

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION****UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT****FILED****FEB 24 2023**MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

DAWN WENTWORTH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

and

JOURNEE HUDSON; YAW APPIAH,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MISSION VISTA HIGH SCHOOL & PERSONNEL; VISTA INNOVATION & DESIGN ACADEMY & PERSONNEL; VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD & PERSONNEL; CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION & PERSONNEL; STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION & PERSONNEL; US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & PERSONNEL; OCEANSIDE POLICE DEPT & PERSONNEL; SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT & PERSONNEL; AM PM AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM & PERSONNEL; KKK; KU KLUX KLAN; UZI; VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES; ROSEMARY SMITHFIELD; CIPRIANO VARGAS; DEBBIE MORTON;

No. 22-55566

D.C. No. 3:21-cv-00757-BAS-AGS

**MEMORANDUM\***

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

MARTHA ALVARADO; JULIE KELLY;  
OCEANSIDE POLICE DEPARTMENT;  
DAVID B. NORRIS; EMMA LARSEN;  
JOSEPH ARMENTA; KIMBERLY  
KRIEDEMAN; MICHELLE WALSH;  
ELIZABETH CLARK; SYLVIA BROWN;  
MISSION VISTA PROXY; 9TH DISTRICT  
PTA; NICOLE ALLARD; RACHEL  
DAMBROSO; SCHOOL COUNSELOR;  
SAN DIEGO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT;  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S  
DEPARTMENT; VISTA UNIFIED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT; U.S. DEPARTMENT  
OF EDUCATION; HELENA ZEROSKI;  
ERIC CHAGALA, Dr.; PEPPARD,  
female/mother; PEPPARD, male/father;  
MISSION VISTA HIGH SCHOOL,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of California  
Cynthia A. Bashant, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 14, 2023\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, FRIEDLAND, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Dawn Wentworth appeals pro se from the district court's order declaring her a vexatious litigant and entering a pre-filing review order against her. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Molski*

---

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

*v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1056 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in declaring Wentworth to be a vexatious litigant and entering a pre-filing review order against her after providing notice and an opportunity to be heard, developing an adequate record for review, making substantive findings as to frivolousness, and narrowly tailoring the order to prevent abusive litigation conduct. *See Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, 761 F.3d 1057, 1062 (9th Cir. 2014) (setting forth the requirements the district court must consider before imposing pre-filing restrictions).

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).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE WENTWORTH CIVIL RIGHTS  
CASES,

**No. 21-cv-00757-BAS-AGS**

# **ORDER DECLARING DAWN WENTWORTH A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT**

On April 4, 2022, the Court issued a Tentative Order Declaring Dawn Wentworth a Vexatious Litigant. (ECF No. 22.) The Court held a hearing on the Tentative Order, at which Ms. Wentworth appeared. (ECF No. 25.) For the following reasons, the Court confirms its tentative order and declares Ms. Wentworth a vexatious litigant for these consolidated civil rights cases.

## I. Background

On April 16, 2021, Ms. Dawn Wentworth, on her own behalf and on behalf of her two children, Yaw Appiah, and Journee Hudson, filed seventy-four civil rights complaints in this federal district court. Many of the complaints were duplicative; they sued the same defendants based on the same allegations. On June 16, 2021, she added one more case with duplicative allegations. The listed basis of federal jurisdiction in all seventy-five of these cases was “the Civil Rights Act of 1964” and “the Unruh Civil Rights Act.” The

1 Court consolidated sixty-eight of these cases that made the same allegations against a  
 2 school district, teachers, law enforcement, and others concerning events involving her  
 3 children's education. These sixty-eight cases were consolidated under the name *In re*  
 4 *Wentworth Civil Rights Litigation*, Case No. 21-cv-0757-BAS-AGS, and are shown in  
 5 Attachment 1.

