

Appen-A

FILED: May 16, 2022

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1009
(8:21-cv-03055-GJH)

SUSHILA GAUR

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

ATTORNEY JAMES MILLIKAN, Office of Public Defender; OFFICE OF
PUBLIC DEFENDER; OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Defendants - Appellees

ORDER

The court denies the petition for rehearing.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Harris, Judge Quattlebaum, and
Judge Heytens.

For the Court

Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
POLICE OFFICE
2022 MAY 19 PM 3:53

624/499

HM-14

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 22-1009

SUSHILA GAUR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ATTORNEY JAMES MILLIKAN, Office of Public Defender; OFFICE OF
PUBLIC DEFENDER; OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
George Jarrod Hazel, District Judge. (8:21-cv-03055-GJH)

Submitted: March 29, 2022

Decided: April 1, 2022

Before HARRIS, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sushila Gaur, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Har-21

PER CURIAM:

Sushila Gaur appeals the district court's order dismissing her complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Gaur's informal briefs do not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, she has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

100-23

Append-B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

SUSHILA GAUR,

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

Civil Action No. GJH-21-3055

ATTORNEY JAMES MILLIKAN,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC DEFENDER,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,

*

*

Defendants.

*

ORDER

In accordance with the foregoing Memorandum Opinion, it is this 17th day of December, 2021, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (ECF No. 2) is GRANTED;
2. Th Complaint IS DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to state a claim and lack of subject matter jurisdiction;
3. The Clerk IS DIRECTED to MAIL to Plaintiff a copy of this Order; and
4. The Clerk IS FURTHER DIRECTED to CLOSE this case.

/s/

GEORGE J. HAZEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Jan-15

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

SUSHILA GAUR,

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

Civil Action No. GJH-21-3055

ATTORNEY JAMES MILLIKAN,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC DEFENDER,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,

*

*

Defendants.

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Sushila Gaur filed the above-captioned civil rights Complaint together with a Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis. ECF Nos. 1, 2.

Gaur invokes this Court's federal question jurisdiction. ECF No. 1, p. 4. She states that James Millikan was her attorney and that she "expected him to respect and protect [her] modesty" but he harassed her despite her request that Millikan not touch her. ECF No. 1, p. 6. Gaur states that she is a "victim of sexual harassment." ECF No. 1, p. 7. Gaur filed a complaint with the Office of the Public Defender but did not receive any reply. ECF No. 1, p. 6. Other than naming the Office of Attorney General as a Defendant (ECF No. 1, p. 3), Gaur makes no allegations against this Defendant in the body of her Complaint. She seeks one billion dollars in damages. ECF No. 1, p. 5.

Because Gaur appears indigent, her Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis is granted. But because this Court lacks jurisdiction over the claims, the Complaint must be dismissed.

As Gaur proceeds in forma pauperis, this Court must review the Complaint, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), to ascertain whether any claims are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is

Har 24

immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii) and (iii). The Court must dismiss any claim that falls within these enumerated categories.

Gaur also proceeds pro se, and so the Court accepts the facts as true and construes the claims generously. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93-94 (2007) (citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007)). That said, the Court may not ignore a clear failure in the pleadings to allege facts which set forth a cognizable claim. *See Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

The claims against all Defendants must be dismissed. District Courts are of limited jurisdiction, hearing cases or controversies as established by federal statute. Specifically, the Court retains jurisdiction over civil actions that arise under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 1331; *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 552 (2005) (federal question jurisdiction); or where parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity jurisdiction); *Stouffer Corp. v. Breckenridge*, 859 F.2d 75, 76 (8th Cir. 1988); *McDonald v. Patton*, 240 F.2d 424, 425-26 (4th Cir. 1957). Under the “well-pleaded complaint” rule, the facts showing the existence of subject matter jurisdiction “must be affirmatively alleged in the complaint.”

Pinkley, Inc. v. City of Frederick, 191 F.3d 394, 399 (4th Cir. 1999) (citing *McNutt v. Gen'l Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178 (1936)). “A court is to presume, therefore, that a case lies outside its limited jurisdiction unless and until jurisdiction has been shown to be proper.” *United States v. Poole*, 531 F.3d 263, 274 (4th Cir. 2008) (citing *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)). Moreover, the “burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction is on . . . the party asserting jurisdiction.” *Robb Evans & Assocs., LLC v.*

Holibaugh, 609 F.3d 359, 362 (4th Cir. 2010); *accord Hertz v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 96 (2010); *McBurney v. Cuccinelli*, 616 F.3d 393, 408 (4th Cir. 2010).

