintiff has filed a Demand for Jury Trial, *see* Dkt. # 23, Plaintiff has not filed any opposition to Defendants’ motions to dismiss. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-12, the Court deems Plaintiff’s failure to file a timely opposition as consent to granting the motions. Accordingly, Defendants’ motions to dismiss the complaint are GRANTED.

Appendix D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

II. Motion to Deem Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant

The Court turns to LACOE's motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant under California Code of Civil Procedure § 391, *see MVL*, which Plaintiff has not opposed.

A. Background<sup>1</sup>

i. *Worker's Compensation Claims and Appeals*

In 2012, Plaintiff filed a worker's compensation claim against LACOE, Case No. ADJ8736268, and the parties settled the claim on January 23, 2013. *See RJN*, Ex. A. The settlement resolved Plaintiff's claims for injuries to her skin, face and psychiatric/nervous system during her employment with LACOE. *See id.* The settlement was approved by the Workers Compensation Appeals Board ("WCAB") on January 28, 2013, and an award was granted by the WCAB. *See id.*, Ex. B.

Plaintiff then filed another worker's compensation claim against LACOE in July 2015, and on March 23, 2018, after a full trial on the merits, the WCAB entered judgment against Plaintiff in Case No. ADJ10064793. *See id.*, Ex. C. The WCAB concluded that Plaintiff's claims did not arise from an industrial injury, and that her claim related to the prior, settled claim. *See id.*

<sup>1</sup> LACOE has filed a request for judicial notice of various publicly filed or recorded documents, including those filed in other actions. *See Request for Judicial Notice*, Dkt. # 17-2 ("RJN"). Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201 a court may take judicial notice of facts not subject to reasonable dispute because they (1) are generally known within the court's territorial jurisdiction, or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. Fed. R. Evid. 201(b). A federal court "may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue." *United States v. Black*, 482 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th Cir. 2007). In addition, the Court "can take judicial notice of '[p]ublic records and government documents available from reliable sources on the Internet.'" *Gerritsen v. Warner Bros. Entm't Inc.*, 112 F. Supp. 3d 1011, 1033 (C.D. Cal. 2015). The Court concludes the documents are the proper subject of judicial notice and GRANTS the request.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

Plaintiff then sought reconsideration of her claims against LACOE by the WCAB. *See id.*, Ex. D. On May 3, 2018 the WCAB denied Plaintiff's Petition for Reconsideration because her claims had already been settled. *See id.* The WCAB explained:

"[Plaintiff] worked as a substitute teacher for [LACOE] [and] alleges a cumulative trauma injury during the period 8/1/2009 through 8/1/2010 based upon exposure at work that led to an infection, resulting in [Plaintiff] claiming injury to the arms, lower extremities, eyes, skin, cervical cancer, hypothyroidism, acid reflux, and internal complaints . . . . [Plaintiff] had another prior claim for a specific injury (ADJ8736268) which previously settled and covered the same industrial complaints."

*Id.*

Plaintiff then filed a petition for writ of review of the matter to the California Court of Appeal, which was denied on July 30, 2018. *See id.*, Ex. E. Plaintiff then petitioned to the California Supreme Court for review of the same matter, but was denied on September 19, 2018. *See id.*, Ex. F.

Plaintiff then filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. *See id.*, Exs. G, H. Plaintiff's Petition was denied on June 24, 2019. *See id.* Plaintiff filed a Petition for Rehearing to the United States Supreme Court, but was denied on August 28, 2019. *See id.*, Exs. I, J.

*ii. Los Angeles County Superior Court Action*

Plaintiff filed a personal injury complaint on October 17, 2019 in Los Angeles Superior Court against LACOE, Case No. 19STCV37015. *See id.*, Ex. M. Plaintiff alleged, among other things, that she contracted a staph infection while working for LACOE. *See id.* On January 8, 2020, the court granted LACOE's demurrer without leave to amend, because Plaintiff's claims were barred by res judicata and/or collateral estoppel, and the statute of limitations. *See id.*, Ex. N. Plaintiff then filed a motion for reconsideration. *See id.*, Ex. O. On February 28, 2020, the court denied the motion. *See id.*, Ex. P.

*iii. This Action*

Plaintiff initiated this action on April 22, 2020 against LACOE and York. *See Compl.* In Plaintiff's complaint, Plaintiff references the state court action. *See id.* at 3. Plaintiff alleges that

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

she was injured at juvenile hall facilities while working as a substitute teacher for LACOE, and was “exposed to and contacted, with multiple exposure a STAPH (Staphylococcus) skin disease that spread over 100% of the body.” *See id.* at 4.