6 The Court scheduled a hearing for May 17, 2021, and ordered Ms. Wentworth to  
 7 appear to discuss these duplicative lawsuits. (ECF No. 4.) The Court warned Ms.  
 8 Wentworth that if she did not appear for the hearing, the Court would issue an order to  
 9 show cause as to why she should not be declared a vexatious litigant. (*Id.*) When both the  
 10 order of consolidation and the order setting a hearing were returned as undeliverable, the  
 11 Court reissued the order and changed the zip code from 92065 to 92068. (ECF No. 8.)

12 Although this reissued order was not returned as undeliverable, Ms. Wentworth  
 13 failed to appear for the May 17, 2021, hearing. The Court then granted Ms. Wentworth  
 14 and her children's Motions to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, but dismissed the consolidated  
 15 sixty-eight cases under Rule 8 and for failure to state a claim and gave Ms. Wentworth  
 16 until August 27, 2021, to file an Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 11.) The order of  
 17 dismissal was returned to the Court—again as undeliverable—despite being sent to the  
 18 updated zip code of 92068. Further, Ms. Wentworth failed to file an amended complaint.

19 On November 17, 2021, Ms. Wentworth moved to reinstate the dismissed action.  
 20 (ECF No. 18.)<sup>1</sup> However, she did not provide any amended complaint curing the defects  
 21 outlined in the Court's dismissal order.

22 With respect to the other seven non-consolidated cases, the Court also granted Ms.  
 23 Wentworth's requests to appear *in forma pauperis*, but again dismissed the complaints  
 24 under Rule 8 and for failure to state a cause of action. (*See Wentworth v. HHSA Co. Admin.*  
 25 *Ctr.*, No. 21-cv-697-BAS; *Wentworth v. Uber Corp. Headquarters HA*, No. 21-cv-699-  
 26

27 <sup>1</sup> Despite the fact that the order dismissing the cases was returned as undeliverable, Ms. Wentworth is  
 28 apparently tracking the progress of her cases since she attaches information about the Court's order of  
 dismissal.

1      BAS; *Wentworth v. Sw. Airlines HQ*, No. 21-cv-702-BAS; *Wentworth v. Chase Inc.*, No.  
 2      21-cv-0730-TWR; *Appiah, Hudson & Wentworth v. Big O Tires*, No. 21-cv-0737-BAS;  
 3      *Appiah, Hudson & Wentworth v. Oceanside Tire & Service Ctr.*, No. 21-cv-0755-BAS;  
 4      *Wentworth v. NCHS Oceanside Health Ctr. & Personnel*, No. 21-cv-0756-BAS.) The  
 5      Court gave Ms. Wentworth until September 3, 2021, to file an amended complaint. Ms.  
 6      Wentworth failed to do so.<sup>2</sup>

7      On November 12 and 15, 2021, Ms. Wentworth filed another sixteen cases. As a  
 8      preliminary matter, the address listed on all sixteen of these cases is the same address that  
 9      has resulted in a return of mail as undeliverable in past cases. Furthermore, in six of these  
 10     cases, Ms. Wentworth specifically indicates that this is the second time she has filed the  
 11     case, as the original was filed in April 2021. (See *Wentworth v. Larsen*, No. 21-cv-1935-  
 12     BAS; *Wentworth v. AM/PM After School Program*, No. 21-cv-1936-BAS; *Wentworth v.*  
 13     *Calif. Bd. of Educ.*, No. 21-cv-1938-BAS; *Wentworth v. Parco*, No. 21-cv-1939-BAS;  
 14     *Wentworth v. U.S. Dept. of Educ.*, No. 21-cv-1941-BAS; *Wentworth v. Sw. Airlines*, No.  
 15     21-cv-1943-BAS.) Thus, although the original cases were dismissed with leave to amend,  
 16     rather than amending, Ms. Wentworth simply waited and then refiled new cases.  
 17     Unfortunately, the new cases did not cure the defects outlined in the Court's earlier orders  
 18     dismissing the actions.

