

## APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Appendix A:</b> United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, Judgment, October 16, 2025. ....	1a
<b>Appendix B:</b> United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, Memorandum of Decision and Order on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, September 8, 2022 .....	3a
<b>Appendix C:</b> United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, Order of Dismissal, September 8, 2022 .....	7a
<b>Appendix D:</b> United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, Order of Court Denying Petition for En Banc Rehearing, December 16, 2025. ....	8a
<b>Appendix E:</b> Petition Access via QR Code and Hyperlink .....	10a

**APPENDIX A**

**United States Court of Appeals  
For the First Circuit**

No. 23-1789

**IRVING F. ROUNDS, JR.,  
Plaintiff - Appellant,**

v.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE;  
RICHARD CIRUOLO, Agent, Department of Justice;  
JOHN COUGHLIN, Agent, Department of Justice,  
Defendants - Appellees.**

Before

Barron, Chief Judge,  
Rikelman and Aframe, Circuit Judges.

**JUDGMENT**

Entered: October 16, 2025

The government has moved for summary affirmance of the district court's decision dismissing plaintiff's complaint. We have carefully reviewed the submissions of the parties and relevant portions of the district court record. Even if we were to assume that plaintiff's appeal from the order of dismissal was

timely, plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any error in the court's decision; likewise, we discern no abuse of discretion in the court's denial of plaintiff's Rule 60(b)(3) motion. The government's motion for summary affirmance is granted and the dismissal of plaintiff's complaint is affirmed. *See* 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c).

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Irving Franklin Rounds Jr.  
Thomas E. Kanwit  
Donald Campbell Lockhart

**APPENDIX B**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

IRVING F. ROUNDS, JR.,  
Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE, AGENT RICHARD CIRUOLO,  
AND AGENT JOHN COUGHLIN  
Defendants

**MEMORANDUM OF DECISION AND ORDER  
ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS  
September 8, 2022**

**CIVIL ACTION  
No. 21-40117-TSH**

HILLMAN, S.J.

Plaintiff Irving F. Rounds proceeding *pro se* has filed this action against Defendants the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ"), Agent Richard Ciruolo and Agent John Coughlin who Plaintiff refers to as a DOJ agents<sup>1</sup> seeking injunctive relief to protect him

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has not filed evidence of proof of service on "Richard Ciruolo" or "John Coughlin." The Court notes that throughout his

from alleged ongoing harassment by the DOJ and Federal Bureau of Investigation. Plaintiff previously filed three actions in this Court for the District of Massachusetts going back to 2015 (15-13541-MLW; 17-40072-TSH; and 19-11388-MPK), as well as one or more actions in state court, all involving claims that he was forced to become a whistleblower relating to allegations of improper venting of refrigerant gases by a former employer. His claims in this Court have also involved the Environmental Protection Agency, which allegedly deprived him of pursuing a patent for a perpetual motion invention. *See Rounds v. U.S. Dept. of Justice, et al.*, 19-11388-FDS.

Plaintiff's *pro se* status "militates in favor of a liberal reading" of his pleading. *See Rodi v. S. New Eng. Sch. of Law*, 389 F.3d 5, 13 (1st Cir.2004). *See also Ahmed v. Rosenblatt*, 118 F.3d 886, 890 (1st Cir.1997) ("The policy behind affording *pro se* plaintiff's liberal interpretation is that if they present sufficient facts, the court may intuit the correct cause of action, even if it was imperfectly pled"). However, Plaintiff's *pro se* status does not absolve him of having to comply with this Court's rules of procedure. "Plaintiff's *pro-se* status does not excuse him from complying with procedural and substantive law." *Burnham v. Wyeth Labs. Inc.*, 348 F.Supp.3d 109, 111-

---

pleadings, Plaintiff has not clearly verified the existence, identities or roles those of those so-called Defendants. Because the time for effecting service on this individual has long passed, Plaintiff's claims against "Richard Ciruolo" and "John Coughlin" are hereby dismissed.

