

No. _____

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

CHRIS JAYE,
Petitioner,

v.

OAK KNOLL VILLAGE, et. al.
Respondents.

MOTION FOR EMERGENT STAY
OF SECOND MANDATE AND SANCTION ORDER
FROM THIRD CIRCUIT

FOR REVIEW BY JUSTICE NEIL GORSUCH

Chris Jaye
Pro se
PO Box 5015
Clinton, NJ 08809
caj@okvnews.com

- NOT TO BE DECIDED BY THE CLERK -

To the Honorable US Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch:

I have just filed a SECOND petition in the same case (15-08324). The underlying case (US District Court of New Jersey) was never final but here we are. As the actual record proves, the lies by Judge Michael Shipp were never corrected by the Third Circuit judges, but furthered by illegal affirmations by a court *without jurisdiction*. (This routine is not new.)

Based on facts and law, it was my full expectation that the judges of Third Circuit would remand the case and direct it to proceed. But Judge Michael Shipp's obvious fraud combined with the lack of compliance with controlling law itself was not addressed at all. Instead, Judge Michael Shipp played the role of a typical New Jersey lawyer-turned-judge and acted to aid his fellow lawyer friends to further the crimes, fraud and embezzlement of thieves. The same routine of theft in the New Jersey courts has found a home in the federal courts.

As the records in this court will prove, the first petition for certiorari (with the mandate to provide a supplemental appendix) was filed in January 2019. It was denied on October 7, 2019 (docketed as **US Supreme Court No. 18-1374**.) I then filed a petition for a rehearing (at additional expense) noting significant substantial and procedures rights being impaired yet again by the same federal judges. It was, as usual, denied. Not without notice, the filing fee check was not cashed until the day the petition was denied. I question whether or not the petition was even circulated by court staff.

Considering the denial of the my petition for rehearing followed the improper return of a motion sent you to (attached to this letter) that was received by the US Supreme Court on September 30, 2019, I know not what the Justice of the US Supreme Court are seeing or considering. It appears

the Clerk thinks he has the right to play the role of bouncer as it pertains to court filings. I put nothing past anyone in the Judicial Branch to do anything to rig the outcome of a case — including, but not limited to, censorship.

As it stands, I have no idea if you are receiving or reviewing anything being sent into court or if the Clerk (and its staff) is playing some role in selecting which cases, applications, motions, etc. are seen. Thus I have attached what was improperly rejected to be considered by you (for a second time) to be considered now due to the fact that there is now a second petition in play.

You may consider my suspicion outlandish, but be mindful that numerous federal judges have lied in their rulings and used illegal tactics to illegally dismiss, close or preclude my cases and claims for years. A first-grader would be able to under the pleading requirement of Rule 8. A high school education would understand *Erickson v. Pardus*. A first-year law student would understand the fact that a separate cause of action does not bar right to relief by *Rooker-Feldman*. But federal judges repeatedly fail to understand that which is their duty to provide — which repeatedly results in the deprivation of access to a court of law and all relief.

The truth is that there is a hateful bias in play against pro se litigants. The lies, case-rigging, censorship, sanctions and costly piecemeal litigation are all tactics of oppression and discrimination in play by those with too much power *and no accountability* (judges). It is high time this Court hold all those responsible for these costly games they are playing with the people. The title "judge" and judicial immunity be damned. A lie is a lie is a lie. And all liars needs to be held responsible for their lies — especially judges who have the power to destroy and ruin lives with their lies.


Chris Ann Jaye

No. _____

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

CHRIS JAYE,
Petitioner,

v.

OAK KNOLL VILLAGE, et. al.
Respondents.

**MOTION FOR EMERGENT STAY
OF SECOND MANDATE AND SANCTION ORDER
FROM THIRD CIRCUIT**

FOR REVIEW BY JUSTICE NEIL GORSUCH

Chris Jaye
Pro se
PO Box 5015
Clinton, NJ 08809
caj@okvnews.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	1-7
<p>Five Year Pattern of Illegality and Discrimination Against <i>Pro se</i> Litigant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Erickson v. Pardus</i> and R. 8 Violated • Illegal Pleading Standard Instituted • Illegal Screening Process Instituted • Illegal Preclusion (<i>Rooker-Feldman</i>) • Illegal Dismissals with Prejudice 		
<p>List of US Supreme Court Petitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven in Total (since 2015) • Two Rejected, Returned and Not Docketed 	7-8
<p>Present and Pending Petition with US Supreme Court 18-1374</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of US Supreme Court Application • Six in Total (not docketed) 	8
<p>List of US District Court of New Jersey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illegal Dismissals • Untimely Appeals • Circuit Court Lacked Jurisdiction • State Claims Held Hostage • 100% Denial of All Relief and Remedies • 100% Denial of Stays of State Action • 100% Avoidance of Challenges to State Statutes • 100% Violation of Federal Rules of Court 	8-9
Reasons for Emergent Stay	9-11
Relief from Lawless Federal Officers (Federal Judges) Cannot Be Obtained	11-13
Conclusion	14-15
Third Circuit Second Judgment from Second Appeal Third Circuit Sanction/Censor Order	Attached

