

APPENDICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A, Opinion and Order, Seventh Cir. Court of Appeals, July 5, 2022	1a
Appendix B, Order, Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Rehearing Denied, August 30, 2022	10a
Appendix C, Order, U.S. Dist. Ct, N. Dist. IL, July 23, 2020.	12a
Appendix D, Order, U.S. Dist. Ct, N. Dist. IL, September 2, 2020	15a

Appendix A
Opinion and Order, Seventh Cir. Court of Appeals,
July 5, 2022

In re Shalaby

**United States Court of Appeals for the
Seventh Circuit**

Submitted November 8, 2021*

Decided July 5, 2022

No. 20-2689

Reporter

2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 18439 *; 2022 WL 2438825

IN RE: ANDREW W. SHALABY, Appellant.

Subsequent History: Rehearing denied by *In re Shalaby, 2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 24541 (7th Cir. Ill., Aug. 30, 2022)*

Prior History: Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. No. 1:20-cv-04315. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, Chief Judge.

In re Shalaby, 775 Fed. Appx. 249, 2019 U.S. App.

*The panel that decided appeal no. 19-2369 is treating this appeal as successive under this court's Internal Operating Procedure 6(b). After an examination of the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and the record. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

LEXIS 24746 (7th Cir. Ill., Aug. 20, 2019)

Counsel: For ANDREW W. SHALABY, Defendant - Appellant: Alan J. Gould, Attorney, Defendant - Appellant, LAW OFFICE OF ALAN J. GOULD, Santa Rosa, CA.

ANDREW W. SHALABY, Defendant - Appellant, Pro se, El Cerrito, CA.

Judges: Before WILLIAM J. BAUER, Circuit Judge. DAVID F. HAMILTON, Circuit Judge. MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, Circuit Judge

ORDER

This appeal has been deemed successive to No. 19-2369, in which we affirmed a decision by the Executive Committee of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois denying district bar admission to Andrew Shalaby. *In re Shalaby*, 775 F. App'x 249 (7th Cir. 2019), cert. denied, 140 S. Ct. 957, 206 L. Ed. 2d 121 (2020). That denial had been based on a detailed 48-page order issued by Judge Reinhard revoking Mr. Shalaby's admission *pro hac vice* in a pending civil case, *Bailey v. Worthington*, No. 16-cv-07548, based on multiple misrepresentations Mr. Shalaby had made to the court.

In this successive appeal, Mr. Shalaby challenges several different actions of the Executive Committee regarding his admission to the bar of the Northern District of Illinois. He also challenges several actions

taken by judicial officers in the still-pending *Bailey* case. We have reviewed Mr. Shalaby's brief and the record. The Executive Committee has not responded to this appeal. As explained below, we affirm the Executive Committee's denial of Mr. Shalaby's second application for admission to the district court's general bar. We dismiss the remainder of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

I. Factual and Procedural Background

Mr. Shalaby is a member of the California bar. He was admitted pro hac vice to represent the plaintiff Bailey in his product liability action against Worthington. Mr. Shalaby came to the conclusion that the magistrate judge assigned to the case, Iain D. Johnston, should have disqualified himself from the case because he had previously been a lawyer with the firm representing defendant Worthington in the case. (In the meantime, in 2020 Judge Johnston was appointed as a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.)

In the *Bailey* case, the defendant moved to revoke Mr. Shalaby's pro hac vice admission on the ground that he had failed to disclose prior disciplinary action in a bankruptcy court in California. District Judge Reinhard, presiding in the *Bailey* case, ultimately revoked Mr. Shalaby's pro hac vice admission. See *Bailey v. Bernzomatic*, Order, Dkt. No. 402, No. 16-cv-07548 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 1, 2019).

Mr. Shalaby responded to that revocation by applying

for general admission (i.e., not just *pro hac vice*) to the bar of the Northern District of Illinois. The Executive Committee denied his 2019 application, finding that the misconduct found and documented by Judge Reinhard showed that Mr. Shalaby did not satisfy the district's standards for character and fitness to practice law. We affirmed that denial in the previous appeal, No. 19-2369. In 2020, Mr. Shalaby again applied for general admission. The Executive Committee again denied his application, and in this appeal Mr. Shalaby challenges that 2020 denial and several other actions by the Executive Committee and by the judges presiding over the *Bailey* action.

II. Appellate Jurisdiction

We must start with the question of our own jurisdiction. Mr. Shalaby's notice of appeal covers two orders: one issued September 2, 2020, denying his application for admission to the bar of the Northern District of Illinois, and another order issued July 23, 2020, directing that Mr. Shalaby be accompanied [*4] by a U.S. Marshal or deputy marshal during any in-person visits to the federal courthouses in the Northern District of Illinois. This court directed Mr. Shalaby to explain the basis for appellate jurisdiction, particularly with respect to the July 23 order. He provided an explanation in his brief.

