

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

GLENDORA,)
)
 Plaintiff)
)
 v.) Civil No. 03-122-B-W
)
 PAUL L. FRIEDMAN, et al,)
)
 Defendants)

RECOMMENDED DECISION

This Court is in receipt of a complaint filed by Glendora, a resident of New York and a talk show hostess for a program entitled, “A Chat with Glendora.” (Docket No. 1.) The complaint is accompanied by a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket No. 2). I now **GRANT** the motion to proceed in forma pauperis and recommend that the Court **DISMISS** the complaint for want of proper venue.

Discussion

Glendora’s complaint is actually a variety of complaints, involving a variety of defendants, filed as a single action. The first to be plead is a complaint against “Alpha Defendants Friedman through Amon.” Not one of the numerous defendants listed in this section of the caption reside in Maine. Glendora alliteratively asserts that these defendants “violently and virulently and viciously violated” her rights when they, as best as I can discern, interacted with Glendora in court proceedings and in treating her court pleadings. They are alleged to be collectively guilty of judicial depravity.

The next set of defendants, members of the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, all of New York, are sued for violating Glendora’s rights, as a New

York State resident, to have good judges. With respect to these defendants, Glendora claims that they have been repeatedly informed of the misconduct and disability of numerous judges but have “cough[ed] up” nothing. This Glendora discerns to be a pendant state law claim.

Set of defendants number three are two men from White Plains, New York. One is dubbed a “bad judge” who unsuccessfully “lied, stole and cheated to abscond with Glendora’s Cablevision stock.” The second person, his law clerk, was declared an agent of Cablevision.

Fourth in line are defendants all of New York, sued for violations of federal, state, and municipal “first come, first serve” public access laws. Glendora also claims that some of these defendants improperly exercised editorial control, damaging Glendora’s relationship to her television audience.

The fifth set of defendants, a woman from Manchester, Connecticut, and a man and a media company of Atlanta, Georgia,¹ are sued for the same violations as the directly aforementioned New York defendants. Glendora explains that Connecticut does not have the same law as New York but that the spirit of public access law in Connecticut is the same and these defendants have failed to cable cast “A Chat with Glendora” the entire first quarter of this year.

Defendants number six are listed as an individual and a media company of Middletown, New York, and three people from Springfield, Missouri. Glendora claims that these defendants violated federal public access laws by charging too much for cablecasting and dubbing her talk show and by using arcane media formats.

¹ There seems to be a copying error in the original complaint as page eight, listing these defendants, is blank. However, the copy of the complaint does contain the names and addresses of the defendants.

The seventh set of defendants of Hopewell Junction, New York are alleged to have violated Glendora's rights under New York real property law by harassing and bullying tenants, commingling security deposits, and lying about needing to have the rental premises for family use. This is described as a pendant state claim.

The eighth and final set of defendants are the "AESCULAPIANS," all of whom are listed with New York addresses. These defendants forced Glendora's husband to go to the hospital by ambulance even though he told them he did not want to and even though Glendora could have driven him, thereby saving \$600 ambulance charge. They lied that he had chest pains, kidnapped and detained him without his consent, and inserted two unnecessary pacemakers, when all he need was to be allowed to go home, sit in the shade of his favorite tree, rest, and sleep. One instrument was inserted too far and punctured his lung, resulting in an extension of his hospital stay by eight days. This, and other unnecessary procedures, contributed to a \$61,000 bill and endangered the couple's future Medicare coverage. Glendora explains: "Franklyn and Glendora had never been to a doctor in their entire married life of 48 years. They sought to make a doctor contract to stay an autopsy if they died at home to preserve their bodies as anatomical gifts to New York Medical College. That is all they went to the doctors for the first time in their 48 years of conjugal joy and connubial bliss."

With respect to the relief sought, Glendora seeks "instant corrections of these wrongs against her and against America, together with \$180,000,000.00 in damages compensatory and punitive."

Glendora claims that this court has jurisdiction over the (non-pendant) claims because there is a federal question and because there is diversity of citizenship. She

asserts that the District of Maine is a proper venue “because Glendora’s court is totally disintegrated, and she has a constitutional right to address her government with grievances that have happened.” (Compl. ¶ 6.)