- **NOT TO BE DECIDED BY THE CLERK** -

To the Honorable US Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch:

I have a petition for certiorari with supplemental appendix pending in this court now. It is docketed as **US Supreme Court No. 18-1374**. Since the judgment/mandate was entered by the Third Circuit (which was not final), I have been forced to incur the cost not only this petition to the US Supreme Court but deal with a second appeal per the same case.

- US District Court of New Jersey, 15-08324.
- US Court of Appeals, Third Circuit: #1 Appeal: 17-2564.
- US Court of Appeals, Third Circuit: #2 Appeal: 18-2187.

There have been two appeals in one case with two separate mandates. The pattern of illegality taking place is endless in these courts. And the cost to me to deal with these games is a cost that no citizen should have to bear.

BACKGROUND

There has been a five year pattern of illegality taken place by federal judges in the US District Court of New Jersey and US Court of Appeals, Third Circuit (as well as the Judicial Council of the Third Circuit). As a result, there has been a 100% dismissal of all my claims by illegal tricks and tactics used by federal officers (federal judges). The goal has been to block, bar and prevent my access to the court. And it has now gone even further in that I have been censored and sanctioned by the circuit judges for filing a suit against state actors and lawyers. Federal judges are violating my First Amendment rights and barring me from a court of law (without due process) by and through this illegal order and censorship of my filings.

Upon judicial review of my five federal cases, multiple appeals and multiple petitions to the US Supreme Court, you will find that there is an illegal practice in play whereby federal judges use illegal tactics to bar suits of *pro se* litigants. The conduct is illegal and **it is criminal**.

Upon judicial review, you will note that I filed my first federal suit in 2014. Since my first filing against state actors (judges), the conduct of the federal judges has been discriminatory, hostile, harassing and illegal. Every directive of the US Supreme Court, every court rule and every federal law has been violated by federal judges in every case.

The pattern in play (which departs from the US Supreme Court's clear directives) has been to illegally screen *pro se* cases (of non-prisoners) by unauthorized tactics. As an initial tactic used to kill cases, federal judges illegally preclude claims via *Rooker-Feldman* to prevent access to the court of *pro se* suits. (You will also find that federal judges routinely presume the validity of state judgments: a finding that **cannot be presumed** when the validity of a state judgment is challenged by the pleadings, pleading which are required to be taken as factual per this Court's directive.)

If that fails to work as the illegal tactic to rid a *pro se* litigant from the court, then the *Twombly* standard is used wherein the district and circuit judges assert facts were not sufficiently pled. To this day, *Erickson v. Pardus* has never been applied yet nor has any federal judge even attempted to glean anything from any of my factual complaints as directed be done by the US Supreme Court time and time again. In fact, the facts in my complaint were repeatedly revised by federal judges in direct violation of US Supreme Court's directives in order to dismiss my claims.

If the pleading standard fails to suffice, then they claim dismissals with prejudice when supplemental jurisdiction over state claims is claimed lost. But then, the federal judges do not

transfer the state claims to be heard in a state court. And when this tactics fail to suffice, federal judges (Judge Kugler) use an Order to Show Cause routine to dismiss defendants (state and federal actors) or simply gift immunity (without summary judgment) to anyone who is employed by any government.

Add to that, state claims are either dismissed illegally or just never adjudicated by state law, even at the circuit level. In 16-2641, the *Erie Doctrine* was deliberately abused as the tool by which to affirm dismissal of state claims by federal common law (which cannot be done).

As to any consideration of any new Bivens claim as per federal officers, no such consideration is applied. In fact, Judge Peter Sheridan was illegally represented by the US Attorney General's Office in violation of federal law which resulted in his dismissal without him even ever appearing. (16-07771) R. 55 fell to the wayside as to an entry of default against him.

Worse yet, the circuit judges have asserted *de novo* review of a ruling of moot to illegally gift immunity to any and all state actors at the appellate level – even when no ruling of immunity was ever granted at the district level. Not only did circuit judges illegally seize control over non-final rulings and refuse to remand the cases (while holding hostage state claims), they violate the standard of review this Court has set to be applied to correct such illegality by district judges.