Turning first to whether the Complaint makes plausible the existence of federal question jurisdiction, the Court finds that it does not. At its core, a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is directed to unlawful conduct under color of law. *See Owens v. Baltimore City State's Attorney Office*, 767 F.3d 379 (4th Cir. 2014). Section 1983 of 42 U.S.C. provides, in part:

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress. . . .

Section 1983 “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n.3 (1979)). Essential to sustaining an action under § 1983 are the presence of two elements. Specifically, the plaintiff must demonstrate that: (1) he suffered a deprivation of “rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws” of the United States; and (2) the act or omission causing the deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

Attorneys appointed by the state or privately hired attorneys do not act under color of state law within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Polk Cty v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 324-25 (1981) (public defenders); *Deas v. Potts*, 547 F.2d 800, 800 (4th Cir. 1976) (privately retained attorney). Accordingly, Gaur’s claims against Attorney James Millikan and the Office of Public Defender must be dismissed.

Gaur’s federal claim against the Office of the Attorney General fails no better. Gaur has failed to allege any conduct by the Office of the Attorney General that resulted in a violation of

her rights. Liability under §1983 attaches only upon personal participation by a defendant in the constitutional violation. *Trulock v. Freeh*, 275 F.3d 391, 402 (4th Cir. 2001). Other than being named as a Defendant, the Office of the Attorney General not mentioned anywhere in the factual allegations of the complaint. Additionally, the Office of the Attorney General is entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity as under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution, a state, its agencies and departments are immune from suits in federal court brought by its citizens or the citizens of another state, unless it consents. *See Pennhurst State Sch. and Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984).

Nor does the Complaint demonstrate the existence of diversity jurisdiction. Gaur and each of the named Defendants are citizens of Maryland. The Complaint does not establish that this Court has diversity jurisdiction.

Without a jurisdictional basis for suit in federal court, Plaintiff's claims are factually and legally without merit. The federal rules require dismissal anytime there is a determination that there is no jurisdiction. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3)* ("If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action."). Dismissal is appropriate here, given the lack of federal subject-matter jurisdiction.

A separate Order follows.

December 17, 2021
Date

/s/
GEORGE J. HAZEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEN-C

sushila gaur <sushilagaur@yahoo.com>, To: Complaints@AGC.Maryland.Gov

Bcc: P*****88 Tue, Jul 21, 2020 at 11:47 AM

Dear Concerned Officer,

I hope you are doing fine.

With very heart and great concern I have to inform you that one of the attorneys, James Millikan - jmillikan@opd.state.md.us - working with Public Defender's Officer touched me inappropriately on February 24 last when I was there in the Court to attend my court date and he was my attorney. It happened in the Court room itself. Number of Court room, most likely, happened to be 401. You do not need any proof. Camera in the Court Room itself is witness. You would like to know that I had warned James Millikan to not to touch me earlier. He was my attorney in other case as well.

Little detail about the case is that I moved away a bit from James Millikan when he touched me first that day. He touched me again and I had to take his hand off my shoulder along with moving away.


You would like to know that Judge on February 24, 2020 in case # 0D00404103 was very nice.

I lodged complaint against James Millikan with Hon Governor Mr. Larry Hogan as well. This person was the reason that I got a phone call from a government officer who asked me to lodge complaint with Bar Counsel.

Hope exemplary action will taken against him.

Please do not hesitate of calling or writing me should you have any question(s) in this regard for me. My phone number happens to be 214-597-8775.

Many thanks in anticipation. Thanks and take care, Sushila



8/20/2022

HAN-16

appen-D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

FORMAL BRIEF

No. 22-1009, Sushila Gaur Vs. James Millikan, Attorney General, MD et al
8:21 - cv - 03055- GJH

1. Declaration of Filing

I understand it and am responsible for filing formal brief facts.

2. Jurisdiction

Name of court or agency from which review is sought:

I seek review from United States Court of Appeals for The Fourth Circuit my case is docketed with .

3. Issues for Review- Supporting Facts and Argument

Issue 1. Same as mentioned in case # 8:21-cv-0355-GJH filed in District Court of MD and mentioned in Informal Brief.

Issue 2. Same as submitted in case # 8:21-cv-0355-GJH filed in District Court of MD and mentioned in Informal Brief.