19      Seven of the new cases had duplicate allegations about a racial slur allegedly being  
 20     used during an on-line gym class between September 13 and September 24, 2021. (See  
 21     *Wentworth v. Calif. Connections Academy*, No. 21-cv-1926-BAS; *Wentworth v. Pavlich*,  
 22     No. 21-cv-1927-BAS; *Wentworth v. Conley*, No. 21-cv-1928-BAS; *Wentworth v. Tamayo*,  
 23     No. 21-cv-1929-BAS; *Wentworth v. Savage*, No. 21-cv-1930-BAS; *Wentworth v. Rivas*,  
 24     No. 21-cv-1931-BAS; *Wentworth v. Pulsipher*, No. 21-cv-1932-BAS.) Although the cases  
 25     each listed a different defendant, they appeared to arise out of the same event and should  
 26

27      <sup>2</sup> Again, the Court's orders granting dismissal were returned as undeliverable. The Court later recused  
 28     on one of these cases: *Wentworth v. Chase, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-00730-TWR-AGS. That case is likewise now  
 closed because Ms. Wentworth did not file an amended pleading.

1 have been combined into one case, particularly given the Court's guidance to Ms.  
2 Wentworth in her previous cases.

3 Further, Ms. Wentworth filed two new cases against AT&T (No. 21-cv-1927-BAS)  
4 and Xfinity Comcast (No. 21-cv-1942-BAS)—both arising out of the failure of her security  
5 system. And she filed a new case against the U.S. District Court, the sole allegation of  
6 which is: "I have filed civil rights violation cases with the U.S. federal court . . . All the  
7 cases were not filed after a change of custody." (No. 21-cv-1940-BAS.)

8 All of the new cases suffered from the same defects as the original seventy-five cases  
9 filed in April and June 2021: they simply did not comply with Rule 8's requirement that  
10 the complaint contain a "short and plain statement of [each] claim." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).

11 This Court set a hearing for December 20, 2021 to determine whether Ms.  
12 Wentworth should be declared a vexatious litigant for: (1) repeatedly filing complaints  
13 without keeping the Court updated as to a valid address; (2) filing duplicate complaints  
14 with insufficient allegations under Rule 8; (3) failing to appear at an earlier hearing when  
15 ordered to do so by the Court; (4) rather than filing amended complaints as allowed by the  
16 Court, filing new complaints long after the deadline for amendment had passed; and  
17 (5) repeatedly filing complaints without any good faith expectation of prevailing. Ms.  
18 Wentworth was warned that if she failed to appear for this hearing, the Court was likely to  
19 declare her a vexatious litigant.

20 Ms. Wentworth failed to appear at the hearing. Since then, she left voicemail  
21 messages with the Court, stating more lawsuits need to be filed, that she is in the process  
22 of gathering more evidence, and that her mail is being tampered with. Further, Ms.  
23 Wentworth returned to the courthouse, stating she plans to file an additional eighty  
24 lawsuits. And on the day the Court issued its Tentative Order, Ms. Wentworth attempted  
25 to file a collection of additional lawsuits. The Court rejected one because it was duplicative  
26 of an earlier suit and fell under the Tentative Order's filing restriction. The Court accepted  
27 three other lawsuits for filing, related them to three identical prior lawsuits, and then  
28

1 dismissed them as duplicative or for failing to pay the filing fee. (Case Nos. 22-cv-0570,  
2 22-cv-0571, 22-cv-0573.)