De novo review could never be applied as law by the appellate court judges since immunity is a doctrine, not law. But *de novo* review (16-2641) to apply immunity at the circuit level was applied. This tactic (used to pull a fast one on a *pro se* litigant) prevented any appeal of the illegal mandate of affirmation of a non-final judgment. And as a bonus, it made an interlocutory order of the district court be transformed into one barred by *res judicata* – at the appellate level!

At every stage and by every illegal tactic and trick, federal judges are violating federal law, federal rules of court, US Supreme Court directives (including long established directives on liberal pleading standards) to implement an illegal screening mechanism and *ad hoc* rulings to prevent, bar and block valid suits brought to the federal court by citizens of the United States.

Since all their illegal tactics have failed to silence me and prevent me from being ruined (as was the plan of all federal judges involved who have conspired with state actors in this illegal scheme), I have been sanctioned. I have been sanctioned – and cannot access the court until I pay monies for these sanctions.

Retaliation by Federal Judges: Because I would not give up, I was sanctioned. Because I called out lawyers and judges, I was sanctioned. Because I highlighted the corrupt conduct of state judges and those in the legal profession, I was sanctioned. And because I dared to do what federal judges, the NJ Attorney General, the United State Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation will not do in terms of getting to the bottom of this statewide RICO enterprise involving the theft of private property by void judicial decrees, I have been attacked, barred, sanctioned, fined and censored by federal judges.

Federal judges do not want *pro se* litigants in their own federal courts. This is how they block us. Federal judges do not want judges held to account. This is how they prevent it.

The censorship/sanction order is just the latest proof of the obstruction of justice in play by federal judges. This is how far **these criminals who call themselves federal judge:** will go to protect this scheme involving state judges in the State of New Jersey – which may involve kickbacks to federal judges as well.

Although I have standing and valid claims, I am without a court because of federal judges. And it is due to the illegal acts of federal officers (federal judges) that I have been illegally sanctioned. It is due to the advocacy of federal judges to protect their own that I have been barred from filing anything. It is because I dared to petition my own government (First Amendment), enjoy my civil rights (42 USC 1983-1988), express myself as to the corruption and criminal conduct of state judges, state actors and state lawyers (First Amendment) that I am being silenced. I am being punished, blocked and barred – and am being censored (yet again). And this is – simply put – obstruction of justice.

Discrimination and Advocacy by Federal Judges: The pattern and practice of the federal government (via federal judges) of bias against *pro se* litigants is beyond obvious with just the slightest review of fast-tracked dismissals. We, *pro se* litigants, are treated as second-class citizens and abused until we go away. There is sufficient case law to prove this to be true.

More disturbingly, there is advocacy on the part of judges to aid other judges. Upon review of my cases, you will see it is an established practice and policy for no state actor to ever need to hire their own attorneys (or suffer any financial loss) for claims against them sued as individuals. The schemers (federal judges and state actors) have arranged that dismissals will come for state actors: one way or the other. Whether they appear or not (in any capacity or not at all), they will be dismissed. My cases (amongst many others) are proof that this is happening.

Deliberate Deprivation of Access to Pursue Claims: After five years of this illegal routine in play, it is not coincidental that two cases that were not final ended up being seized by the US Court of Appeals, Third Circuit: seized and then killed with finality. It is not coincidental that non-final judgments declaring a loss of supplemental jurisdiction have never been remanded to the state courts. It is not coincidental that Judge Michael Shipp and Judge Robert Kugler gifted

immunity to all (including judicial immunity to a county clerk) to kill off complaints without summary judgments; including for those who never appeared at all. And it is not coincidental that circuit judges used *de novo* review illegally to apply immunity (16-2641): ensuing no appeal from this ruling could be had.

Everything is designed to protect government workers (state and federal). Free them from litigation. Free them from liability. Everything is designed and implemented to ensure that no government actor (state or federal) ever even needs to mount a defense – especially against a *pro se* litigant. And this is why I have never been able to pursue a single claim yet.

The racket, scheme and illegality that is in play with the force of color of law backing it ensures (guarantees) that no *pro se* litigant can enjoy their federal or state rights in a federal court. By the illegal acts of federal judges, *pro se* litigants seeking to pursue remedies in the law and enjoy their rights are blocked by every trick and tactic under the sun. As a result, a citizen's civil rights (First Amendment) are thwarted– and by the very people hired to uphold them, **federal judges**.

