

Appendix A

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGMENT

In the Matter of the Welfare of the Child of: C.R. and
J.R., Parents

Appellate Court # A25-0935

Trial Court # 27-JV-25-1195

*Pursuant to a decision of the Minnesota Court
of Appeals duly made and entered, it is determined
and adjudged that the decision of the Hennepin
County District Court, Juvenile Division herein
appealed from be and the same hereby is affirmed and
judgment is entered accordingly.*

Dated and signed: November 20, 2025

FOR THE COURT

*Attest: s/Christ Rutherford-Block
Clerk of the Appellate Courts*

*By: s/Amy Schroeder
Assistant Clerk*

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS
TRANSCRIPT OF
JUDGMENT

I, Christa Rutherford-Block, Clerk of the Appellate Courts, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full and true copy of the Entry of Judgment in the cause therein entitled, as appears from the original record in my office; that I have carefully compared the within copy with said original and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom.

Witness my signature at the Minnesota Judicial Center, In the City of St. Paul November 20, 2025
Dated

Attest: *s/Christa Rutherford-Block*
Clerk of the Appellate Courts

By: *s/Amy Schroeder*
Assistant Clerk

Appendix B

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGMENT

Joseph Daryll Rued, also o/b/o W.O.R., a minor child,
Appellant, vs. Charles Webber, Respondent.

Appellate Court # A25-0362

Trial Court # 70-CV-24-7810

*Pursuant to a decision of the Minnesota Court
of Appeals duly made and entered, it is determined
and adjudged that the decision of the Scott County
District Court herein appealed from be and the same
hereby is affirmed and judgment is entered
accordingly.*

Dated and signed: December 19, 2025

FOR THE COURT

*Attest: s/Christ Rutherford-Block
Clerk of the Appellate Courts*

*By: s/Amy Schroeder
Assistant Clerk*

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS
TRANSCRIPT OF
JUDGMENT

I, Christa Rutherford-Block, Clerk of the Appellate Courts, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full and true copy of the Entry of Judgment in the cause therein entitled, as appears from the original record in my office; that I have carefully compared the within copy with said original and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom.

Witness my signature at the Minnesota Judicial Center, In the City of St. Paul December 19, 2025
Dated

Attest: *s/Christa Rutherford-Block*
Clerk of the Appellate Courts

By: *s/Amy Schroeder*
Assistant Clerk

Appendix C

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGMENT

In the Matter of the Welfare of the Child(ren) of: C.R.
and J.R., Parents

Appellate Court # A25-1150

Trial Court # 70-JV-25-7699

*Pursuant to a decision of the Minnesota Court
of Appeals duly made and entered, it is determined
and adjudged that the decision of the Scott County
District Court herein appealed from be and the same
hereby is affirmed and judgment is entered
accordingly.*

Dated and signed: December 26, 2025

FOR THE COURT

*Attest: s/Christ Rutherford-Block
Clerk of the Appellate Courts*

*By: s/Amy Schroeder
Assistant Clerk*

STATE OF MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS
TRANSCRIPT OF
JUDGMENT

I, Christa Rutherford-Block, Clerk of the Appellate Courts, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full and true copy of the Entry of Judgment in the cause therein entitled, as appears from the original record in my office; that I have carefully compared the within copy with said original and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom.

Witness my signature at the Minnesota Judicial Center, In the City of St. Paul December 26, 2025
Dated

Attest: *s/Christa Rutherford-Block*
Clerk of the Appellate Courts

By: *s/Amy Schroeder*
Assistant Clerk

Appendix D

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN SUPREME COURT
A25-0935

In the Matter of the Welfare of the Child of: C.R. and
J.R., parents

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Based upon all the files, records, and
proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition of
J.R., S.R., and L.R. for further review is denied.

Dated: November 14, 2025

GAÏTAS, J., took no part in the consideration
or decision of this case.

Appendix I

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN SUPREME COURT
A25-0362

Joseph Daryll Rued,
also o/b/o W.O.R., a minor child

Petitioner,

vs.

Charles Webber, et al.,

Respondents.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Based upon all the files, records, and
proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition of
Joseph Daryll Rued, also o/b/o W.O.R., a minor child
for further review is denied.

Dated: November 26, 2025

GAÏTAS, J., took no part in the consideration
or decision of this case.

Appendix F

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN SUPREME COURT
A25-0935

In the Matter of the Welfare of the Child(ren) of: C.R.
and J.R., parents

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Based upon all the files, records, and
proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition of
J.R., S.R., and L.R. for further review is denied.

