

Not Intended for Print Publication

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ABINGDON DIVISION**

VASU D. ARORA, M.D,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 1:05CV00034
)	
v.)	OPINION
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	By: James P. Jones
ET AL.,)	Chief United States District Judge
)	
Defendants.)	

Vasu D. Arora, Pro Se; Julie C. Dudley, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Defendants.

The plaintiff, a frequent pro se litigator in this and other courts,¹ pleaded guilty in this court to various health care crimes in 1999 and was sentenced to thirty-seven months imprisonment. In this case, filed April 21, 2005, he seeks to sue the current and past United States Attorneys, as well as the assistant United States Attorneys who were involved in the prosecution of his case, claiming that they violated his

¹ See, e.g., *Arora v. United States*, 144 Fed. Appx. 627 (9th Cir. 2005) (unpublished); *Arora v. Inderneel*, 132 Fed. Appx. 445 (4th Cir. 2005) (unpublished); *United States v. Arora*, 77 Fed. Appx. 646 (4th Cir. 2003) (unpublished), *cert. denied*, 125 S. Ct. 192 (2004); *In re Arora*, 63 Fed. Appx. 657 (4th Cir. 2003) (unpublished); *United States v. Arora*, 43 Fed. Appx. 598 (4th Cir. 2002) (unpublished); *Aurora v. Edwards*, No. 7:05CV00188 (W.D. Va. Oct. 13, 2005); *Arora v. Alemparte*, No. 1:03CV00020, 2003 WL 214448877 (W.D. Va. June 23, 2003).

constitutional rights in the course of the prosecution. The defendants have moved to dismiss on the grounds of immunity and the statute of limitations, among other things. The plaintiff has responded to the motion and it is ripe for decision.

For the reasons stated by the defendants in their briefs, I find that the Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss should be granted.

By orders entered November 24, 2004, Arora was enjoined from filing any further suits or actions in this court pro se without the prior written permission of the court. *Arora v. Inderneel*, No. 1:04CV00030; *Arora v. Hyder*, No. 1:04CV00031; *Arora v. Matin*, No. 1:04CV00032; *Arora v. Fasih*, No. 1:04CV00033; *Arora v. Husain*, No. 1:04CV00034; *Arora v. Alemparte*, No. 1:04CV00035; *Arora v. Tabassum*, No. 1:04CV00036. The record of the present case does not indicate that Arora obtained any such permission. The plaintiff is advised that violation of this injunction may result in his prosecution for criminal contempt of the court's orders.

A separate order of dismissal will be entered herewith.

DATED: November 4, 2005

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Chief United States District Judge