Circling the Wagons: Federal judges clearly think they can pull any trick on a citizen to bar them from court and get away with it by the benevolence of other judges or attorneys in the US Department of Justice. This is proven because the Judicial Council of the Third Circuit has established that it will not investigate their own – and it too has barred me (illegally) from filing any additional judicial complaints.

Upon review, you will see that every judge bars me from filing documents (or fails to docket documents) whenever I get too close to revealing the crimes of judges. It is arranged this way. And this is obstruction of justice – which no federal employee will address.

As it stands per the orders now at issue, the sanction order and second mandate (utterly illegal) are just the latest orders in an ongoing scheme. And they need to be stayed. Skilled lawyers who know exactly how to work the system against the citizen under the pretense of being judges: but all of this violates the Constitution which these federal judges have all sworn to uphold.

LIST OF US SUPREME COURT PETITIONS

1. **15-753:** Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (denied)
Contract Clause, 14th Amendment, Due Process Violations by State of New Jersey
NJ Supreme Court
2. **16-451:** Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (denied) (15-08324)
Interlocutory: FRCP Violations by US District Court
Third Circuit Denied Appeal
3. **17-738:** Jaye v. NJ AG Hoffman, et. al. (denied) (14-07471)
Petition: Third Circuit Judgment (on Non-Final Order)
Third Circuit (16-2641)
4. **17-739:** Jaye v. NJ AG Hoffman, et. al. (denied) (14-07471)
Petition for Mandamus: Seeking Mandate to Make Federal Judges Follow Law
5. Not Docketed (**Returned by Clerk**): Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (15-08324)
Prejudgment Petition for Certiori (40 Booklets)
6. Not Docketed (**Returned by Clerk**): Jaye v. NJ AG Hoffman (16-07771)
Petition Regarding Denial of Injunction on Unconstitutional Prejudgment State Liens
Third Circuit Denied Appeal: 17-2231
Motion to Judge Gorsuch Not Decided: Everything Returned.
7. **18-1374: *****PENDING NOW*****:** Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (15-08324)
Petition: Third Circuit Judgment (17-2564)

Plus: ILLEGAL SECOND APPEAL: Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (15-08324)
Third Circuit: Docket 18-2187
Judgement Entered – Seeking Extension to File Petition or Have Supplemented with 18-1374

Cost to Citizen v. Government Employee: The words judicial economy are as foreign to the federal judges of the US District of New Jersey and US Court of Appeals, Third Circuit as are the US Supreme Court's directives on piecemeal litigation, finality and the liberal pleading standard. The cost to a citizen in dealing with criminals parading about as federal judges is great, but it is of no cost and ZERO CONSEQUENCE to the federal judges to play these games. None have been investigated, disciplined or referred for impeachment for their illegal conduct.

PRESENT APPLICATIONS TO US SUPREME COURT per 18-1374
(NOT DOCKETED BY CLERK HARRIS TO THIS DAY)

- January 17, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito
- January 17, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito
- January 25, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito
- February 22, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito
- June 6, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito
- August 15, 2019 – Application to US Justice Alito

NOTE: Clerk Harris has received all of these by tracked mail. They have all been received by the US Supreme Court. I am clearly being censored by the government employees of the United States' Judicial Branch again. None have been docketed to this day. Several address the issue of the two appeals in the matter of 15-08324: Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village (petition #7).

LIST of US DISTRICT COURT OF NEW JERSEY

1. 07471-14: Jaye v. NJ AG Hoffman
(non-final, forced into appeal, state claims not transferred/ adjudicated)
2. 15-08324: Jaye v. Oak Knoll Village, et. al. (non-final, forced into appeal.)*
**US Supreme petition pending now. 18-1374. Separate second judgment exists.*
3. 15-5303: Oak Knoll Village v. Jaye
(Removal action. Denied. No appeal could be taken.)

4. 16-07771: Jaye v. NJ AG Hoffman, et. al.
(non-final, summons not provided, lingering in limbo, illegally closed)

5. 17-05257: Jaye v. US District Court Michael Shipp, et. al.
(non-final, summons not provided, lingering in limbo)

NOTE: Not one claim survived the pleading stage in any of these cases. Not one case was remanded to district court. Not one claim was transferred to a state court. Killed at every stage by every federal judge.

REASONS for EMERGENT STAY of BOTH ORDERS

1. The sanction order is illegal. Access to the court to petition for a rehearing or hearing *en banc* cannot require payment of sanctions first. This illegal order was issued *sua sponte*, absent any lawful right and without any right to even file a motion for reconsideration. It is unlawful and void. And it should be stayed until the US Supreme Court, at the least, gives me the opportunity to have the first judgment (18-1374) heard by this Court.