Dated: December 19, 2025

GAÏTAS, J., took no part in the consideration
or decision of this case.

Appendix G

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN COURT OF APPEALS

A25-0935

ORDER OPINION

In the Matter of the Welfare	Hennepin County
of the Child of: C.R. and J.R.,	District Court File
Parents	No 27-JV-25-1195

Considered and decided by Reyes, Presiding
Judge; Worke, Judge; and Johnson, Judge.

**BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND
PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:**

1. On May 12, 2025, appellants paternal-grandparents Scott Rued and Leah Rued (grandparents) filed a petition in Hennepin County District Court alleging that their grandchild (child) was a child in need of protection or services (CHIPS). Appellant Joseph Rued is the child's non-custodial father (father).

2. In the petition, grandparents alleged that the child was CHIPS because, in respondent Catrina M. Rued's (mother) care, he was the victim of abuse, was without necessities, was without necessary

special care, was medically neglected, was without proper parental care, and was in a dangerous environment. In support of the petition, grandparents filed several thousand pages of legal documents that have been previously filed in matters involving appellants and directly or indirectly involving the child.

3. On May 13, 2025, the district court filed an order dismissing the petition, observing that “the relief sought . . . is to place the child in the care of his father.” The district court dismissed the petition because “the sole purpose of the petition is to modify custody . . . which is prohibited by Minn. Stat. § 260C.141, subd. 1 [(2024)].” The district court further stated that “Hennepin County is not the appropriate venue” because the child resided with mother in Scott County.

4. Appellants filed this appeal to challenge the dismissal of the CHIPS petition. Related appellate matters include: A25-1497, A25-1175, A25-1150, A25-0831, A25-0362, A25-0361, A25-0209, A25-0057, A24-2035, A24-1905, A24-1740, A24-1706, A24-1705, A24-0982, A24-0759, A24-0719, A23-1936, A23-1755, A23-1754, A23-1467, A23-1444, A23-1235, A23-1004, A23-0715, A23-0044, A22-1420, A22-1060, A22-0812, A22-0593, A21-1064, and A21-0798. Mother filed a letter with this court stating that appellants are rehashing fraud allegations that have been addressed in past cases.

5. This court uses an abuse-of-discretion standard to review a district court’s dismissal of a CHIPS petition for failure to establish a prima facie case for the relief sought. *In re Welfare of Child of*

D.L.D., 865 N.W.2d 315, 318 (Minn. App. 2015), rev. denied (Minn. July 20, 2015). A district court's interpretation and application of the CHIPS statute is reviewed de novo, *In re Welfare of Child of T.P.*, 747 N.W.2d 356, 360 (Minn. 2008), as is its interpretation of the rules of juvenile protection procedure, *In re Welfare of Child of R.K.*, 901 N.W.2d 156, 159 (Minn. 2017).

6. Appellants argue that the district court erred by concluding that the petition was filed solely as a means to modify custody. "Any reputable person, including . . . families, having knowledge of a child . . . who appears to be in need of protection or services . . . may petition the juvenile court . . . [and provide] a statement of facts that would establish, if proven, that there is a need for protection or services for the child." Minn. Stat. § 260C.141, subd. 1. "The [district] court may not allow a petition to proceed . . . if it appears that the sole purpose of the petition is to modify custody between the parents." *Id.*

7. Here, the record supports the district court's dismissal of the petition because "the sole purpose of the petition is to modify custody." Appellants do not dispute that the legal documents filed to support the petition have been filed in other matters in which appellants sought custody of the child. There is nothing in the filings suggesting that appellants are seeking reunification efforts with the child and mother; rather, the filings are replete with allegations of maltreatment and abuse and a conspiracy between several individuals and entities to fraudulently cover up the maltreatment and abuse.

8. For example, in *Rued v. Rued*, No. A22-0812, 2023 WL 193669, at *1 (Minn. App. Jan. 17, 2023), we stated the following:

Father's parents, Leah and Scott Rued . . . have attempted, with father's support, to obtain third-party custody of the child, and there has been a child in need of protection or services (CHIPS) proceeding in juvenile court concerning father's repeated allegations of abuse by mother and her extended family against the child...[W]e [previously] affirmed the district court's grant of sole physical and sole legal custody of the child to mother. . . . We concluded that the district court did not clearly err by finding that the child had not been sexually abused by mother or by mother's nonjoint son and daughter, and that the parties' child was not allergic to foods containing dairy or wheat.

