

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-2114

---

WILLIAM F. KAETZ,  
Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; RENÉE MARIE BUMB,  
Chief United States District Judge New Jersey District Court, Trenton Vicinage

---

(D.N.J. No. 1:23-cv-02741)

---

SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING

---

Present: CHAGARES, *Chief Judge*, JORDAN, HARDIMAN, KRAUSE, RESTREPO, BIBAS, PORTER, MATEY, PHIPPS, FREEMAN, and MONTGOMERY-REEVES, *Circuit Judges*.

The petition for rehearing filed by **appellant** in the above-entitled case having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court and to all the other available circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service, and no judge who concurred in the decision having asked for rehearing, and a majority of the judges of the

circuit in regular service not having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing by the panel and the Court en banc, is denied.

BY THE COURT,

s/ Peter J. Phipps  
Circuit Judge

Dated: January 3, 2025  
Amr/cc: All counsel of record

**NOT PRECEDENTIAL**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-2114

---

WILLIAM F. KAETZ,  
Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; RENÉE MARIE BUMB,  
Chief United States District Judge New Jersey District Court, Trenton Vicinage

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of New Jersey  
(D.C. Civil Action No. 1-23-cv-02741)  
District Judge: Honorable Juan R. Sánchez

---

Submitted on Appellees' Motion for Summary Affirmance  
Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6  
September 12, 2024  
Before: JORDAN, PORTER, and PHIPPS, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: October 1, 2024)

---

OPINION\*

---

---

\* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

PER CURIAM

Appellees' motion for summary affirmance is granted, and we will summarily affirm the District Court's order dismissing William Kaetz's complaint. The reasons for our ruling are explained by separate opinion issued in Kaetz v. United States, C.A. No. 23-2322. Kaetz's motion to withdraw the motion for judicial notice that he filed at Appeal Docket No. 18 is granted. Kaetz's corrected motion for judicial notice is granted to the extent that we have considered the arguments raised therein in resolving this appeal. To the extent that any of Kaetz's submissions on appeal can be construed to request any other relief, such relief is denied.