3 **II. Analysis**

4 “District courts have the inherent power to file restrictive pre-filing orders against  
5 vexatious litigants with abusive and lengthy histories of litigation.” *Weissman v. Quail*  
6 *Lodge*, 179 F.3d 1194, 1197 (9th Cir. 1999). “Such pre-filing orders may enjoin the litigant  
7 from filing further actions or papers unless he or she meets certain requirements, such as  
8 obtaining leave of the court or filing declarations that support the merits of the case.” *Id.*;  
9 *see also DeLong v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 1990) (“There is strong  
10 precedent establishing the inherent power of federal courts to regulate the activities of  
11 abusive litigants by imposing carefully tailored restrictions under the appropriate  
12 circumstances.” (alteration omitted)). Nonetheless, “such pre-filing orders should rarely  
13 be filed.” *Id.*

14 In *DeLong*, the Ninth Circuit laid out a four-part test before declaring a litigant  
15 vexatious. The first two requirements are procedural: the litigant must have notice and an  
16 opportunity to be heard on the issue and there must be an adequate record for review. 912  
17 F.2d at 1147–48. With respect to this second factor, the court “should include a listing of  
18 all cases and motions that led the district court to conclude that a vexatious litigant order  
19 was needed.” *Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1058 (9th Cir. 2007)  
20 (per curiam) (quoting *DeLong*, 912 F.2d at 1147).

21 The last two factors are substantive. First, the court must make substantive findings  
22 that the plaintiff’s litigation has been frivolous or harassing. *DeLong*, 912 F.2d at 1148.  
23 And, finally, any restriction must be narrowly tailored “to closely fit the specific vice  
24 encountered.” *Id.* at 1147–48.

25 **A. Notice and Opportunity to be Heard**

26 As outlined above, the Court gave Ms. Wentworth multiple opportunities to be  
27 heard. (ECF Nos. 4, 8, 20, 25.) Ms. Wentworth appeared and argued at the hearing on the  
28 Court’s Tentative Order. (ECF No. 25.) Hence, these opportunities satisfy the first

procedural requirement. *See Ringgold-Lockhart v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, 761 F.3d 1057, 1063 (9th Cir. 2014).

## **B. Adequate Record for Review**

In *Molski*, the Ninth Circuit held that a district court compiled a proper record for review where “[t]he record before the district court contained a complete list of the cases filed by Molski in the Central District of California, along with the complaints from many of those cases,” and where “[a]lthough the district court’s decision entering the pre-filing order did not list every case filed by Molski, it did outline and discuss many of them.” *Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1063 (discussing *Molski*, 500 F.3d 1047). The Court has included a list of Ms. Wentworth’s many civil rights cases in Attachment 1 and summarized them above. Further, the Court incorporates its discussion of these cases from its prior orders. (ECF Nos. 11, 19, 20.) Finally, the Court highlights several of these cases here to show they demonstrate a pattern of frivolous and harassing filings:

- *Hudson; Wentworth v. Uzi*, No. 21-cv-00681-BAS-AGS (S.D. Cal. filed Apr. 16, 2021).
  - Wentworth alleged Defendant “Uzi” violated the “Civil Rights Act [of] 1964” and the California Unruh Civil Rights Act in December 2019. No factual details were given for the “Statement of Claim.” The Complaint’s “Relief” section identified “Malicious Intent,” “Racial Discrimination / Harassment / Aggression,” and “Hate Crime” with no details.
- *Wentworth v. San Diego County Sheriff Department*, No. 21-cv-00701-BAS-AGS (S.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2021).
  - Wentworth alleged the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department committed fraud and violated the “Civil Rights Act [of] 1964” and the California Unruh Civil Rights Act in 2019 and 2020. No factual details were given for the “Statement of Claim.” The Complaint’s “Relief” section sought \$1 million and identifies “Malicious Intent,” “Termination,” and “Hate Crime” with no details.

- 1     • *Hudson v. Groundkeeper*, No. 21-cv-00707-BAS-AGS (S.D. Cal. filed Apr. 16,  
2     2021).
  - 3         ○ Filed on behalf of her son, Wentworth alleged a “Groundkeeper/Security  
4         [Person]” violated the “Civil Rights Act [of] 1964” and the California  
5         Unruh Civil Rights Act from 2016 to 2020. No factual details were given  
6         for the “Statement of Claim.” The Complaint’s “Relief” section identified  
7         “Malicious Intent,” “Racial Discrimination / Harassment / Aggression,”  
8         and “Hate Crime” with no details.
- 9     • *Appiah et al. v. KKK Ku Klux Klan*, No. 21-cv-00744-BAS-AGS (S.D. Cal. filed  
10    Apr. 16, 2021).
  - 11         ○ Filed on behalf of herself and her two children, Wentworth alleged the Ku  
12         Klux Klan violated civil rights laws and committed “racial discrimination  
13         / harassment / intimidation / aggression” from April 2019 to 2021. No  
14         factual details were given for the “Statement of Claim.” The Complaint’s  
15         “Relief” section sought \$1 million and identifies “Malicious Intent” and  
16         “Hate Crime” with no details.