9. This CHIPS petition is yet another filing in a blizzard of state and federal filings regarding matters that have already been resolved by the courts. The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing the petition.

10. Appellants also challenge the district court's venue ruling. "When it is alleged that a child is in need of protection or services, venue may be in the county where the child is found, in the county of residence, or in the county where the alleged conditions causing the child's need for protection or services occurred." Minn. Stat. § 260C.121, subd. 1 (2024).

11. Here, the district court stated that “the child is not a resident of Hennepin County [so] Hennepin County is not the appropriate venue.” Appellants argue that venue is proper because the condition causing the child to be CHIPS is what father alleges is conspiracy and fraud perpetuated by Hennepin County family court, Hennepin County juvenile court, and Hennepin County child protective services. But mother and the child live in Scott County, and that is where mother is allegedly failing in her parental duties, which would make Scott County the convenient location for rehabilitative services to assist mother and the child in reunification. That is, if the petition was not filed merely in an attempt to transfer custody to father. The district court properly applied the venue statute to determine that venue was improper in Hennepin County.

12. Lastly, appellants argue that court administration violated their constitutional rights by refusing to accept their post-decision filings to seek reconsideration of the dismissal.

13. Appellants “attempted to file [a] motion to amend and for relief from fraud on [May 27, 2025].” The district court found that appellants “delivered a large stack of filings containing over 125 pages of documents to court administration. . . . [And] demanded the documents be filed into the closed case.” The documents contained confidential items. Following review by legal staff, the confidential information was separated, and the public documents were filed and forwarded to the district court. Because the documents were filed and considered by the district court, this issue is moot. See *In re*

Inspection of Minn. Auto Specialties, Inc., 346 N.W.2d 657, 658 (Minn. 1984) (stating that courts hear only live controversies, and issues are moot when no remedy can be granted).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The district court's order dismissing the petition is affirmed.

2. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c), this order opinion is nonprecedential, except as law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel.

Dated: October 8, 2025 **BY THE COURT**

s/Renee L. Worke
Judge Renee L. Worke

Appendix H

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN COURT OF APPEALS

A25-0362

Joseph Daryll Rued, also
o/b/o W.O.R., a minor child

Appellant[s],

ORDER OPINION

vs.

Scott County

Charles Webber, [et al]

District Court File
No. 70-CV-24-7810

Respondent[s].

Considered and decided by Larkin, Presiding
Judge; Ross, Judge; and Bond, Judge.

**BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND
PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:**

1. In June 2024, appellant Joseph Daryll Rued sued respondent Judge Charles Webber, seeking a temporary restraining order requiring Judge Webber to reverse prior rulings made in a family-law matter. Judge Webber moved the district court to dismiss and to find that Rued is a frivolous litigant. On September 11, 2024, the district court dismissed the

case and issued an order to show cause why Rued should not be sanctioned under Minn. R. Civ. P. 11. Rued appealed the final judgment of dismissal, we affirmed, and the Minnesota Supreme Court denied review. *Rued ex rel. W.O.R. v. Webber*, No. A24-1706, 2025 WL 1291587 (Minn. App. Apr. 25, 2025), rev. denied (Minn. July 15, 2025).

2. On October 31, 2024, the district court held a hearing on its order to show cause and on the frivolous-litigant motion. Rued appeared at the hearing. On January 2, 2025, the district court filed orders determining Rued to be a frivolous litigant under Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 9.06(b) and imposing sanctions under Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(a)-(c). The district court's orders require Rued to pay \$20,000 in sanctions and meet preconditions for filing any future documents in district court. Rued appeals.

3. Rued first challenges the district court's frivolous-litigant determination. We review a district court's determination that a party is a frivolous litigant for an abuse of discretion. See *Szarzynski v. Szarzynski*, 732 N.W.2d 285, 290, 294-95 (Minn. App. 2007). A district court abuses its discretion if its findings of fact are unsupported by the record or if it improperly applies the law. *Honke v. Honke*, 960 N.W.2d 261, 265 (Minn. 2021).

4. A frivolous litigant is a person who repeatedly relitigates a final determination, repeatedly serves or files frivolous documents, or "institutes and maintains a claim that is not well grounded in fact and not warranted by existing law[.]" Minn. Gen.

R. Prac. 9.06(b). After notice and hearing on a motion to have a person declared a frivolous litigant, a district court may, if it determines the person to be a frivolous litigant, require the frivolous litigant to post security or impose preconditions that the frivolous litigant must meet to serve or file any new claims, motions, or requests. Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 9.01. The district court must consider the seven factors identified in Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 9.02(b) in making its determination.

