

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

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 7th day of October, two thousand nineteen.

Yi Sun,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

Tsai Chung Chao, M.D., Naturo-Medical Health Care P.C., Hugh Hu Mo, Michael A. Sonkin, Martin Clearwater & Bell LLP, Charles L. Bardes, M.D. and Profess of Clinical Medicine, Weill Medical College, Carmen Victoria St. George, Anthony Ofodile, Det. Maddy Acevedo, Manhattan Special Victims Squad of New York Police Department, State of New York Department of Health Office of Professional Medical Conduct, Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, State of New York Commission on Judicial Conduct, Departmental Disciplinary Committee, Supreme Court, Appellate Division of the State of New York, First Judicial Department,

Defendants-Appellees.

ORDER

Docket No. 19-269

Appellant, pro se, moves for leave to file an amended motion for reconsideration or reconsideration en banc.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is DENIED as moot in light of this Court's October 4, 2019 order denying Appellant's motion for reconsideration or reconsideration en banc.

For the Court:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe,
Clerk of Court




United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 16th day of August, two thousand nineteen.

Present:

José A. Cabranes,
Debra Ann Livingston,
Raymond J. Lohier, Jr.,
Circuit Judges.

Yi Sun,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

19-269

Tsai Chung Chao, M.D., et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appellant, pro se, moves for various relief, including summary reversal and transfer of this case to another circuit, and Appellees move to dismiss for failure to file a brief and for sanctions. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motions are DENIED and the appeal is DISMISSED because it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *See Pillay v. INS*, 45 F.3d 14, 17 (2d Cir. 1995) (per curiam) (holding this Court has inherent authority to dismiss an appeal when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact).

Appellant has filed a number of frivolous motions in this Court, including 2d Cir. 19-269, docs. 77, 83, 118, 152, 160, 168, and 179. Accordingly, Appellant is hereby warned that the continued filing of duplicative, vexatious, or clearly meritless appeals, motions, or other papers could result in the imposition of a sanction that would require Appellant to obtain permission from this Court prior to filing any further submissions in this Court (a "leave-to-file" sanction). *See In re Martin-Trigona*, 9 F.3d 226, 229 (2d Cir. 1993); *Sassower v. Sansverie*, 885 F.2d 9, 11 (2d Cir. 1989).

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court


