

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Opinion, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (November 13, 2025).....	1a
Judgment, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (November 13, 2025).....	5a
Final Judgment, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division (May 8, 2025)	7a
Order Dismissing Case, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division (February 20, 2025)	9a
Minute Entry by Judge Regarding Complaint Submission, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division (January 17, 2025).....	12a

REHEARING ORDER

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing En Banc, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (December 16, 2025).....	13a
--	-----

OTHER CASE ORDER OR DOCUMENTS

Order Denying Motions for Findings of Fact, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Case No. H-20-3740 (August 31, 2021)	15a
---	-----

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Motion for Finding of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division – Addressing Production of Internal Affairs Records (ECF Case No. 4: 20-cv-03740, Doc 90, August 27, 2021).....	17a
Final Judgment, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit – Affirmation of District Court’s in Camera Review of Internal Affairs Records (ECF Case No. 21-20451, Doc 00516415056, August 1, 2022).....	20a
Disclosure of Fabricated Evidence , Transcript of Hearing, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division (ECF Doc 142, January 17, 2025).....	22a

**OPINION, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
(NOVEMBER 13, 2025)**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,
INCORPORATED; UNKNOWN HOUSTON
POLICE INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATOR;
JEFFERSON CAPITAL COLLECTION AGENCY;
IC SYSTEMS; EASY PAY LOANS; NEWMAN
BOOK PUBLISHING; CARLOS SAUZO; JUDGE L.
KORDUBA; DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION;
CITY OF PEARLAND; JOAQUINA SPIKES; CITY
OF HOUSTON; NATIONAL AUTO GROUP;
ELISSA MOHAMMED; CREDIT ACCEPTANCE,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 25-20068

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:24-CV-2882

Before: DENNIS, ENGELHARDT, and WILSON,
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

John Hall, a litigant proceeding *pro se*, filed this action asserting claims under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, and 1985. Specifically, Hall, a former employee of the Houston Police Department, alleges Defendants have conspired to retaliate against him for his investigation of crimes while he was an officer, and have fabricated records, hacked his electronics, denied him loans, interfered in housing and education contracts, and biased courts against him, among other allegations of misconduct.

Defendants filed motions to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).¹ During a hearing, the district court instructed Hall that his pleadings failed to “allege [] violations of the law” for the reasons outlined in the motions to dismiss and gave Hall leave to amend. After Hall filed his amended complaint, the district court issued an order explaining that Hall’s amended complaint “suffer[ed] from the same deficiencies [identified in the various motions to dismiss that] the Court identified in the previous versions of the complaint,” and Hall failed to allege sufficient facts in support of his claims under RICO, the FCRA, and the FDCPA. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968; 15 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.*; 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* The

* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5th Cir. R. 47.5.

¹ The motions to dismiss uniformly argue Hall failed to plead facts sufficient to state claims under Rule 12(b)(6).

court dismissed Hall's case with prejudice and denied all pending motions as moot. Hall timely appealed.

Our review is de novo.² Construing Hall's briefs "liberally," as we must for a *pro se* litigant, *see Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995), Hall fails to explain how the district court erred in dismissing his claims under Rule 12(b)(6). *Brinkmann v. Dall. Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987) (concluding that appellant forfeited an argument by failing to address the district court's analysis and explain how it erred). Hall generally argues the court applied a more stringent pleading standard. But he fails to cite portions of the record in support of this argument or otherwise explain how the court erred on these grounds beyond a conclusory level. *Rollins v. Home Depot USA*, 8 F.4th 393, 397 n.1 (5th Cir. 2021).³

² We accept Hall's version of the facts as true and view those facts in the light most favorable to him. Because Hall represents himself, we hold his complaint to a less strict standard than we would if it were written by a lawyer. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520–21 (1972) (citations omitted). Hall's complaint still must satisfy the requirement that we impose on all complaints in federal court: It must contain enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. *In re S. Scrap Material Co.*, 541 F.3d 584, 587 (5th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

³ We address three of Hall's remaining arguments. Hall argues (1) the district court prematurely dismissed Hall's case when it issued its "sua sponte dismissal," which violated his due process rights; (2) that the district court "emboldened defendants to continue" their conspiracy through relying on fabricated evidence outside the court record in violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56; and (3) the district court committed numerous instances of judicial misconduct. These challenges are without merit. First, before dismissing the action, the court gave Hall numerous opportunities to amend his complaint, held a hearing

For the foregoing reasons, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED. Hall's motion for judicial notice is DENIED AS MOOT.