2. The right to a rehearing and hearing *en banc* is a court rule authorized by Congress. It is, therefore, a right. The Third Circuit cannot bar me from rights by the rules by this order nor can it censor my filings as it continues to do. (A timely petition for a rehearing and hearing *en banc* was served and received. It was just not docketed as per the sanction order.)

3. The pending petition (18-1374) will likely be heard due to the incredible departures from normal procedure. If heard, the US Supreme Court will dictate what comes of the illegal second judgment by the Third Circuit in the same underlying case as well as the sanction order that applies.

4. The federal judges of the Third Circuit had no jurisdiction over the first or second appeal.

According, the orders stemming from the second appeal are void as a matter of law and should be treated as such (as should that resulting in the petition to this court now pending, 18-1374).

5. My applications to Justice Samuel Alito have not been heard because **they have not been docketed.** They need to be heard since an evidentiary hearing as to the Third Circuit's finding that I lacked evidentiary proof as per calling state judges "thieves" as a basis for barring me from ECF and ordering sanctions against me is warranted. Due process and equal protection affords me the right to have an evidentiary hearing to provide the Third Circuit with the evidentiary proof it needs that the state judges, state actors and state lawyers are "thieves" as I have stated.

6. Judicial economy dictates there be no piecemeal litigation. The Third Circuit (along with the US District Court of New Jersey) have done nothing but cause additional litigation, including, but not limited to, splitting appeals as they have done. Worse yet, they did not provide rulings on all matters appealed, remanded no non-final orders and transferred no state claims which were dismissed for loss of supplemental jurisdiction. It is impossible for a citizen to know what ruling is the judgment (to petitioned as final) when there are judgments all over the place: all which fail to conform to federal law as to finality, the FRCP or FRAP.

7. Federal judges have acted as advocates and not judges. The result is the illegality in these orders which are intended to do nothing but silence me and prevent me from petitioning my government which is a FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT.

8. The Third Circuit did not address any of the failures of the district court judges as it pertains to executing federal statutes. No constitutional challenges to state statutes have been adjudicated. No stays of state action have been given. Every right to every remedy has been

barred and blocked. My rights via the 14th Amendment remain violated as a result of the illegal actions by federal officers (federal judges) who have refused to provide me with the equal protection of the law by and through these orders. THEY HAVE NOT DONE THEIR JOBS.

**ANY RELIEF FROM LAWLESS FEDERAL OFFICES
(FEDERAL JUDGES) CANNOT BE OBTAINED**

I can request no stay from the Third Circuit without paying for the sanctions. They have refused to allow me to file anything until I pay these sanctions. As per my First Amendment rights, I will not pay for sanctions for speaking my mind. Federal judges have no right to force me to pay sanctions in order to file documents with a court, especially documents which deal with the illegality of the orders itself.

I will not pay these sanctions. No judge has a right to force me to pay money as a punishment for speaking out against my corrupt state government and courts.

I have every right to call state actors (especially state judges) “scum” and “thieves” as they have played a direct, central role in stealing my property, depriving me of clean title, denying me due process and denying me equal protection under the law in one case after the next **since 2008**. I will not retract these statements nor apologize for them. I do not have to do so. And there is no “safe space” for offended federal judges.

I have suffered **hundreds of thousands of dollars in loss** and years of deprivation by void judgments and illegal, unconstitutional prejudgment liens by state actors. (See US Supreme Court 15-753, cert denied.) In reverse, every claim brought against the perpetrators has been illegally dismissed (with no right to amend). The words “scum” and “thieves” are appropriate as

it applies to state actors (judges). I have had no trials: an inviolate right by the NJ Constitution. There has been no evidence entered in any case. I have been denied the right to all defenses. I have been deprived the right to cross-examine the alleged "Plaintiffs." The judges simply rule against me. 100%. And then they enter judgments to allow the extortion of my money by private parties via public judgments. It is theft by judicial decree. And the state judges are thieves.

State judges (aiding lawyers in a statewide scheme) are stealing people's property by illegal court proceedings and void judicial decrees. Their rulings are void. And they cannot stand as a matter of law.

The federal courts (including this Court) was supposed to address this. They did not. Instead, I have been SANCTIONED me for being a victim of a criminal scheme. If not for federal judges seeking to shield the crimes of their colleagues, the actions of state actors and lawyers in the state court would have been stayed as a matter of law as is my right as a person who filed a civil rights suit. But instead, federal judges have done nothing.