B. Legal Standard

“[T]here is strong precedent establishing the inherent power of federal courts to regulate the activities of abusive litigants by imposing carefully tailored restrictions under the appropriate circumstances.” *De Long v. Hennessy*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 1990) (alteration omitted) (citing *Tripathi v. Beaman*, 878 F.2d 351, 352 (10th Cir. 1989)).<sup>2</sup> “Pursuant to the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), ‘enjoining litigants with abusive and lengthy litigation histories is one such restriction’ that courts may impose.” *Ringgold-Lockhart v. Cnty. of L.A.*, 761 F.3d 1057, 1061 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *De Long*, 912 F.2d at 1147). Courts, however, should rarely resort to this power because of its potential burden on the litigant’s constitutional right of access to the court system. *Id.* at 1061–62.

The Ninth Circuit allows the imposition pre-filing restrictions only if a court: “(1) give[s] litigants notice and an opportunity to oppose the order before it is entered; (2) compile[s] an adequate record for appellate review, including a listing of all the cases and motions that led the district court to conclude that a vexatious litigant order was needed; (3) make[s] substantive findings of frivolousness or harassment; and (4) tailor[s] the order narrowly so as to closely fit the specific vice encountered.” *Id.* at 1062 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted). The first two requirements are procedural, while the latter two are substantive. *Id.* In considering the substantive requirements, the Ninth Circuit has looked to five factors enumerated by the Second Circuit:

- (1) the litigant’s history of litigation and in particular whether it entailed vexatious, harassing, or duplicative suits; (2) the litigant’s motive in pursuing the litigation, for example, whether the litigant had a good faith expectation of prevailing; (3) whether the litigant is represented by counsel; (4) whether the litigant has caused unnecessary expense to the parties or placed a needless burden on the courts; and (5) whether other sanctions would be adequate to protect the courts and other parties.

<sup>2</sup> Under the Central District of California Local Rules, a court in this district may, at its discretion, rely on California state law in determining whether a party is a vexatious litigant. *See* L.R. 83-8.4; *Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1061 n.1. Here, the Court relies on the federal standards in determining whether Plaintiff is a vexatious litigant.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

*Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1051 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting *Safir v. U.S. Lines, Inc.*, 792 F.2d 19, 24 (2d Cir. 1986)).

C. Discussion

The Court turns to the third factor, which requires the Court to make substantive findings of frivolousness or harassment, and finding it dispositive does not reach the other factors. *See Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1064; *De Long*, 912 F.2d at 1148. “To determine whether the litigation is frivolous, district courts must look at both the number and content of the filings as indicia of the frivolousness of the litigant’s claims.” *Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1064 (internal quotation marks omitted). The “number” inquiry asks whether the amount of complaints filed is inordinate. *Id.*; *De Long*, 912 F.3d at 1148. The content inquiry asks also whether the plaintiff’s claims are “patently without merit”; litigiousness on its own is insufficient. *See Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1064; *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1059. A finding of harassment requires that a litigant’s filings “show a pattern of harassment.” *Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1064 (quoting *De Long*, 912 F.3d at 1148). Finally, courts should also consider whether other, less restrictive options, are adequate to protect the court and parties. *Id.*

The Court concludes that it is inappropriate to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant at this time. The record before the Court includes a worker’s compensation judgment and Plaintiff’s numerous appeals from that adverse judgment against her; and one other state court action in which a demurrer was granted against her. On this record, the Court is not convinced that the number of complaints Plaintiff has filed is “inordinate.” *See id.* (citing *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1060 (roughly 400 similar cases); *Wood v. Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, Inc.*, 705 F.2d 1515, 1523, 1526 (9th Cir. 1983) (thirty-five actions filed in 30 jurisdictions); *In re Oliver*, 682 F.2d 443, 444 (3d Cir. 1982) (more than fifty frivolous cases); *In re Green*, 669 F.2d 779, 781 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (per curiam) (between 600 and 700 complaints)). There is not sufficient evidence of a pattern of harassment. Moreover, other less severe remedies may be available to deter this conduct. *See id.* at 1065.

In sum, the Court DENIES LACOE’s motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant at this time.