17         Combined, the Court’s efforts to document Ms. Wentworth’s many cases provide an  
18         adequate record for review. *See Ringgold-Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1063–64.

### 19         C. Substantive Findings of Frivolousness or Harassment

20         With respect to substantive findings of frivolity or harassment, the Court must find  
21         more than a showing of litigiousness. “[T]he simple fact that a plaintiff has filed a large  
22         number of complaints, standing alone, is not a basis for designating a litigant as  
23         ‘vexatious.’” *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1061. Even “the textual and factual similarity of a  
24         plaintiff’s complaints, standing alone, is not a basis for finding a party to be a vexatious  
25         litigant.” *Id.* After all, “there is nothing inherently vexatious about using prior complaints  
26         as a template.” *Id.* Hence, the Court must examine both the number and content of Ms.  
27         Wentworth’s filings to determine whether they are frivolous or harassing. *See Ringgold-*  
28         *Lockhart*, 761 F.3d at 1064. Having reviewed Ms. Wentworth’s well over fifty civil rights

1 cases, the Court finds they are both frivolous and harassing. They are frivolous because  
 2 the lawsuits include almost no details about Ms. Wentworth's claims, are duplicative,  
 3 request millions of dollars in damages, and are repeatedly abandoned once the Court issues  
 4 a screening order requesting details about the claims. *See Moy v. United States*, 906 F.2d  
 5 467, 470 (9th Cir. 1990) ("An injunction cannot issue merely upon a showing of  
 6 litigiousness. The plaintiff's claims must not only be numerous, but also be patently  
 7 without merit."). These many cases have consumed "a great deal" of the Court's time, and  
 8 Ms. Wentworth has not responded to the Court's concerns and guidance expressed in prior  
 9 orders. *See id.*

10 Moreover, Local Rule 83.11 requires anyone proceeding without an attorney to  
 11 "keep the court . . . advised as to current address." At the hearing on the Court's Tentative  
 12 Order, Ms. Wentworth argued her mail was being tampered with and she had not received  
 13 the Court's Orders. However, while some orders were returned as undeliverable, others  
 14 were not. (See ECF Nos. 4 to 22 (including undeliverable notices for some orders but not  
 15 the Court's May 13, 2021, order setting a hearing and others).) And the Court notes Ms.  
 16 Wentworth lists the same address on her latest filings as the Court has used before. (See  
 17 Compl. in Case No. 22-cv-00571-BAS-KSC (S.D. Cal. filed Apr. 4, 2022) (listing "PO  
 18 Box 495, Oceanside, CA 92068" on the Civil Cover Sheet, the same address being used in  
 19 this consolidated action).) Finally, address issues aside, any troubles with mail do not  
 20 explain the main problem here: Ms. Wentworth filing dozens of duplicative lawsuits  
 21 without enough detail to allow the Court to proceed.

22 Accordingly, for those civil rights cases that have been consolidated, the Court finds  
 23 Ms. Wentworth's filings have been frivolous and harassing.