For five years, they have done nothing to uphold my rights. Thus to seek relief from them now would be futile. Moreover, any attempts at relief sought would only be permitted if I paid these sanctions. And I will not pay these sanctions. And due to the *ad hoc* law in play, God knows what they would demand if I actually complied. I will not fall into their illegal trap yet again.

It is due to the illegal advocacy on the part of federal judges (many with ties to NJ Chief Justice Stuart Rabner and his cronies involved in this RICO enterprise) that I have had to incur the cost, loss and deprivation of rights in the state courts. Piecemeal litigation could have been prevented. Removal and supplemental jurisdiction could have been granted. Stays could have been issued.

And if any of this was done (execution of federal statutes as required by federal officers), I would not have lost 12 years of my life and hundreds of thousands of dollars in a scheme to enrich lawyers in the State of New Jersey. And I would not now be facing the illegal theft of my inheritance and another illegal foreclosure. All of this could have been prevented by federal judges. It was not. So seeking relief from them now would be a joke. And a total waste. These federal judges are not judges: they are criminals.

To seek any stays from such criminals parading about as federal judges would be futile. They have shown their colors, their advocacies and their illegality. Their latest sanction/censorship order is proof that they will continue to play a role in seeing me **financially ruined**: a plan that was put in motion since my first filing in the federal court in 2014.

In fact, the purpose of the sanction order is to fast-track my financial ruin and delay proceedings (such as a remand of the case itself) so that their state actor buddies can continue to steal from me without impairment in the state action they all refuse to stay. I am being attacked on every front – and have no court where remedies exist.

Worse yet, federal judges (aided in part by the US Department of Justice) have failed in their duty to prevent this known conspiracy to violate civil rights. Considering they think they are out of reach of the law, this court – THE US SUPREME COURT – needs to act.

The questions remain:

Will this reach you, US Supreme Court Justice Gorsuch?

Or will Clerk Harris return it so that it is never seen?

CONCLUSION

The US Supreme Court needs to stay these orders. If anything, it needs to stay both orders until such time that I can supplement 18-1374. A second “mandate” is unprecedented as was the second appeal and the seizure of non-final orders by the Third Circuit judges in the first place.

If the Judicial Council of the Third Circuit executed federal statutes according to the directives of Congress, many of these federal judges would have been under investigation for their unfit, corrupt conduct. If this had happened, these federal judges would have been less inclined to take the bold, illegal steps they have taken to silence me, punish me, sanction me and harm me as they have done. There is a reason Congress makes law... although federal judges routinely ignore them as they see fit.

Since no one hold federal judges accountable by other federal officers and they operate on the presumption that this Court will never hear any of my petitions (possibly because clerks deny them without any justice reviewing my petitions), this Court needs to act.


In light of the fact that most *pro se* litigants would not be as inclined to study the law, challenge the lies, file appeals, and petition the US Supreme Court as many times as I have, I fear for the rights of other *pro se* litigants with less resources and time. This Court should fear for their rights as well. The travesty of justice is too great, the discriminatory too real, the harm too severe and the inequity too obvious for this Court to turn a blind eye to it.

It is beyond evident that the US Supreme Court’s directives are being ignored by federal judges. They need to be held to account. When they decide to pull fast ones and depart from this Court’s directive, they should be forced to answer for their action. **No one is above the law.**

If something as basic as the *Rooker-Feldman* Doctrine or *Erickson v. Pardus* is too challenging for a federal judge to understand, he or she should not preside over federal cases. They are not competent if they cannot understand the law! And if such departures are being done to rig the outcome of case (as has been the case in my case), these federal judges cannot serve the people. If this means referrals for their impeachment and removal, so be it. If it means they are charged with crimes for aiding in a criminal scheme, so be it. The integrity of the courts and rights of the citizens far surpass the egos, political desires, friendship and financial gains of unelected rogue, lawless lawyers in black robes.

As to this illegal sanction order, I will not pay it. I spoke my mind and will continue to do so. I cannot be fined for doing so. New Jersey state judges are thieves. Chief Justice Rabner runs a judicial system designed to enrich lawyers through void judicial decrees. The state courts are corrupt to the core as are its judges. If given a court (or even an evidentiary hearing), I will prove this to be a fact. All these "honorable judges" in the US District Court of New Jersey and Third Circuit need do is give me a day in court and I will prove my case!

As to sanctioning, the federal judges should be. It should be the federal judges who acted outside the rule of law, violated my rights and caused all this chaos and unnecessary expense to me as well as the taxpaying public. This lawless conduct is not judicial, not expected of a neutral judge and should not be shielded by any claims of immunity for any reason.



Chris Ann Jaye
Pro se, Petitioner

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-2187

CHRIS ANN JAYE,
Appellant

v.