on the pending motions to dismiss, explained to Hall the deficiencies in his complaint, permitted Hall to amend his complaint a fourth time, and advised him to seek counsel. The court did not unfairly dismiss the suit without giving Hall fair notice and an opportunity to respond. *Davoodi v. Aus. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 755 F.3d 307, 310 (5th Cir. 2014) (citing *Lozano v. Ocwen Fed. Bank, FSB*, 489 F.3d 636, 642–43 (5th Cir. 2007)) (explaining that in dismissing an action, fairness usually requires notice of the court's intention and an opportunity to respond). Second, because the district court assessed Hall's claims under Rule 12(b)(6), any argument pertaining to Rule 56 is inapplicable. And finally, Hall's arguments on appeal concerning judicial misconduct are not properly before us. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 351(a) (providing procedure to assert judicial misconduct complaint with clerk of court).

**JUDGMENT, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
(NOVEMBER 13, 2025)**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,
INCORPORATED; UNKNOWN HOUSTON
POLICE INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATOR;
JEFFERSON CAPITAL COLLECTION AGENCY;
IC SYSTEMS; EASY PAY LOANS; NEWMAN
BOOK PUBLISHING; CARLOS SAUZO; JUDGE
L. KORDUBA; DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION;
CITY OF PEARLAND; JOAQUINA SPIKES;
CITY OF HOUSTON; NATIONAL AUTO GROUP;
ELISSA MOHAMMED; CREDIT ACCEPTANCE,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 25-20068

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:24-CV-2882

Before: DENNIS, ENGELHARDT, and WILSON,
Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

This cause was considered on the record on appeal and the briefs on file.

IT IS ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the judgment of the District Court is AFFIRMED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Appellant pay to Appellees the costs on appeal to be taxed by the Clerk of this Court.

The judgment or mandate of this court shall issue 7 days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires, or 7 days after entry of an order denying a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion for stay of mandate, whichever is later. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(B). The court may shorten or extend the time by order. See 5th Cir. R. 41 I.O.P.

**FINAL JUDGMENT,
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION
(MAY 8, 2025)**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-2882

Before: Keith P. ELLISON, U.S. District Judge.

FINAL JUDGMENT

Plaintiff John E. Hall brought this suit against Defendants Experian Information Solutions, Inc., an Unknown Houston Police Internal Affairs Investigator, Jefferson Capital Collection Agency, IC Systems, Easy Pay Loans, Newman Book Publishing, Carlos Sauzo, Judge L. Korduba, the Department of Education, the City of Pearland, Joaquina Spikes, the city of Houston, National Auto Group, Elissa Mohammed, and Credit

Acceptance (“Defendants”). The Court dismissed the case for failure to state a claim, among other issues. *See* Doc. No. 130.

As a result, the court hereby ENTERS final judgment on all claims against these Defendants. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a), and for the reasons set forth at the hearing (which include failure to state a claim, duplicative allegations of earlier-asserted claims in a previously filed and pending lawsuit, qualified immunity, absolute immunity), final judgment is hereby ENTERED for all Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED. SIGNED at Houston, Texas on this the 8th of May, 2025.

/s/ Keith P. Ellison
U.S. District Judge

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE,
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION
(FEBRUARY 20, 2025)**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-2882

Before: Keith P. ELLISON, U.S. District Judge.

ORDER

Plaintiff John E. Hall brought this suit against Defendants Experian Information Solutions, Inc., an Unknown Houston Police Internal Affairs Investigator, Jefferson Capital Collection Agency, IC Systems, Easy Pay Loans, Newman Book Publishing, Carlos Sauzo, Judge L. Korduba, the Department of Education, the City of Pearland, Joaquina Spikes, the city of Houston, National Auto Group, Elissa Mohammed, and Credit

Acceptance (“Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges violations of various laws related to the Defendants’ alleged engagement “in a conspiracy to breach contracts, overcharge for [certain services]” as well as their independent violations “of the Fair Credit Reporting Act and the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act in order to collect unlawful debt, lower credit scores, deny credit, and deny employment.” (Doc. No. 5). In response, various Defendants filed Motions to Dismiss. (Docs. No. 34, 44, 46, 55, 60, 63, 65, 109.)

The Court heard arguments on these Motions on January 17th, 2025, where the Court noted several deficiencies in Plaintiff’s complaint. The Court allowed Plaintiff thirty (30) days to replead and submit a new version of an amended complaint by February 17th, 2024. *See* Minute Entry dated 01/17/2025. On February 18th, 2025, Plaintiff filed a 76 page Amended Complaint. ECF 128. However, this Amended Complaint suffers from the same deficiencies the Court identified in the previous versions of the complaint. Among other issues, Plaintiff fails to allege sufficient facts to support his claims for violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. These deficiencies, among others identified in the various Motions to Dismiss, are fatal to Plaintiff’s complaint.