24 **D. Narrow Tailoring**

25 Any pre-filing order must be narrowly tailored to fit the specific abuse encountered.  
 26 The Court finds the appropriate tailoring here is to restrict Ms. Wentworth from freely  
 27 filing lawsuits "based on the facts and issues" raised in the consolidated civil rights cases  
 28 shown in Attachment 1. *See Wood v. Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce*, 705 F.2d

1 1515, 1526 (9th Cir. 1986). If Ms. Wentworth wishes to proceed with any claims related  
2 to those lawsuits, she must address the Court's prior orders in these cases, not file new  
3 duplicative lawsuits.<sup>3</sup>

4 **III. Conclusion**

5 In light of the foregoing, the Court declares Ms. Dawn Wentworth a vexatious  
6 litigant for these consolidated civil rights cases. Further, the Court subjects Ms. Wentworth  
7 to the following pre-filing order.

8 The Clerk of Court is directed not to file any new complaints from Ms. Wentworth  
9 that: (a) appear to be related to the consolidated civil rights actions shown in Attachment  
10 1; or (b) are against any of the defendants shown in Attachment 1. Instead, the Clerk is  
11 directed to send the proposed complaints to the undersigned, who will review them to  
12 determine whether they are not frivolous or harassing and should be accepted for filing.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14  
15 **DATED: April 29, 2022**

  
16 Hon. Cynthia Bashant  
United States District Judge

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>3</sup> The Court's Tentative Order noted that although Ms. Wentworth has filed various lawsuits  
26 against other defendants, which have not been consolidated, those cases appear to arise out of different  
27 events. The Court will not subject Ms. Wentworth to a broader pre-filing order that would include all  
28 these lawsuits in this order. However, because Ms. Wentworth has filed more duplicative lawsuits against  
other defendants, the Court will consider whether an additional or broader pre-filing order is appropriate  
in those cases and provide her an opportunity to respond.

## ATTACHMENT 1

Count	Case	Title	Date Filed
1	3:2021-cv-00681-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. UZI</i>	4/16/2021
2	3:2021-cv-00682-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Vista Unified School District Board of Trustees et al</i>	4/16/2021
3	3:2021-cv-00683-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Oceanside Police Department</i>	4/16/2021
4	3:2021-cv-00684-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Oceanside Police Dept.</i>	4/16/2021
5	3:2021-cv-00685-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Norris</i>	4/16/2021
6	3:2021-cv-00686-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Larsen</i>	4/16/2021
7	3:2021-cv-00688-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Appiah et al</i>	4/16/2021
8	3:2021-cv-00689-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Wilson</i>	4/16/2021
9	3:2021-cv-00690-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Walsh</i>	4/16/2021
10	3:2021-cv-00691-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Clark</i>	4/16/2021
11	3:2021-cv-00692-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth et al v. Brown</i>	4/16/2021
12	3:2021-cv-00693-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Clark</i>	4/16/2021
13	3:2021-cv-00694-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth et al v. Mission Vista Proxy</i>	4/16/2021
14	3:2021-cv-00695-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. 9th District PTA</i>	4/16/2021
15	3:2021-cv-00696-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Allard</i>	4/16/2021
16	3:2021-cv-00698-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Mission Vista Proxy</i>	4/16/2021
17	3:2021-cv-00700-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. School Counselor</i>	4/16/2021
18	3:2021-cv-00701-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. San Diego Sheriff's Department</i>	4/16/2021
19	3:2021-cv-00703-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth et al v. San Diego County Sheriff's Dept</i>	4/16/2021
20	3:2021-cv-00705-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Vista Unified School District</i>	4/16/2021
21	3:2021-cv-00706-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Vista United School District School Counselor</i>	4/16/2021
22	3:2021-cv-00707-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Vista Unified School District et al</i>	4/16/2021
23	3:2021-cv-00708-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Parco</i>	4/16/2021
24	3:2021-cv-00709-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Shackelford</i>	4/16/2021
25	3:2021-cv-00710-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Allard</i>	4/16/2021