Neither Glendora nor a single one of the numerous defendants is from Maine and not a single contact or occurrence is alleged to have a connection to Maine. However liberally I construe this complaint,² the District of Maine is not the proper venue for this complaint; this conclusion is indisputable with respect to those claims purportedly based on subject matter jurisdiction, see 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), as well as for those that might be premised on diversity jurisdiction, see id. § 1391(a). “The district court of a district in which is filed a case laying venue in the wrong division or district shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought.” Id. § 1406(a). See Glendora v. Philbin, 1999 WL 672637 (E.D. Pa. 1999) (concluding that a Glendora complaint relating to events in New Rochelle, New York was not properly lodged in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and transferring the case to the District of New York).

I cannot in good faith recommend that the Court attempt to transfer the case to a District where there might be proper venue for two reasons. First, the complaint is in fact eight separate complaints with defendants, conduct, and law that span the country and extend to the Mariana Islands (although New York people and places predominate). Second, it appears that Glendora’s reference to the disintegration of her court seems to be based on her lack of success in prosecuting similar actions in other Districts, particularly

² I recognize that Glendora contends that dismissal at this juncture is inappropriate given her pro se status (Compl. ¶¶ 8-9) and I am cognizant of the requirement that this court read complaints only for a concern that they state a cause of action. (See e.g. Glendora v. Cablevision Systems, 1995 WL 15830 (2nd Cir. N.Y.)

the Districts of New York, see e.g., Glendora v. Lemle, 2001 WL 984926 (E.D.N.Y. 2001); Glendora v. City of White Plains, 53 F.Supp. 2d 621 (S.D.N.Y. 1999); Glendora v. Bruiser Ken, 1999 WL 390642 (E.D.N.Y. 1999); Glendora v. Pinkerton Sec. and Detective Servs., 25 F. Supp. 2d. 447 (S.D.N.Y. 1998); Glendora v. Tele-Communications, Inc., 1996 WL 721077 (S.D.N.Y. 1996); Glendora v. Marshall, 947 F. Supp. 707 (S.D.N.Y. (1996), but also in other Districts, see, e.g., Glendora v. Brading, 2002 WL 31971936 (D. Or. 2002), other Circuits, see, e.g., Glendora v. Sellers, 2003 WL 220510 (10th Cir. 2003) (stating that Glendora’s case filings, this one in a District with no relation to any claims or parties, “amounted to a pattern of malicious, abusive, and frivolous litigation”); Glendora v. Anderson, 2003 WL 202108 (9th Cir. 2003) (affirming lack-of-venue-dismissal of Glendora’s action); Glendora v. Walker, 2002 WL 31839186 (4th Cir. 2002) (dismissing Glendora’s appeal because frivolous); Glendora v. Levin, 2001 WL 1587415 (6th Cir. 2001) (concluding that Glendora’s complaint did not state a claim that entitled her to relief); Glendora v. Nickerson, 225 F.3d 648 (3d Cir. 2000) (“Appeal Dismissed.”). In re Glendora, 1999 WL 60093(D.C. Cir. 1999) (denying petition for writ of mandamus, concluding that the district court was correct in determining that venue did not lie); Glendora v. Rehnquist, 194 F.3d 173, 1999 WL 334512 (D.C. Cir. 1999) (affirming dismissal of action finding the issues presented no occasion for an opinion); Glendora v. Board of Dirs., 152 F.3d 918, 1998 WL 386023 (2d Cir. 1998)(affirming dismissal of complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction), New York state court, see, e.g., Glendora v. Hubbard, 643 N.Y.S.2d 377 (N.Y. 1996); Glendora v. Walsh, 642 N.Y.S.2d 545 (N.Y. 1996); Glendora v. CBS, Inc., 624 N.Y.S.2d 254 (N.Y. 1995), not to mention the United States Supreme Court, Glendora v. Porzio,

523 U.S. 206 (1998) (denying Glendora leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and, in the wake of fourteen petitions between 1994 and 1998, entering an order barring prospective in forma pauperis filings by Glendora in non-criminal cases).

I do recognize that Glendora has absolutely withheld her consent to the handling of her case by magistrate judge. (Compl. ¶4.) However, this recommended decision is just that. It is not case dispositive. Glendora will have her opportunity to object in accordance with the notice below and, should she do so, an Article III District Court judge will review the decision de novo, a process that fully comports with the Constitution.

