

1 APPENDIX

2 **NOTE: Prefatory Note Regarding Alleged Sealed Documents**

3 Despite the Redwood County Court's repeated labeling of certain defense filings as
4 "confidential," Petitioner has found **no formal judicial order**—at the state or federal levels—
5 authorizing the sealing of these documents. Specifically:

6 **Redwood County District Court (Case No. 64-CR-15-649):**

- 7 ○ The Register of Actions reflects no signed motion or order to seal. Instead, filings
8 were marked "confidential" or "deficient" by administrative classification,
9 **without** any judicial directive.

10 **United States District Court for the District of Minnesota (Case No. 0:24-cv-02299-JWB):**

- 11 ○ A review of the federal docket does not reveal any order sealing or restricting
12 access to documents allegedly labeled "confidential."

13 **Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals (Case No. 24-2639):**

- 14 ○ No entry or directive appears on the appellate docket indicating that any filings
15 were placed under seal pursuant to a court order.

16 **Minnesota Supreme Court:**

- 17 ○ To Petitioner's knowledge, no order exists at the level of the Minnesota Supreme
18 Court requiring these documents to be sealed.

19 Petitioner contends that this "confidential" label was instead an administrative tactic used to
20 preclude meaningful judicial review and conceal evidence of prosecutorial and judicial
21 misconduct—thus evading constitutional scrutiny. Indeed, the judge and prosecution openly
22 referenced the contents of these filings in court, confirming they were not truly sealed from
23 judicial view. Because no lawful basis for sealing these records exists, Petitioner maintains that
24 the "confidential" classification is illegitimate and further illustrates how state officials allegedly
25 acted to obscure exculpatory or impeaching information, **in violation of due process.**

26 **A. Eighth Circuit Materials**

27 1. **Key Dispositions & Orders**

28 A.1.1. Eighth Circuit Summary Affirmance (Oct. 24, 2024)

29 A.1.2. Final Order Denying Reconsideration and Prohibiting Further Filings (Dec. 6, 2024)

30 2. **Petitioner Filings & Court Responses**

31 A.2.1. Petitioner's Notice of Appeal & Appeal Submission

32 A.2.2. Motion for Leave to Submit Additional Evidence (with Court Order Granting)

33 A.2.3. Supplemental Filings & Escalation to Eighth Circuit

34 A.2.4. Rehearing Petitions & Orders (including Overlength Petition Filings, Motions, Denials)

35 **3. Other Relevant Documents**

- 36 A.3.1. Complaint Dismissal (Case No. 64-CR-15-649, Aug. 29, 2024)
37 A.3.2. Motion for Reimbursement & Expungement (Sept. 18, 2024)
38 A.3.3. Correspondence with Judge Michelle Dietrich & Redwood County Officials
39 A.3.4. “Failure to Appear” (Affidavit of Truth, Motion to Quash, Extraction, Order for
40 Conditional Release, Excessive bail)
41 A.3.5. BCA Submissions by the State Original and Amended

42 **B. U.S. District Court – District of Minnesota (Case No. 0:24-cv-02299-JWB)**

43 **1. Dismissal & Key Filings**

- 44 B.1.1. Judge Blackwell’s Order Dismissing Case as Frivolous (July 11, 2024)
45 B.1.2. Petitioner’s Original Complaint w/ Correspondences to AG and Court (May 2, 2024)
46 B.1.3. Correspondence with the District Court re: Case Closure

47 **C. Additional Case Materials**

48 **1. State & Federal Dockets / Filings**

- 49 C.1.1. Civil Docket (U.S. District Court – Minnesota)
50 C.1.2. Original & Amended Complaints and Charges (State)
51 C.1.3. Registry of Actions (Case No. 64-CR-15-649)
52 C.1.4. Past Civil Case Orders & Complaints (2020 & 2022)

53 **2. Judicial & Prosecutorial Complaints**

- 54 C.2.1. Petition for Writ of Prohibition Against Judge Dietrich
55 C.2.2. Judicial Standards Complaint
56 C.2.3. Order “Paragraph 6”

