

Appendix A

Court Orders


Supporting Jurisdiction

#s Labeled
Center right
margin

- 1 - U.S. Appeal Courts 3rd Cir.
- 2 - PA Supreme Court Decision
- 3 - U.S. Appeals 3rd Cir. Nov. 18th, 2019 order

***AMENDED BLD-046**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT**



No. 17-2515

RAMSEY RANDALL,
Appellant

v.

**FACEBOOK, INC., SUPERVISORY LIABILITY;
FOX NEWS AND ENTERTAINMENT, INC., SUPERVISORY LIABILITY;
GOOGLE, INC., CORPORATE ENTITY, SUPERVISORY LIABILITY;
READING EAGLE COMPANY, Supervisory Liability; DISTRICT ATTORNEY JOHN
ADAMS, ESQ. IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES; WEST
READING POLICE DEPARTMENT; JOSEPH M. BROWN, CRIMINAL
INVESTIGATOR, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES;
KARIE GOOD, Police Officer, IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES;
BERKS COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA (TOWNSHIP), IN ITS OFFICIAL/INDIVIDUAL
CAPACITY VIA MUNICIPAL LIABILITY**

Appx. A1

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 5-17-cv-01526)
District Judge: Honorable Joel H. Slomsky

Submitted for Possible Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) or
Summary Action Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
November 9, 2017

Before: **AMBRO, RESTREPO, and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges**

JUDGMENT

24

This cause came to be considered on the record from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was submitted for possible dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and for possible summary action pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6 on November 9, 2017. On consideration whereof, it is now hereby

ORDERED and ADJUDGED by this Court that the judgment of the District Court entered June 22, 2017, and the order entered August 2, 2017, denying reconsideration, be and the same are hereby affirmed. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

ATTEST:

s/Marcia M. Waldron
Clerk

DATED: November 30, 2017


Certified as a true copy and issued in lieu
of a formal mandate on 12/22/17

Teste: Marcia M. Waldron
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

Appx. A7.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT

RAMSEY RANDALL,

No. 191 MM 2018

Petitioner

v.

BERKS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON
PLEAS; JUDGE PATRICK BARRETT,

Respondents


ORDER

PER CURIAM

AND NOW, this 6th day of February, 2019, the Application for Leave to File Original Process and the Request to File Response are GRANTED, and the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Extraordinary Relief is DENIED. The Prothonotary is DIRECTED to strike the name of the jurist from the caption.

Appx. A2

A True Copy Elizabeth E. Zisk
As. Of 02/06/2019

Attest: 
Chief Clerk
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-2381

Randall v. Superintendent Mahanoy SCI

No. 19-2830

Randall v. Township of Berks County

To: Clerk

- 1) Appellant's Pro-Se Motion in No. 19-2830 for Reconsideration of Court's October 17, 2019, Order Denying In-Forma-Pauperis Status
- 2) Appellant's Pro-Se Motion in Nos. 18-2381 and 19-2830 to Consolidate Appeals
- 3) Appellant's Pro-Se "Memo" Regarding Nos. 18-2381 and 19-2830 Dated October 25, 2019
- 4) Appellant's Pro-Se Letter and "Memo" Regarding Nos. 18-2381 and 19-2830 Dated October 28, 2019

In No. 19-2830, an appeal from a civil-rights action, the appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis was denied on October 17, 2019. The Court's order gave the appellant fourteen days to prepay the required fees and warned him that the appeal would be dismissed if he did not do so. Instead of prepaying the required fees, the appellant filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's order. That motion will be submitted to the Court for whatever action it deems appropriate.

Separately, the appellant moved to consolidate No. 19-2830 with No. 18-2381, a habeas appeal in which the appellant is represented by counsel. The motion to consolidate is DENIED. If the fees for No. 19-2830 are prepaid and that appeal proceeds to briefing, the appellant may file a new motion asking to consolidate the appeals for disposition if that relief would be appropriate at that time.

Appx. # 43

The pro-se “memos” received from the appellant will be placed on this Court’s dockets, but no further action can be taken on them. To the extent they relate to No. 18-2381, the appellant is represented by counsel in that appeal and cannot file pro-se documents. See 3d Cir. L.A.R. 27.8, 31.3. The memos are referred to the appellant’s counsel in No. 18-2381 for any action counsel deems appropriate. To the extent the memos relate to No. 19-2830, if the fees for that appeal are paid, the appellant will be required to file a brief in support of his appeal. All of the appellant’s arguments about the merits of his appeal must be included in his brief. Arguments, information, and exhibits included in other filings—like these memos—may not be considered by the Court when it considers the appeal.

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit
Clerk

Dated: November 18, 2019
JK/cc: All Counsel of Record
Ramsey Randall

APPX. # A3