We have jurisdiction to hear Mr. Shalaby's appeal from the denial of his application for bar admission. As we said in his prior appeal, we treat filing restrictions and denials of bar memberships as judicial actions, not

administrative actions, so appeal offers an appropriate remedy. See *In re Chapman*, 328 F.3d 903, 904 (7th Cir. 2003) (Executive Committee's filing restrictions were judicial actions subject to appeal); *In re Palmisano*, 70 F.3d 483, 484-85 (7th Cir. 1995) (Executive Committee's disbarment of attorney from district court bar was judicial act subject to appeal).

The unusual order that Mr. Shalaby be accompanied by U.S. Marshals is another story. It does not actually limit his access to the courts and their power to adjudicate cases in which Mr. Shalaby is a party or counsel. He still has access to the courts, but with an escort for security reasons. This order is more akin to the order in *In re Long*, 475 F.3d 880 (7th Cir. 2007), where the Executive Committee barred a person from access to the court library in the Dirksen courthouse in Chicago based on various incidents of refusal to behave appropriately in the library. See also *In re Kowalski*, 765 F. App'x 139 (7th Cir. 2019) (dismissing appeal of similar order requiring attorney to be escorted inside courthouse), cert. denied, 140 S. Ct. 266, 205 L. Ed. 2d 166 (2019). We therefore do not have appellate jurisdiction to consider the escort order. To the extent Mr. Shalaby also challenges a separate order requiring him to communicate with the court by U.S. mail rather than electronic mail, we similarly lack appellate jurisdiction to review such an administrative order. Mr. Shalaby's brief also seeks relief from this court setting aside as void several orders entered in the *Bailey* case (see Appellant's Br. at 45), and in the absence of a final appealable judgment in that case, we also lack jurisdiction over

those orders.

III. Role of Magistrate Judge on Executive Committee

On the merits, Mr. Shalaby argues that the membership of a magistrate judge on the Executive Committee undermines the validity of the order denying him admission. Under the local rules and internal operating procedures of the Northern District of Illinois, most matters of court administration and management, including issues of bar admission and discipline, are delegated to the Executive Committee. The committee includes the chief district judge and five other district judges, as well as the presiding magistrate judge of the district. Under the Northern District's operating procedures, the chief district judge does not vote unless the vote is otherwise tied. IOP-02(c).

Mr. Shalaby asserts in this appeal that, at least to the extent the Executive Committee acts on judicial matters within our appellate jurisdiction, including bar admissions, having a magistrate judge participate with voting power without the consent of affected parties violates 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). Under section 636(c), a magistrate judge may, with the consent of all parties, exercise the powers of a district judge in a civil case. Without that consent of all parties, the magistrate judge's powers are the more limited ones granted under other provisions of section 636. As Mr. Shalaby sees the problem, the Executive Committee exercised judicial powers in denying his bar admission, and the participation of a magistrate judge in that

decision without his consent invalidates the whole decision.

We addressed a similar issue in *Palmisano*, where we addressed the membership of the clerk of court on the Executive Committee when it acted to discipline [*7] an attorney. The clerk is an ex officio, non-voting member of the Executive Committee. We rejected the challenge in *Palmisano*, finding no reason why the voting judges could not take advice from the clerk as from any other member of the court staff. 70 F.3d at 485.

This case is different from *Palmisano* to the extent that the presiding magistrate judge is a voting member of the Executive Committee. We are confident, however, that Mr. Shalaby's application for bar admission is not a "civil matter" subject to section 636(c). And while we do not question the power of the district judges to include the presiding magistrate judge in the governance of the court, we need not resolve any broader questions about the Northern District's decision to bestow voting power on the presiding magistrate judge for matters of court governance. There is no evidence of any disagreement among the voting members in Mr. Shalaby's case, let alone a tie-breaking vote by the chief district judge. The presiding magistrate judge's vote could not have been decisive in this case. The composition of the Executive Committee therefore offers no reason to question the validity of its decision on Mr. Shalaby's application.

IV. Other Issues

Mr. Shalaby reprises in this appeal some arguments that we rejected in the prior appeal. We rejected his theory that denial of his bar admission violated his free speech rights. He argues in this appeal that the denial violated his "freedom of thought," but that label adds nothing to the First Amendment argument that we rejected. He also argues that he has improperly been subjected to multiple punishments for the same conduct. Denial of bar admission is not, however, a criminal punishment subject to the Double Jeopardy Clause. Merely submitting successive applications for bar admission does not require the Executive Committee to disregard Mr. Shalaby's track record when deciding whether he has shown good character and is fit to practice law in the district. See N.D. Ill. LR 83.10(a).

Mr. Shalaby also argues that the Executive Committee failed to comply with some of the procedural requirements for attorney discipline. Those arguments are off-target, however, because bar admission is distinct from bar discipline. Different procedures and rules govern admission and discipline. Mr. Shalaby has not shown any procedural defect in the denial of his application for bar admission.

We have considered Mr. Shalaby's other arguments and requests for relief, and they are all without [*9] merit and/or beyond our jurisdiction in this appeal.

