

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

T. MATTHEW PHILLIPS,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

HON. MARI PARLADE,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-01464-GMN-NJK

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit on the grounds that the judge presiding over state court family law proceedings relied on artificial intelligence to craft her rulings. *See* Docket No. 1. Concurrently herewith, the undersigned is issuing a report and recommendation that this case be dismissed with prejudice. Given the overarching circumstances, the Court also separately issues this order to show cause why Plaintiff should not be declared a vexatious litigant.<sup>1</sup>

District courts have the power to enter pre-filing orders against vexatious litigants pursuant to the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). “Flagrant abuse of the judicial process cannot be tolerated because it enables one person to preempt the use of judicial time that properly could be used to consider the meritorious claims of other litigants.” *De Long v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1148 (9th Cir. 1990). In determining whether a pre-filing order is appropriate, the Ninth Circuit has outlined four factors for this Court to consider. First, the litigant must be given notice and a chance to be heard. *Id.* Second, this Court must compile an adequate record for review. *Id.* Third, this Court must make substantive findings about the frivolous or harassing nature of the plaintiff’s litigation. *Id.* Fourth, any pre-filing order must be narrowly tailored to closely fit the specific vice encountered. *Id.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is an attorney licensed in California. Although he is appearing *pro se* in this case, he is entitled to no leniency as such. *See, e.g., Huffman v. Lindgren*, 81 F.4th 1016, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 2023).

1 Plaintiff is a disgruntled litigant in state court family law proceedings. This is at least  
2 Plaintiff's tenth case filed in federal court predicated on allegations of judicial or other misconduct  
3 related to state court. *See also Phillips v. Ochoa*, Case No. 2:20-cv-00272-JAD-VCF (D. Nev.  
4 Feb. 7, 2020) (case brought against state court judge, county, and state); *Phillips v. Duckworth*,  
5 Case No. 2:20-cv-2345-RFB-NJK (D. Nev. Dec. 29, 2020) (case brought against state court judge,  
6 clerk of court, state court administrator, and state court administrative agency); *Phillips v. Truby*,  
7 Case No. 2:21-cv-00358-KJD-EJY (D. Nev. Mar. 2, 2021) (case brought against director of family  
8 support division of district attorney's office, DMV director, and state attorney general); *Phillips v.*  
9 *Ochoa*, Case No. 2:21-cv-00483-APG-NJK (D. Nev. Mar. 24, 2021) (case brought against state  
10 court judges and state attorney general); *Shahroki v. Harter*, Case No. 2:21-cv-00557-APG-BNW  
11 (D. Nev. Apr. 5, 2021) (case brought against state court judge);<sup>2</sup> *Phillips v. Vincent Ochoa*, Case  
12 No. 2:21-cv-01127-RFB-NJK (D. Nev. June 14, 2021) (case brought against state court judge,  
13 Plaintiff's ex-wife, and her counsel); *Phillips v. Henderson*, Case No. 2:24-cv-00594-DJA (D.  
14 Nev. Mar. 27, 2024) (case brought against state court judge, law clerk, judicial executive assistant,  
15 and state court itself); *Phillips v. Henderson*, Case No. 2:24-cv-00859-JAD-BNW (D. Nev. May  
16 7, 2024) (case brought against state court judge); *Phillips v. Ochoa*, Case No. 2:24-cv-2086-RFB-  
17 BNW (D. Nev. Dec. 16, 2022) (case brought against state court judge, state court itself, county,  
18 district attorney, deputy district attorney, attorney, and Plaintiff's ex-wife). Despite the many  
19 federal cases Plaintiff has brought against state court actors, he has achieved success in none of  
20 them either from this Court or from the Ninth Circuit. Plaintiff apparently remains undeterred,  
21 however, filing another suit against a state court judge that Plaintiff cannot possibly win.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 

---

<sup>2</sup> This case had two plaintiffs, one of which was T. Matthew Phillips.

1 Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause in writing, no later than August 25,  
2 2025, why he should not be declared a vexatious litigant subject to a pre-filing order for any cases  
3 related to state court proceedings or brought against anyone affiliated with the state court system.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: August 11, 2025

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
10 United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28