CONCLUSION

I now recommend that the court **DISMISS** this complaint because Glendora has filed a case laying venue in the wrong District.

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

July 16, 2003.

Margaret J. Kravchuk
U.S. Magistrate Judge

**U.S. District Court
District of Maine (Bangor)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:03-cv-00122-JAW
Internal Use Only**

GLENDORA v. FRIEDMAN et al

Assigned to: JUDGE JOHN A. WOODCOCK

Referred to:

Demand: \$

Lead Docket: None

Related Cases: None

Case in other court: None

Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 07/08/03

Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights:

Other

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

GLENDORA

represented by **GLENDORA**

BOX 69

HOPEWELL, NY 12533

PRO SE

V.

Defendant

PAUL L FRIEDMAN

CLARENCE COOPER

ALFRED G NICOLS, JR

MARVIN J GARBIS

STEPHEN P FRIOT

MICHAEL B MUKASEY

JAMES PARKISON

LEONIDAS RALPH MECHAM

PATRICK FISHER

SUE L ROBINSON

MARY E STANLEY

ALEX R MUNSON

ALEX R JOHNSON

DENNIS JACOBS

JOHM M WALKER, JR

ROSEANN B MACKECHNE

BERNARD F MADSEN, JR

LYNN DOBBS

HELENA M HARRIS

MICHAEL J DAVIS

JONATHAN G LEBEDOFF

BRENDA TOFFE

ADRIAN MYERS

JOHN T COPENHAVER, JR

KAREN MURPHY

DEANELL REECE TACHZ

PAUL J KELLY, JR

HARRIS I HARTZ

PATRICK FISCHER

AUDREY F WEIGEL

CATHY CATTERSON

JEFF CROCKER

**DOE HUG, *FIRST NAME NOT
SPECIFIED IN COMPLAINT***

**DOE OSCANLAIN, *FIRST
NAME NOT SPECIFIED IN
COMPLAINT***

**DOE TASHIMA, *FIRST NAME
NOT SPECIFIED IN
COMPLAINT***

ROBERT W DOYLE

ROBERT A LIFSON

KENNETH W RUDOLPH

NANCY SUNSHINE

J HARVIE WILKINSON, III

WILLIAM W WILKINS

BOYCE F MARTIN

J L EDMUNDSON

ROBERT E GERBER

SHELLEY C CHAPMAN

CAROL B AMON

GERALD STERN

LEE KIKLIER

JOHN P DIBLASI

BARRY SKWIERSKI

CHARLES F DOLAN

JAMES L DOLAN

MACK BUDILL

THOMAS GARGER

CHARLES A FORMZ

**CABLEVISION SYSTEMS
CORP**

DANIEL P SICCONI

PAUL LAPLANTE

REGGIE ANDERSON

DIANNE BENNETT

ROBERT ASTARITA

TONY LAVALIER

PAUL RYAN

TOM MCKEON

**BRIAN DOE, *LAST NAME
NOT SPECIFIED IN
COMPLAINT***

**DOE HARTUNG, *FIRST
NAME NOT SPECIFIED IN
COMPLAINT***

LAWRENCE BURILL

ROBERT M CALLAGY

RALPH GARGULIO

SUBHASH KULKARNI

HOPEWELL MEDICAL P C

**HUDSON VALLEY EMERG
PHY**

LEROY J PHYLLIPS

ASHOK SHAH

HUDSON VALLEY CRITICAL

DIANE C KANTAROS

JAMES M SCADUTO

DANIEL G CHAPURRI

DANIEL M PHILBIN

LAWRENCE S SCHEK

KHURRAM I ASHRAT

**TACONIC
CARDIOTHORACTIC**

**HUDSON VALLEY
UROLOGY**

PETER ZAKOW

HUDSON VALLEY RAD

BRYAN C YEN

DONALD C LIEN

MARK R BRADY

BENJAMIN SECKLER

PHILIP AMATULLE

HENRY J FISCHER

JOSEPH C ANTONIO

JACK I HENTEL

ZEV W GOLDSTEIN

**VASSAR BROTHERS MED
CTR**

**NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS
INC**

**REVENUE MAXIMIZATION
GROUP INC, THE**

WEN SHEN