12 (D.Mass. 2018) (*citing Ahmed*, 118 F.3d 890).

Plaintiff seeks only injunctive relief in the form of an order prohibiting Defendants from harassing or threatening him. Complaint, at V. The standard for injunctive relief is the familiar four-part test: (1) the likelihood of success on the merits; (2) the potential for irreparable harm if the injunction is denied; (3) the balance of relevant impositions, i.e., the hardship to the nonmovant if enjoined as contrasted with the hardship to the movant if no injunction issues; and (4) the effect (if any) of the court's ruling on the public interest. *Charlesbank Equity Fund II v. Blinds to Go, Inc.*, 370 F.3d 151, 162 (1st Cir. 2004).

The Court agrees with the Defendant that Plaintiff has, either by direct statement or attempted incorporation of his other complaints, alleged such a broad and vague set of claims that it is impossible to discern exactly what he is claiming. *Kuehl v. F.D.I.C.*, 8 F.3d 905, 908 (1st Cir. 1993) (“A district court has the power to dismiss a complaint when a plaintiff fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Rule 8(a)(2)’s “short and plain statement” 3 requirement”). There is no coherent legal theory underlying Plaintiff’s Complaint, only a mashup of claimed injustices and conspiracy theories. Plaintiff has done nothing in his opposition to persuade the Court that he requires immediate relief or that he is likely to succeed on the merits. Therefore, his complaint, which seeks only injunctive relief, must be dismissed. *See Charlesbank Equity Fund II v. Blinds to Go, Inc.*, 370 F.3d at 162.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 12) is **granted**. Plaintiff's Motion to Change Venue (Docket No. 10) is **denied**.

*/s/ Timothy S. Hillman*  
**TIMOTHY S. HILLMAN**  
**SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE**

**SO ORDERED.**

**APPENDIX C**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Rounds,  
Plaintiff,

V.

U.S. Department of Justice, et al.,  
Defendants,

**CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 21-40117-TSH**

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Hillman, D. J.

In accordance with the Court's Order dated 9/8/22, granting the defendants' motion to dismiss, it is hereby ORDERED that the above-entitled action be and hereby is dismissed.

9/8/22  
Date

By the Court,  
  
/s/ Martin Castles  
Deputy Clerk

**APPENDIX D**

**United States Court of Appeals  
For the First Circuit**

No. 23-1789

**IRVING F. ROUNDS, JR.,  
Plaintiff - Appellant,**

v.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE;  
RICHARD CIRUOLO, Agent, Department of Justice;  
JOHN COUGHLIN, Agent, Department of Justice,  
Defendants - Appellees.**

Before

**Barron, Chief Judge,  
Gelpí, Montecalvo, Rikelman,  
Aframe and Dunlap, Circuit Judges.**

**ORDER OF COURT**

Entered: December 16, 2025

The petition for rehearing having been denied by the panel of judges who decided the case, and the petition for rehearing en banc having been submitted to the active judges of this court and a majority of the judges not having voted that the case be heard en

banc, it is ordered that the petition for rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc be **DENIED**. Appellant's motion to exceed the word limit is **ALLOWED**. All other pending motions, to the extent not mooted by the foregoing, are **DENIED**.

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Irving Franklin Rounds Jr.,  
Thomas E. Kanwit,  
Donald Campbell Lockhart,  
Michael L. Fitzgerald

**APPENDIX E**

**United States Court of Appeals  
For the First Circuit**

No. 23-1789

**IRVING F. ROUNDS JR.,**  
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE;**  
RICHARD CIRUOLO, Agent, Department of Justice;  
JOHN COUGHLIN, Agent, Department of Justice,  
Defendants-Appellees

**EXHIBIT A**

**Petition Access via QR Code and Hyperlink**

This exhibit provides direct digital access to the petitioner's public petition referenced in this filing. The Court may access the petition by scanning the QR code below or by visiting the hyperlink provided.



Hyperlink: <https://c.org/V78gHt9fZd>