57 **3. Audit & Evidence Records**

- 58 C.3.1. Minnesota State Audit (2016) Non-Compliance
59 C.3.2. Law Firm Chemical Analysis Request 2016 & Prosecution’s Correspondence BCA 2017

60 **D. Attempts for Relief Outside Eighth Circuit**

61 **1. Oversight Authorities**

- 62 D.1.1. F.B.I. – D.O.J. - Klobuchar Responses
63 D.1.2. Communications with Lori Swanson (Former MN AG) & AG Keith Ellison’s Office
64 D.1.3. Submissions: Lawyers Board of Professional Responsibility, MN Judicial Board

65 **2. Disqualification Motions Obstructed Chief Judge Oversight**

- 66 D.2.1. Disqualification Motions Obstructed

67 **E. Statutory & Regulatory Provisions**

- 68 • **Fourteenth Amendment (Due Process Clause)**
69 • **28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)**
70 • **Supreme Court Rule 13**
71 • **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3)**
72 • **Eighth Circuit Rule 47A(a)**
73 • **Eighth Circuit Local Rule 40A(c)**

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

No: 24-2639

Ryan Christopher Edner

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

State of Minnesota; Jenna Peterson-Haler, Prosecutor

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota
(0:24-cv-02299-JWB)

JUDGMENT

Before SHEPHERD, ERICKSON, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

This court has reviewed the original file of the United States District Court. It is ordered by the court that the judgment of the district court is summarily affirmed. See Eighth Circuit Rule 47A(a).

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is granted. The motion to stay state court proceedings is denied as moot. The motion to reopen is denied.

October 24, 2024

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
Acting Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

/s/ Maureen W. Gornik

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

No: 24-2639

Ryan Christopher Edner

Appellant

v.

State of Minnesota and Jenna Peterson-Haler, Prosecutor

Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota
(0:24-cv-02299-JWB)

ORDER

The motion for reconsideration is denied. No further filings will be accepted in this case.

December 06, 2024

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
Acting Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

/s/ Maureen W. Gornik

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Ryan C. Edner

Civ. No. 24-2299 (JWB/LIB)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

State of Minnesota and Jenna
Peterson-Haler, *Prosecutor*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Ryan C. Edner has filed a fourth federal lawsuit arising from his ongoing state criminal proceedings. (Doc. No. 1). Almost a decade ago, Edner was charged with several criminal offenses in Minnesota state court. *See State of Minnesota v. Edner*, Case No. 64-CR-15-649 (Minn. Dist. Ct. Sept. 5, 2015); *see also* (Doc. No. 1-1 at 33). Those proceedings remain pending, with Edner's jury trial scheduled for September 10–11, 2024. *See* Minnesota Court Records Online ("MCRO"), <https://publicaccess.courts.state.mn.us/CaseSearch> (last accessed July 9, 2024); *see also Stutzka v. McCarville*, 420 F.3d 757, 760 n.2 (8th Cir. 2005) (allowing courts to take judicial notice of judicial opinions and public records). The full history of Edner's state criminal case is detailed in *Edner v. Dietrich, et al.*, Civ. No. 22-70 (JRT/LIB) (D. Minn.).

In his latest federal Complaint, Edner alleges that he tried to file a self-styled "Motion to Compel" in his criminal proceeding but the state court administrator rejected it, noting "deficiencies" with the filing. (*See* Doc. No. 1 at 5–7.) He claims that the failure to address this motion prejudices his case and deprives him of a right to a fair trial. (*Id.*)

Although not named as a defendant to this action, Edner requests a federal court order directing Judge Dietrich—the presiding state court trial judge—to address his motion in state court. (*See id.* at 10–11).

Edner did not pay the filing fee but has requested to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). (Doc. No. 2). His case therefore faces review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

DISCUSSION

Upon review of Edner’s IFP application, he appears to qualify financially for IFP status. However, an IFP application will be denied and the case dismissed if the action is frivolous or malicious or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *Atkinson v. Bohn*, 91 F.3d 1127, 1128 (8th Cir. 1996) (*per curiam*); *Carter v. Schafer*, 273 Fed. App’x 581, 582 (8th Cir. 2008) (*per curiam*) (“[T]he provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) apply to all persons proceeding IFP and are not limited to prisoner suits, and the provisions allow dismissal without service.”). For the reasons below, Edner’s Complaint is dismissed without prejudice, and his IFP application and Motion for Assignment to Judge John R. Tunheim are denied as moot.