OAK KNOLL VILLAGE CONDOMINIUM OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.; ERICK P. SPRONCK; ROBERT A. STEPHENSON; DENNIS LEFFLER; KELLY JONES; JENNIFER COOLING; KONSTANTINOS RENTOULIS; THE ESTATE OF JOSEPH COUSINS f/k/a JOSEPH COUSINS (deceased); MARILYN COUSINS; LES GIESE; ANNE THORNTON; MAINTENANCE SOLUTIONS, INC., its agents and assigns; CONDO MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE CORPORATION, its agents and assigns; RCP MANAGEMENT; ACCESS PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, its agents and assigns; FOX CHASE CONTRACTING, LLC, its agents and assigns; TRACY BLAIR; BERMAN, SAUTER, RECORD & JACOBS, PC, its agents and assigns f/k/a BERMAN, SAUTER, RECORD & JACOBS; KENNETH SAUTER, ESQ. and CPA; EDWARD A. BERMAN, ESQ.; STEVEN ROWLAND, ESQ.; BROWN, MOSKOWITZ & KALLEN, PC., its agents and assigns; HILL WALLACK, its agents and assigns; MARSHALL, DENNEHY, WARNER, COLEMAN & GOGGIN, its agents and assigns; SUBURBAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS, its agents and assigns; SCHNECK, PRICE, SMITH & KING, LLP, its agents and assigns; THE LAW OFFICES OF ANN M. MCGUFFIN, its agents and assigns; WILLIAMS TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPELINE, its agents and assigns; CLINTON TOWNSHIP SEWERAGE AUTHORITY, its agents and assigns; PUMPING SERVICES, INC., its agents and assigns; J. FLETCHER-CREAMER & SONS, its agents and assigns; STRATHMORE INSURANCE, its agents and assigns; QBE INSURANCE CORPORATION, its agents and assigns; COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION UNDERWRITERS OF AMERICA, INC., its agents and assigns; MIRRA & ASSOCIATES, LLC, its agents and assigns; JOHN DOES 1-20 (Fictitious Names); STEPHENSON ASSOCIATES, INC.; HENKELS AND MCCOY, INC., its agents and assigns; FREY ENGINEERING; GNY INSURANCE COMPANIES, its agents and assigns

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of New Jersey

(D.C. Civil Action No. 1:15-cv-08324)
District Judge: Honorable Robert B. Kugler

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)
July 19, 2019
Before: KRAUSE, SCIRICA and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

JUDGMENT

This cause came to be considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey and was submitted pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a) on July 19, 2019. On consideration whereof, it is now hereby

ORDERED and ADJUDGED by this Court that the judgment of the District Court entered May 18, 2018, be and the same is hereby affirmed. Costs taxed against the appellant. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

ATTEST:

s/Patrcia S. Dodszuweit
Clerk

Dated: August 1, 2019

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

C.A. No. **18-2187**

CHRIS ANN JAYE, Appellant

VS.

OAK KNOLL VILLAGE CONDOMINIUM OWNERS ASSOCIATION INC, ET AL.

(D.N.J. Civ. No. 1:15-cv-08324)

Present: KRAUSE, SCIRICA and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the Appellees' motions for sanctions and motion to preclude Appellant Chris Ann Jaye from filing further documents in this appeal, and Jaye's responses thereto, the Appellees' motions are granted.

Jaye has filed in state and federal court numerous complaints and appeals, all of which pertain to a dispute between her and her condominium association regarding unpaid assessments and fees. Because of her repetitive and frivolous filings in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, that court has (1) directed that the defendants need not respond to Jaye's motions unless ordered to do so, see Jaye v. Hoffman, D.N.J. Civ. No. 1:14-cv-07471 (order entered May 18, 2018); Jaye v. Hoffman, D.N.J. Civ. No. 1:16-cv-07771 (order entered Apr. 9, 2018); (2) warned Jaye that "false statements and reckless accusations of misconduct against Defendants in the face of clear evidence to the contrary are potential grounds for sanctions against Plaintiff," Jaye v. Oak Knoll Vill. Condo. Owners Ass'n, Civ. No. 1:15-cv-08324, 2016 WL 7013468, at *6 n.11 (D.N.J. Nov. 30, 2016); and (3) prohibited Jaye, when proceeding pro se, from filing lawsuits "relating to disputes concerning the payment of her condominium fees, or foreclosure proceedings, or any perceived conspiracies emanating out of them," Jaye v. Shipp, D.N.J. Civ. No. 1:17-cv-05257 (order entered May 18, 2018).