The Executive Committee order of September 2, 2020,

denying Mr. Shalaby's application for admission to the general bar of the Northern District of Illinois is hereby AFFIRMED. To the extent Mr. Shalaby has sought other relief in this appeal, the remainder of the appeal is DISMISSED for lack of appellate jurisdiction.

Appendix B
Order, Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals,
Rehearing Denied

In re Shalaby

United States Court of Appeals for the
Seventh Circuit

August 30, 2022, Decided

No. 20-2689

Reporter
2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 24541 *; 2022 WL 3756985
IN RE: ANDREW W. SHALABY, Appellant.

Prior History: Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. No. 1:20-cv-04315. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, Chief Judge.

In re Shalaby, 2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 18439, 2022 WL 2438825 (7th Cir. Ill., July 5, 2022)

Counsel: For ANDREW W. SHALABY, Defendant - Appellant: Alan J. Gould, Attorney, LAW OFFICE OF ALAN J. GOULD, Santa Rosa, CA.

ANDREW W. SHALABY, Defendant - Appellant, El Cerrito, CA.

Judges: Before WILLIAM J. BAUER, Circuit Judge,

DAVID F. HAMILTON, Circuit Judge, MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, Circuit Judge.

ORDER

On consideration of appellant Andrew W. Shalaby's petition for panel rehearing, filed August 19, 2022, all judges on the original panel have voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

Accordingly, the petition for panel rehearing filed by appellant Andrew W. Shalaby is DENIED.

Appendix C
Order, U.S. Dist. Ct, N. Dist. IL, July 23, 2020

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

In the Matter of Andrew W. Shalaby
Civil Action No. 20 C 4315

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ORDER

Andrew W. Shalaby has been denied admission to the General Bar of this Court on three separate occasions. The denials were based on Shalaby's false statements to the Court in case number 16-cv-07548, *Kurtis M. Bailey v. Worthington Cylinder Corporation, et al*, before the Honorable Philip G. Reinhard, and on petitions for leave to appear as an attorney in the Northern District of Illinois. In addition, the Executive Committee has previously twice ordered Mr. Shalaby to communicate with the Clerk's Office only via U.S. Mail.

The Executive Committee has received troubling reports concerning Mr. Shalaby's behavior during recent visits to the Stanley Roszkowski Rockford Federal Courthouse in Rockford, Illinois. In addition to Mr. Shalaby's disruptive behavior during Court hearings and his false statements on Court documents, Mr. Shalaby has failed to comply with the orders from the Executive Committee: He was directed to communicate with the Clerk's Office only by way of

United States Mail (see orders dated February 18, 2020 and July 10, 2020 in 18 D 21). Mr. Shalaby continued to violate this Court's order by emailing the Clerk's Office staff on July 20, 2020 and July 21, 2020.

Andrew W. Shalaby's recent demand for videoconference sessions with judges and other inappropriate conduct raises concerns for the Court, the Clerk's Office, and the U.S. Marshals Service. Pending further investigation and the potential imposition of additional restrictions on Mr. Shalaby's movement within the courthouses, the Executive Committee of this Court orders as follows:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED That to maintain judicial security, the court imposes an escort requirement: Upon his arrival at the Stanley J. Roszkowski U.S. Courthouse at 327 S. Church Street, Rockford, Illinois 61101 or the Dirksen U.S. Courthouse at 219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, Andrew Shalaby is ordered to sign in at the security desk.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That a representative of the U.S. Marshals Service shall accompany Mr. Shalaby at all times while he is present in the Stanley J. Roszkowski U.S. Courthouse or in the Dirksen U.S. Courthouse, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That failure to comply with this order may lead to additional restrictions on Mr. Shalaby's movement in the Northern District of Illinois Courthouses, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause to be created and maintained a miscellaneous docket with the title "In the matter of Andrew W. Shalaby" and case number 20 C 4315. The miscellaneous docket shall serve as the repository of this order and any order or minute order entered pursuant to this order. All orders will be entered on the docket following standard docketing procedures. A brief entry will be made on the docket indicating the receipt of any materials from Mr. Shalaby.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause a copy of this order to be emailed to Mr. Shalaby at the email address on record.

ENTER:
FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, Chief Judge
Dated at Chicago, Illinois this 23rd day of July, 2020

Appendix D
Order, U.S. Dist. Ct, N. Dist. IL, September 2, 2020

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

In the Matter of Andrew W. Shalaby
18 D 21 and 20-cv-04315
(Before the Executive Committee)

ORDER

Andrew Shalaby has submitted the following for the Executive Committee consideration:

Date Received by Court	Caption
July 7, 2020	General Bar Petition
July 28, 2020	Motion to Disqualify Executive Committee
July 28, 2020	Request for Production of Documents
August 11, 2020	Motion to Consolidate

At its meeting August 20, 2020, the Executive Committee reviewed the four above-listed documents, therefore

16a

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all above-listed submissions, including petitions, motions and requests are summarily denied.

ENTER:

FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, Chief Judge

DATED: September 2, 2020