Issue 3. Same as submitted in case # 8:21-cv-0355-GJH filed in District Court of MD and mentioned in Informal Brief.

Issue 4. Same as submitted in case # 8:21-cv-0355-GJH filed in District Court of MD and mentioned in Informal Brief.

4. Relief Requested:

Justice is the only relief I request from Honorable court; so that any other woman doesn't fall prey of the lust of James Millikan. Attorney General of MD should be punished for patronizing, protecting and conniving a criminal in James Millikan who sexually harassed me.

Justice, also, includes- to order police to lodge complaint against James Millikan, Attorney General of MD and others who supported, protected and connived with Millikan. Also, financial relief same as mentioned in my complaint filed in District Court of Maryland at Greenbelt.

Honorable Court would like to know that I posted email to the commanders of all, almost, districts of Montgomery County on January 28, 2022 to lodge complaint against Public Defender James Millikan and Attorney General of MD. I did not hear from police officers so far set aside lodging complaint. It shows the clout James Millikan and Attorney General have over the police and how they are misusing it.

5. Prior Appeals (for appellants only)

A. Have you filed other cases in this court?

Yes, 8:21-cv-00631-PJM. That case has reached to The Honorable Supreme Court with pending case # 6339-21. Opposite party has filed waiver there. It means they accepted their mistake. And I

1.
Han-17

am thankful to them for admitting their mistake paving path for me to get job with Department Of Defense I applied for and were rejected by DOS forcing me to knock the doors of Courts.

B. If you checked Yes, what are the case names and docket numbers for those appeals and what was the ultimate disposition of each?

As mentioned above case # happened to be 8:21-cv-00631-PJM against Department of Defense. Case was denied and I took it up the Honorable Supreme Court with case # 21-6339 still pending with WAIVER filed by Attorney General.

Also, like to mention here that James Millikan and Attorney General, MD are misusing their power to influence and manipulate the staff of Appeal Court. "Informal form" sent to me was form to be filled out by "INMATES" to confuse me and get the case rejected/dismissed. I hope Court will conduct inquiry in to the matter.

Signature and Type your name and address here:


 2/2/2022

Sushila Gaur
sushilagaur@yahoo.com,
8106 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD- 20910
214-597-8775

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on 2/2/2022 I ^{did not} served a copy of this Formal Brief on all parties, addressed as shown below:

Answer -- I would like to request Honorable Court to serve the papers to party because my financial situation is not good at this time.

 2/2/2022
Signature

Appen-E

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1009

**SUSHILA GAUR, Vs Attorney James Millikan, OPD; Office Of AG,
Plaintiff Defendants - Appellees**

Petition to Review to Correct the Mistakes of Judges

My petition is denied by the Judges Harris, Quattlebaum, and Heytens I did not challenge the basis of district court disposition.

I would like to request judges that I have very clearly mentioned the "basis" of challenging the decision of Judge George J Hazel.

Sexual harassment case *Tomka v. Seiler Corporation* was in "Federal" Appellate Court. And it proves that my case is very within jurisdiction.

Also, There are Federal policies related to sexual harassment; which are violated by James Millikan. Violation of federal policies and rules entitles me to file sexual harassment case in Federal Court. And case is in very jurisdiction of the court I have filed case in. You must be aware of the Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Hence, dismissal of case # 22-1009 by Federal court for the reason of lack of subject matter jurisdiction is wrong; as stated by the court in order issued on 4/1/2022.

I will request court to reconsider their decision and do the justice instead of favoring of criminals who are influential people.

Also, would like to request judges to order police to lodge criminal case against Millikan and AG Frosh. They are misusing their offices to influence police to not have criminal case against them. I hope this is within jurisdiction of any judge and court.

Signature Type your name and address here:

**Sushila Gaur
sushilagaur@yahoo.com,
8106 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD- 20910
214-597-8775**

[Handwritten signature of Sushila Gaur]
4/8/2022

Ham-19

CIVIL COVER SHEET

GJH 21CV3055

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other documents required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required to be filed with the Complaint of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

SUSHILA GAUR
8106 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD - 20910

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

Montgomery

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Pro se

DEFENDANTS

Office of Public Defender
191 E Jefferson St
Rockville - MD - 20850

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Montgomery
Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☒ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609
			<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 876 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
- ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Brief description of cause:

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$ 1 Billion

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No

V. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 11/30/2021

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Ham-20