The case therefore is DISMISSED WITH PRE-JUDICE for failure to state a claim. All pending motions in this case are deemed MOOT.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas on this the 20th day of February 2025.

/s/ Keith P. Ellison
U.S. District Judge

¹ This includes ECF Nos. 34, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68, 72, 73, 76, 77, 102, 106, 109, 111, 114, 117, 125, and 129.

**MINUTE ENTRY BY JUDGE REGARDING
COMPLAINT SUBMISSION, U.S. DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION
(JANUARY 17, 2025)**

Minute Entry for proceedings held before Judge Keith P Ellison. MOTION HEARING held on 1/17/2025. The Court directed that Plaintiff will have 30 days from this day (February 17th, 2025) to submit a new version of an amended complaint—not one that has already been submitted. The Court advised Plaintiff that if Plaintiff chooses to go forward with this matter with a new amended complaint, he will be subject to attorneys fees from all Defendants if his claims are unsuccessful. The Court highly encouraged Plaintiff to consult with the Volunteer Lawyers program, and heed their advice on the viability of his claims. Appearances: John Hall, Steve Zahn, Michelle Taylor, Whitney White, Jacob Bod, Eugene Martin, Rachel Fraser, Lisa Parker, Derrick Reed (Court Reporter: G. Dye) (Law clerk: T. Djukanovic)., filed. (aar4) (Entered: 01/17/2025)

**ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR
REHEARING EN BANC, U.S. COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
(DECEMBER 16, 2025)**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,
INCORPORATED; UNKNOWN HOUSTON
POLICE INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATOR;
JEFFERSON CAPITAL COLLECTION AGENCY;
IC SYSTEMS; EASY PAY LOANS; NEWMAN
BOOK PUBLISHING; CARLOS SAUZO; JUDGE L.
KORDUBA; DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION;
CITY OF PEARLAND; JOAQUINA SPIKES;
CITY OF HOUSTON; NATIONAL AUTO GROUP;
ELISSA MOHAMMED; CREDIT ACCEPTANCE,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 25-20068

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:24-CV-2882

Before: DENNIS, ENGELHARDT, and WILSON,
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The petition for panel rehearing is DENIED. Because no member of the panel or judge in regular active service requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc (Fed. R. App. P.40 and 5th Cir. R. 40), the petition for rehearing en banc is DENIED.

* Judge Don R. Willett did not participate in the consideration of the rehearing en banc.

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR FINDINGS
OF FACT, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS,
CASE NO. H-20-3740
(AUGUST 31, 2021)**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE CITY OF HOUSTON, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. H-20-3740

Before: Lynn N. HUGHES, U.S. District Judge.

ORDER

On August 27, 2021, John E. Hall moved for findings of fact and conclusions of law. He says that this court must prove “that the criminal investigation conducted on Hall was not illegal” and that this court “was not a co-conspirator” in obstructing this judicial process.

As the one who brought this case, Hall—not this Court nor the City of Houston—must show that his claims have merit. This court has reviewed the docu-

ments from the City, and they do not support his claims. He is not entitled to these confidential documents, and this court will not give them to him. His motion for findings of fact and conclusions of law “based on omissions, absence of negative findings, spoliage of evidence, and disputed issues” is denied.

Signed on August 31, 2021, at Houston, Texas.

/s/ Lynn N. Hughes
U.S. District Judge

**MOTION FOR FINDING OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, HOUSTON
DIVISION – ADDRESSING PRODUCTION
OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS RECORDS
(ECF CASE NO. 4: 20-CV-03740, DOC 90,
AUGUST 27, 2021)**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF HOUSTON
HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 4:20-CV-03740

ATTENTION: NATHAN OCHSNER, CLERK

**REQUEST FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSION OF LAW BASED ON
OMISSIONS, ABSENCE OF NEGATIVE
FINDINGS, SPOILAGE OF EVIDENCE
(PHOTO) AND DISPUTED ISSUES**

[...]