III. Conclusion

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 20-3691 PSG (ASx)

Date July 28, 2020

Title Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** LACOE's motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant. The Court **GRANTS** Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. This order closes the case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

MIME-Version:1.0 From:cacd\_ecfmail@cacd.uscourts.gov To:ecfnef@cacd.uscourts.gov  
Message-Id:<30241470@cacd.uscourts.gov>Subject:Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Tina  
Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al Order on Motion to Dismiss  
Content-Type: text/html

**This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT  
RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.  
\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\* There is no charge for viewing opinions.**

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

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 7/28/2020 at 4:50 PM PDT and filed on 7/28/2020

**Case Name:** Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al

**Case Number:** **2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS**

**Filer:**

**WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 07/28/2020**

**Document Number:** **[31]**

**Docket Text:**

**MINUTES (In Chambers): The Court GRANTS the motions to dismiss and DENIES the motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant by Judge Philip S. Gutierrez granting [13] MOTION to Dismiss (MD JS-6. Case Terminated); denying [16] MOTION to Dismiss Case as Frivolous; denying [17] MOTION for Sanctions: For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES LACOE's motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant. The Court GRANTS Defendants motions to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. This order closes the case. (see document for further details) (MD JS-6. Case Terminated) (bm)**

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

Vibiana Andrade andrade\_vibiana@lacoce.edu

Margret G Parke shalvorsen@gordonrees.com, mparke@grsm.com, msalinas@grsm.com

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been delivered by First Class U. S. Mail or by other means BY THE FILER to :**

Tina Marie Bradford

2838 South Sycamore Avenue Apt 1

Los Angeles CA 90016

*Appendix D*

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 15 2021

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

TINA MARIE BRADFORD,

No. 20-56148

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No.

v.

2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF  
EDUCATION; et al.,

Central District of California,  
Los Angeles

Defendants-Appellees.

ORDER

Before: WARDLAW and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's motion for a monetary judgment (Docket Entry No. 3) is denied.

The motion for production of transcripts at government expense (Docket Entry No. 2) is denied. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 753(f); *Henderson v. United States*, 734 F.2d 483 (9th Cir. 1984).

The opening brief has been filed. The answering brief is due February 25, 2021; and the optional reply brief is due within 21 days after service of the answering brief.

Because appellant is proceeding without counsel, appellant is not required to file excerpts of record. *See* 9th Cir. R. 30-1.3. If appellant does not file excerpts of record, appellees "must file Supplemental Excerpts of Record that contain all of the documents that are cited in the pro se opening brief or otherwise required by

*Appendix E*

Rule 30-1.4, as well as the documents that are cited in the answering brief.” *See id.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Tina Marie Bradford,  v.  Los Angeles County Office of Education et al	PLAINTIFF(S)  DEFENDANT(S)	CASE NUMBER  CV20-03691-PSG (ASx)  ORDER RE REQUEST TO PROCEED <i>IN FORMA PAUPERIS</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

IT IS ORDERED that the Request to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is hereby GRANTED.

April 28, 2020  
Date

/ s / Sagar  
United States Magistrate Judge

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Request to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* be DENIED for the following reason(s):

<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate showing of indigency	<input type="checkbox"/> District Court lacks jurisdiction
<input type="checkbox"/> Legally and/or factually patently frivolous	<input type="checkbox"/> Immunity as to _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Comments:

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Request to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is hereby:

GRANTED

DENIED (see comments above). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

- Plaintiff SHALL PAY THE FILING FEES IN FULL within 30 days or this case will be dismissed.
- This case is hereby DISMISSED immediately.
- This case is hereby REMANDED to state court.

Date \_\_\_\_\_ United States District Judge \_\_\_\_\_

MIME-Version:1.0 From:cacd\_ecfmail@cacd.uscourts.gov To:ecfnef@cacd.uscourts.gov  
Message-Id:<29723945@cacd.uscourts.gov>Subject:Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Tina  
Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al Order on Request to Proceed In  
Forma Pauperis with Declaration in Support (CV-60) Content-Type: text/html

**This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT  
RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.**

**\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy  
permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free  
electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by  
the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of  
each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the  
free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 4/28/2020 at 2:08 PM PDT and filed on 4/28/2020

**Case Name:** Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles County Office of Education et al

**Case Number:** 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

**Filer:**

**Document Number:** 7

**Docket Text:**

**ORDER by Magistrate Judge Alka Sagar: granting [3] REQUEST to Proceed in Forma  
Pauperis with Declaration in Support (CV-60). (hr)**

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

**2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS Notice has been delivered by First Class U. S. Mail or by other means BY  
THE FILER to :**

Tina Marie Bradford  
2838 South Sycamore Avenue Apt 1  
Los Angeles CA 90016

*Appendix F*