We, too, have warned Jaye that duplicative or frivolous motions may result in sanctions. See Jaye v. Att'y Gen. New Jersey, C.A. No. 16-2641 (order entered Sept. 22, 2016); Jaye v. Oak Knoll Vill. Condo. Assoc., C.A. No. 18-2187 (order entered Aug. 2, 2018); Jaye v. Oak Knoll Vill. Condo. Assoc., C.A. No. 17-2564, 751 F. App'x 293, 300 (Sept. 13, 2018). In the case at bar, C.A. No. 18-2187, we advised Jaye that if "she continues to make disparaging remarks against opposing parties, counsel, or judges or allegations of criminal behavior or other wrongdoing by persons involved in the litigation that are not

Jaye v. Oak Knoll Condominium Owners Association, et al.

C.A. No. 18-2187

Page 2

supported by clear evidence, she will be subject to sanctions, including monetary fines.” (order entered Aug. 2, 2018).

Despite that warning, Jaye has continued her baseless attacks against opposing counsel, accusing him of criminal conduct, using profanity to make her points, and threatening him by referencing his children by name. For instance, in an email sent to opposing counsel after he moved for sanctions, Jaye calls him a “complete and total illegal, criminal ass,” a “shyster,” and a “piece of shit, scumbag lawyer.” She also accuses him of “pull[ing] this shit in the prior case,” of using “teeny-bopper tactics,” and of “trying to hide your illegal and criminal acts behind these monstrous filings whereby you cry and bemoan my conduct as a basis for relief in the law.” Jaye further states that “if there is any justice, the world will come crashing down on YOU ...” and she “hopes [that his children, who Jaye names] are in the prime of their life to see you dragged out in handcuffs when it does!” Notice of Mot. (filed Nov. 27, 2018). Moreover, in a submission opposing the appellees’ motion for sanctions, Jay accuses opposing counsel of “illegal conduct,” calling him, inter alia, a “thief,” “embezzler,” “extortionist,” “shyster,” and “conman.” Opp’n, p. 2 (filed on Dec. 7, 2018). Jaye also claims that he “committed perjury and obstructed justice.” *Id.* at 5. Jaye further claims that he is a “liar and a perjurer” who “uses his law license to steal.” Mot. to Suspend or Disbar, p. 3, 8 (filed on Dec. 7, 2018); see also Letter Br., p. 4 (filed on Jan. 16, 2019). But she offers no specific evidence in support of those allegations, which appear baseless, vindictive, and abusive.

Jaye also has sustained her attacks on state and federal judges and clerks. For example, in the motion that she filed on November 16, 2018, Jaye complained of “the obvious fraud by yet another judge (Judge Kugler).” In that motion, Jaye further claimed that “the court and its staff have rigged the filings in order to rig the outcomes.” Moreover, Jaye has alleged that “judges and clerks alike have ensured my rights have been violated ... [a]nd they have proceeded on this time-wasting venture of fraud, lies and deception to rig the outcome as advocates for the defendants.” Letter Br., p. 3 (filed on Jan. 16, 2019). More recently, Jaye stated that judges of this Court “sit back on your useless, corrupt asses and refuse to rule to undo any of the illegal acts you have done ...” Letter, p. 2 (filed on May 22, 2019). She also personally attacks District Court judges, calling Judge Shipp an “idiot” and “filth,” and Judge Kugler “scum.” *Id.* at p. 3.

Based on Jaye’s failure to adhere to our prior admonitions, and her continued, unwarranted attacks on opposing counsel, judges, and court staff, we impose on Jaye a monetary fine of \$1000, payable immediately. See Coghlan v. Starkey, 852 F.2d 806,

Jaye v. Oak Knoll Condominium Owners Association, et al.

C.A. No. 18-2187

Page 3

808, 817 (5th Cir. 1988) (noting that courts of appeals have authority to impose sanctions). The Clerk is instructed to not accept any further filings from Jaye until the fine is paid in full. After the fine is fully paid, Jaye may file only one petition for rehearing in this appeal. We also direct the Clerk not to accept for filing in this case any other documents from her. See In re Oliver, 682 F.2d 443, 445 (3d Cir. 1982) (recognizing power to issue orders to restrict the filing of meritless pleadings under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)). Finally, given the abusive and frivolous nature of Jaye's submissions, the appellees need not file any responsive documents in any future appeal filed by Jaye unless specifically directed to do so by the Court.

By the Court,

s/ Richard L. Nygaard
Circuit Judge

Dated: August 1, 2019
CLW/cc: Ms. Chis Ann Jaye
All Counsel of Record