Count	Case	Title	Date Filed
26	3:2021-cv-00711-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Groundskeeper/Security</i>	4/16/2021
27	3:2021-cv-00712-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. UZI</i>	4/16/2021
28	3:2021-cv-00713-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. New English Teacher</i>	4/16/2021
29	3:2021-cv-00714-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Shackelford</i>	4/16/2021
30	3:2021-cv-00715-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. New English Teacher</i>	4/16/2021
31	3:2021-cv-00716-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. AM/PM Afterschool</i>	4/16/2021
32	3:2021-cv-00717-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Peppard 1 et al</i>	4/16/2021
33	3:2021-cv-00718-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Vista Unified School District Board of Trustees et al</i>	4/16/2021
34	3:2021-cv-00719-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Ho</i>	4/16/2021
35	3:2021-cv-00720-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Buck</i>	4/16/2021
36	3:2021-cv-00721-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Ho</i>	4/16/2021
37	3:2021-cv-00722-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Dambroso</i>	4/16/2021
38	3:2021-cv-00723-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Buck</i>	4/16/2021
39	3:2021-cv-00724-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Martin</i>	4/16/2021
40	3:2021-cv-00725-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Domenici</i>	4/16/2021
41	3:2021-cv-00726-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Gulley</i>	4/16/2021
42	3:2021-cv-00727-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Westerlund</i>	4/16/2021
43	3:2021-cv-00728-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Zeroski</i>	4/16/2021
44	3:2021-cv-00729-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Gulley</i>	4/16/2021
45	3:2021-cv-00731-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Chagala</i>	4/16/2021
46	3:2021-cv-00732-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Wiblemo</i>	4/16/2021
47	3:2021-cv-00733-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. McIntosh</i>	4/16/2021
48	3:2021-cv-00734-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. DAmbroso</i>	4/16/2021
49	3:2021-cv-00736-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Wiblemo</i>	4/16/2021
50	3:2021-cv-00738-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Walsh</i>	4/16/2021
51	3:2021-cv-00739-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. CA Dept of Education</i>	4/16/2021
52	3:2021-cv-00740-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Strohauer</i>	4/16/2021
53	3:2021-cv-00741-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Peppard</i>	4/16/2021
54	3:2021-cv-00742-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Doyle</i>	4/16/2021
55	3:2021-cv-00743-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Westerlund</i>	4/16/2021
56	3:2021-cv-00744-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. KKK Ku Klux Klan</i>	4/16/2021
57	3:2021-cv-00745-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. McIntosh</i>	4/16/2021

Count	Case	Title	Date Filed
58	3:2021-cv-00746-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Wetmore</i>	4/16/2021
59	3:2021-cv-00747-BAS-AGS	<i>Appiah et al v. Neighbor - 510 Calle Montecito Dr Unit 50 Oceanside CA 92058</i>	4/16/2021
60	3:2021-cv-00748-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Kenney</i>	4/16/2021
61	3:2021-cv-00749-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Kenney</i>	4/16/2021
62	3:2021-cv-00750-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. U.S. Dept of Education</i>	4/16/2021
63	3:2021-cv-00751-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Zeroski</i>	4/16/2021
64	3:2021-cv-00752-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Wetmore</i>	4/16/2021
65	3:2021-cv-00753-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson v. Mission Vista High School</i>	4/16/2021
66	3:2021-cv-00754-BAS-AGS	<i>Hudson et al v. Peppard et al</i>	4/16/2021
67	3:2021-cv-00757-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth et al v. Mission Vista High School &amp; Personnel et al</i>	4/16/2021
68	3:021-cv-01122-BAS-AGS	<i>Wentworth v. Peppard</i>	6/16/2021

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAY 11 2023

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

DAWN WENTWORTH,

No. 22-55566

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:21-cv-00757-BAS-AGS  
Southern District of California,  
San Diego

and

JOURNEE HUDSON; YAW APPIAH,

ORDER

Plaintiffs,

v.

MISSION VISTA HIGH SCHOOL &  
PERSONNEL; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before: FERNANDEZ, FRIEDLAND, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

We treat Wentworth's filings (Docket Entry Nos. 15 and 16) as a petition for rehearing, and deny the petition.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**