I. Due to the ongoing state proceeding, *Younger* abstention requires dismissal

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) requires this Court to abstain from exercising jurisdiction over Edner’s case. *Younger* requires federal courts to abstain from hearing cases where “(1) there is an ongoing state proceeding, (2) that implicates important state interests, and (3) that provides an adequate opportunity to raise any relevant federal questions.” *Tony Alamo Christian Ministries v. Selig*, 664 F.3d 1245, 1249 (8th Cir. 2012) (citation omitted). Each factor is satisfied here.

First, there is no question that Edner's state criminal case remains pending. Second, it is clearly established that ongoing state criminal proceedings implicate the important state interest of enforcing state criminal laws. *See, e.g., Meador v. Paulson*, 385 F. App'x 613 (8th Cir. 2010) (affirming dismissal of § 1983 action based on *Younger* abstention where there was an ongoing state criminal case). Finally, the state court proceedings offer adequate opportunities for Edner to raise his constitutional challenges. To the extent that Edner claims the prosecutor has misrepresented evidence or has not followed court orders, he can bring those claims in his criminal proceeding. As for his "Motion to Compel," Edner can refile it because the court administrator told him why the filing was deficient—it was missing a hearing date. (*See* Doc. No. 1-1 at 27.) And he has an upcoming pretrial hearing (August 23, 2024) before his September trial.

The "bad faith" exception to *Younger* also does not apply here. A federal court need not abstain where state proceedings were initiated in bad faith or to harass litigants. *Tony Alamo Christian Ministries*, 664 F.3d at 1254 (citing *Younger*, 401 U.S. at 49–54). But the exception applies only where the prosecution was brought with no hope of obtaining a valid conviction. *Edner v. Redwood County District Attorney's Off.*, Civ. No. 19 -2486 (SRN/LIB), 2020 WL 2215724, at *4 (D. Minn. May 7, 2020) (quoting *Perez v. Ledesma*, 401 U.S. 82, 85 (1971)). While Edner's criminal case has been pending for almost a decade and has endured several continuances and a pandemic, this Court cannot say that his criminal charges were brought with no hope of obtaining a valid conviction. The *Younger* abstention doctrine, therefore, compels this Court to decline to exercise jurisdiction over Edner's claims and dismiss his case. *See Tony Alamo Christian*

Ministries, 664 F.3d at 1251 (“Where *Younger* abstention is otherwise appropriate, the district court must dismiss the action, not stay it pending final resolution of the state-court proceedings.”). Because Edner seeks only equitable relief—an order directing the state court trial judge to address Edner’s motion in the state court proceedings—*Younger* abstention requires dismissal and not a stay.

II. Edner’s claims are barred by sovereign and prosecutorial immunity

Even if *Younger* abstention did not apply, Edner’s case would still be dismissed. Edner asserts his claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To establish a plausible § 1983 claim, a “plaintiff must allege the violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

Edner identifies two defendants to his claims: the State of Minnesota and Jenna Peterson-Haler, the Redwood County Attorney. (See Doc. No. 1). As for the State of Minnesota, a state is not a “person” subject to liability under § 1983. *Will v. Michigan Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 70 (1989). Further, and more to the point, “[u]nless a State has waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity or Congress has overridden it, [] a State cannot be sued directly in its own name regardless of the relief sought.” *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 167 n.14 (1985); *Monroe v. Ark. State Univ.*, 495 F.3d 591, 594 (8th Cir. 2007) (explaining that the Eleventh Amendment bars any kind of relief, not merely monetary damages, against state agencies). Congress did not abrogate sovereign immunity when it enacted § 1983. See *Burk v. Beene*, 948 F.2d 489, 493 (8th Cir. 1991). And Minnesota has not waived immunity to § 1983 claims. See *McCormack v. Minn.*