

Appendix A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

FEB 19 2026

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

DAVID GEORGE KARKOUR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 25-3242

D.C. No. 2:25-cv-03673-MRA-JDE

Central District of California,  
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: CALLAHAN, FRIEDLAND, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

After considering the response to the court's June 5, 2025 order and the opening brief, we deny the motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry No. 3) and dismiss this appeal as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), (e)(2).

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

**DISMISSED.**

App. A-1

Appendix B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J S - 6

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-03673-MRA-JDE Date: April 28, 2025  
Title David George Karkour v. Federal Bureau of Investigation

Present: The Honorable: Mónica Ramírez Almadani, United States District Judge

Gabriela Garcia  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:  
N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant:  
N/A

**Proceedings (In Chambers): Order Denying Request To Proceed In Forma Pauperis and Petition for Permanent Injunction (ECF Nos. 1-2) And Dismissing Action With Prejudice**

**I. Background.**

On April 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Petition for Permanent Injunction and a Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis. (ECF Nos. 1-2.) Plaintiff seeks to permanently enjoin the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) from covertly placing implants inside Plaintiff’s body. (ECF No. 1 at 2.)

Plaintiff alleges the following. The FBI has been placing the implants and imposing “software restrictions” in Plaintiff’s body since March 8, 2010. (*Id.*) The FBI also has been using “extremely disturbing software sounds” and “high beam headlights” to control Plaintiff. (*Id.* at 3.) The torture also includes implants that are “transmitted through eye drops such as antibiotic eye drops, cortisone, or numbing eye drops,” through waterproof adhesive bandages, and through purchased vegetables. (*Id.* at 5-6.) Plaintiff has been victimized by implants delivered through vaccines since he was born. (*Id.* at 7.) The undercover implants “have been possibly controlled by Supercomputer Software, that is instantaneously transmitted from Satellites in Orbit.” (*Id.* at 9.) The implants cannot be scanned or found by medical devices. (*Id.* at 10.) Most health practitioners are aware of the implants but keep them undercover. (*Id.*) People with implants who express opinions about public figures or important organizations may contract cancer or other serious diseases. (*Id.*) The undercover implants also have been used on animals, who “can possibly be wirelessly manipulated (via satellites) against Humans whenever . . . the possible Undercover people may choose to do so.” (*Id.* at 11.)

App. B - 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-03673-MRA-JDE

Date: April 28, 2025

Title David George Karkour v. Federal Bureau of Investigation

Plaintiff seeks 10 billion dollars in damages. (*Id.* at 3.) He also seeks a permanent injunction against the FBI to stop the “Covert Imprisonment, Covert Enslavement, Covert Oppression, and Covert Torture on a daily basis.” (*Id.* at 4.)

As stated below, the Petition is denied, and the action is dismissed with prejudice.

**II. The Petition Is Procedurally Improper.**

“The standard for a permanent injunction is essentially the same as for a preliminary injunction, with the exception that the plaintiff must show actual success, rather than a likelihood of success.” *National Association of Wheat Growers v. Becerra*, 468 F. Supp. 3d 1247, 1265 (E.D. Cal. 2020) (citing *Amoco Prod. Co. v. Village of Gambell*, 480 U.S. 531, 546 n.12 (1987)). Because Plaintiff seeks a permanent injunction at the outset of this case rather than at its conclusion, it is procedurally improper.

To the extent that the Petition could be liberally construed as a request for a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction, it still would be procedurally improper. Plaintiff has not demonstrated notice to the adverse party or explained why it should not be required. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(1) (preliminary injunction may issue only on notice to the adverse party); Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(B) (temporary restraining order requires certification in writing any efforts made to give notice and reasons why it should not be required). Plaintiff also has not filed a verified Complaint, a requirement for injunctive relief. *See Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen’s Medical Center*, 810 F.3d 631, 633 (9th Cir. 2015) (“A court’s equitable power lies only over the merits of the case or controversy before it. When a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief based on claims not pled in the complaint, the court does not have the authority to issue an injunction.”).

For these reasons alone, denial of the Petition is warranted.

**III. The Allegations Are Frivolous And Wholly Insubstantial.**

A litigant who seeks injunctive relief without filing a Complaint may be granted an extension of time to file a Complaint. *See Diaz v. Hurley*, 2020 WL 860071, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2020). A civil action is commenced only by the filing of a Complaint with the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civil P. 3. Here, however, granting Plaintiff an extension of time for such a purpose is not warranted because his allegations are wholly insubstantial and obviously frivolous.

*Appl. B-2*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-03673-MRA-JDE

Date: April 28, 2025

Title David George Karkour v. Federal Bureau of Investigation

“Over the years [the Supreme] Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit, wholly insubstantial, obviously frivolous, plainly unsubstantial, or no longer open to discussion.” *Hagans v. Levine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536 (1974) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “[C]onstitutional insubstantiality’ for this purpose has been equated with such concepts as ‘essentially fictitious,’ ‘wholly insubstantial,’ ‘obviously frivolous,’ and ‘obviously without merit.’” *Shapiro v. McManus*, 577 U.S. 39, 45-46 (2015) (quoting *Goosby v. Osser*, 409 U.S. 512, 518 (1973)).

Here, Plaintiff’s allegations are wholly insubstantial and obviously frivolous. He alleges that the FBI has been controlling and torturing him and others through the use of software-controlled implants for decades. Allegations of a similarly fanciful nature have been held not to raise a substantial federal question, thereby warranting dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. See *Atakapa Indian de Creole Nation v. Louisiana*, 943 F.3d 1004, 1007 (5th Cir. 2019) (holding that a district court lacked jurisdiction to consider a suit that was brought under “the 1795 Spanish Treaty with the Catholic Majesty of Spain and the 1800 French Treaty with the former Christian Majesty of France,” named several world leaders as defendants, and alleged a monopoly of “intergalactic foreign trade”); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1009-10 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (holding that a district court lacked jurisdiction to consider a plaintiff’s allegations of “a massive surveillance operation against him” after his conversation with an airline representative, and collecting similar cases of “patent insubstantiality”); *Grady v. United States Government*, 702 F. App’x 929, 930 (11th Cir. 2017) (“[The] allegations — that the government employed surveillance specialists to harass him while he was in the library and at theaters; performed sting operations at local bars; used electromagnetic surveillance, cameras, and rooftop devices to monitor him; and had a nurse act as a covert operative to implant a microchip in his ear — are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be devoid of merit. . . . They were properly dismissed [for lack of jurisdiction].”).

Because the allegations are obviously frivolous, the Court declines to grant Plaintiff an extension of time to file a Complaint. Instead, the action is dismissed with prejudice. See *El v. AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc.*, 710 F.3d 748, 751 (7th Cir. 2013) (“[I]f the reason there’s no federal jurisdiction is the plaintiff’s having predicated jurisdiction on a frivolous federal claim, dismissal with prejudice is appropriate, for such a suit will go nowhere in any court.”) (citation omitted).

Ash. B-3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-03673-MRA-JDE Date: April 28, 2025

Title David George Karkour v. Federal Bureau of Investigation

**IV. Conclusion.**

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Permanent Injunction and the Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis are denied. (ECF No. 1-2.) The action is dismissed with prejudice.

It is so ordered.

Initials of Preparer

\_\_\_\_\_  
:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
gga

*App. B-4*

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