[ECF Doc 90, August 27, 2021, p.4]

. . . May 1, 2018. And due to the materiality of this matter, what fact finding evidence does Judge Hughes have to offer other than he personally has the capacity to read Hall's mind and determine that Hall would come to the same conclusion as he that the May 31, 2018 document which provided no complainant names had more probative value than the June 12, 2020 email which was provided by a live open records clerk, who could be cross examined, who provide Hall with the name of the ex-wife as the individual making a police complaint against Hall. The Malveaux complaint was suppose to include a photo. The failure of Judge Hughes to factually verify these acts of fraud reflects that Judge Hughes was bias and prejudice toward Hall. Therefore, Hall is requesting that the Judge explain why he didn't request a computer generated printout to determine that the June 12, 2020 document was available on May 1, 2018 when initially requested and whether HPD destroyed the Malveaux photo placed in Hall's internal affairs file without his knowledge.

With respect to the May 31, 2018 document offered by the City of Houston and police department, the content of the document made several substantial claims or allegations regarding a criminal investigation conducted by the police department and criminal investigators targeting Mr. Hall. A material fact in the May 31, 2018 document concerns whether during Judge Hughes in camera inspection did Judge Hughes verified that the pen register and wiretap investigations conducted on Mr. Hall were authorized and documented in compliance with federal statutes and state laws. It is Hall's contention that Judge Hughes' in camera review disclosed that the pen register and the wiretap

investigations conducted on Hall were illegal and not authorized by a Court of Law or Magistrate of competent jurisdiction. And therefore, Judge Hughes dismissed Hall's case to cover up the criminal offenses committed by the Houston Police Department. Hall . . .

[. . .]

Respectfully,

/s/ John E. Hall

Dr. John "Jay" Hall, pro se
17818 Running Brook Ln.
Spring, Texas 77379

**FINAL JUDGMENT, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT – AFFIRMATION
OF DISTRICT COURT’S IN CAMERA REVIEW
OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS RECORDS (ECF
CASE NO. 21-20451, DOC 00516415056,
AUGUST 1, 2022)**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOHN E. HALL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CITY OF HOUSTON; ART ACEVEDO, Houston
Police Chief; KRISTIE L. LEWIS, Police Attorney;
CHAIRMAN ANTHONY HALL, Former City
Attorney; MAY WALKER, Former Police Officer;
LEE P. BROWN, Former Mayor; MICHAEL
DIRDEN, Former Executive Chief; GAYLAND
MALVEAUX; C. O. BRADFORD, Former Police
Chief; J. DOTSON, Former Assistant Chief;
RENITA FERGUSON,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-20451

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
4:20-CV-3740

Before: RICHMAN, Chief Judge,
WIENER and WILLETT, Circuit Judges.

[. . .]

[ECF Doc 00516415056, August 1, 2022, p.10]

. . . valid 12(b)(6) motion does not violate [Hall's] right to a jury trial under the Seventh Amendment.”²⁵

IX. In-Camera Review

Hall finally objects to the district court's in-camera review of documents produced by the City of Houston. The court explained that it “has reviewed the documents from the City, and they do not support [Hall's] claims. He is not entitled to these confidential documents, and this court will not give them to him.” Hall cites inapplicable criminal law and out-of-circuit precedents that cannot provide a basis for his claim. “It is settled that in camera proceedings are an appropriate means to resolve disputed issues of privilege.”²⁶ Hall has thus not demonstrated that this evidentiary decision constituted error.

X. Conclusion

Hall has not presented any valid reason to disturb the district court's judgment, so we AFFIRM.

²⁵ *Hasse v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 748 F.3d 624, 631 n.5 (5th Cir. 2014).

²⁶ *In re Eisenberg*, 654 F.2d 1107, 1112 n.7 (5th Cir. Unit B Nov. 1981).

**DISCLOSURE OF FABRICATED EVIDENCE ,
TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING, U.S. DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION
(ECF DOC 142, JANUARY 17, 2025)**

[ECF Doc 142, January 17, 2025, Transcript, p.13]

... the law in that process, then that opens them up for liability.

THE COURT: You haven't identified—you haven't identified any breach of the law. You haven't identified a single one of them.

MR. HALL: Well, I believe I have addressed those factors, your Honor. Can I give you an example?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. HALL: Okay. I'm going to give you an example: You have Attorney Taylor who represents the City of Houston. Included in my pleadings is that the City of Houston submitted a document which is a May 31, 2018, document. The City of Houston submitted that in the court records.

When we do discovery of that document, we find out—and the City of Houston can respond—we find out that that document was fraudulent based—it was fabricated evidence based on an FBI agent claiming it was fabricated.

When we do further due diligence on the document, we found out that they used PIN registers. When we contacted the department of—the city, when we contact the State Departments, when we perused the court records, we found out that they

were using a PIN register that was not authorized by a judge.

And since they are under color of law, that's a 1983 violation. So, what I'm saying is you have that type of evidence

[. . .]