5. In this case, the district court considered each of the seven factors outlined in Minn. Gen. R. Prac. 9.02(b) and made the following determinations that are supported by the record: (1) Rued has litigated the same issues, with adverse results, in state court cases several times; (2) Rued will not prevail on his claim given judicial immunity and because the relief sought is improper; (3) prior court decisions determined that Rued's claims against Judge Webber have no merit and Rued has expressed an intention to file continuous claims until the court reverses its prior rulings in the family-law matter; (4) Rued's claim forms the basis of three other lawsuits against Judge Webber, each of which has injured the efficient administration of justice; (5) Rued has previously paid over \$150,000 in attorney fees and was declared a frivolous litigant in two prior cases but continues to file claims despite these sanctions; (6) previous security requirements have not ensured adequate safeguards to frivolous filings and preconditions on filing are appropriate; and (7) there "is no reason to believe less severe sanctions will stop [Rued's] frivolous litigation" when such measures have failed in the past. Based on our careful review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not

abuse its discretion when it determined that Rued is a frivolous litigant and imposed preconditions on his ability to file documents in district court.

6. Rued contends that the district court lacked jurisdiction to consider the frivolous-litigant motion because he had filed a notice of appeal of the district court's September 11, 2024 dismissal order. When a district court order is appealed, the district court's "authority to make any order that affects the order or judgment appealed from" is "suspended." Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 108.01, subd. 2. However, this rule does not restrict the district court's jurisdiction over "matters independent of, supplemental to, or collateral to the order or judgment appealed from." *Id.* "Collateral matters, such as motions for sanctions . . . are independent of the underlying decision and the district court's consideration of those matters is permitted because it does not implicate the decision appealed from." *City of Waite Park v. Minn. Off. of Admin. Hearings*, 758 N.W.2d 347, 354 (Minn. App. 2008). Because the frivolous-litigant motion did not implicate the then pending appeal of the final judgment of dismissal, Rued's jurisdiction argument fails.

7. Rued next challenges the district court's order finding him in violation of Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(a)-(c) and imposing monetary sanctions in the amount of \$20,000. When a self-represented party presents a claim to the court, the party certifies that, to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief, the claim is not presented for an improper purpose, that the claim is warranted by existing law or an extension of that law, and that allegations and other factual contentions are supported by evidence.

Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(a)-(c). A district court may, on its own initiative, enter an order describing the “specific conduct that appears to violate” rule 11 and direct the party to show cause why it has not violated rule 11. Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(a)(2). Upon determining that a violation of rule 11 has occurred, a district court may impose sanctions. Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03. “We review the district court’s award of sanctions under [rule 11] for an abuse of discretion.” *In re Est. of Flatgard*, 14 N.W.3d 305, 313 (Minn. App. 2024) (quotation omitted), rev. denied (Minn. Mar. 18, 2025).

8. Rued claims that the district court failed to give proper notice under Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03. Rued’s argument is not supported by the record. In its show-cause order, the district court described the specific conduct that appeared to violate rule 11.02(a)-(c). Specifically, the district court’s order stated that Rued “has intentionally and grossly violated [r]ules 11.02(a)-(c) by repeatedly filing frivolous lawsuits without any evidentiary support, knowing that our state and federal courts have determined on numerous occasions that the issues have no merit” and that the current civil suit “is frivolous and brought to harass and needlessly increase costs of litigation.” Rued appeared at the show-cause hearing and argued that his fraud claims had not previously been litigated. In its frivolous litigant order, the district court determined that Rued “provided no reasonable explanation or excuse for his continuous frivolous, harassing, and intentional conduct” and sanctions were “appropriate and necessary to deter future frivolous filings.” These findings are more than amply supported by the record. Therefore, the district court did not abuse its

discretion by determining that Rued violated rule 11 and imposing monetary sanctions.

9. Rued claims that the district court's sanctions order deprived him of due process and that the sanctions and frivolous-litigant orders violate his First Amendment right to access the courts. Other than citing the constitutional provisions, Rued does not provide any legal authority or relevant analysis to support his contentions. See *State, Dep't of Labor & Indus. v. Wintz Parcel Drivers, Inc.*, 558 N.W.2d 480, 480 (Minn. 1997) (declining to address inadequately briefed issue). Regardless, Rued's arguments lack merit. Rued was provided notice and an opportunity to respond at the show-cause hearing. See *Staeheli v. City of St. Paul*, 732 N.W.2d 298, 304 (Minn. App. 2007) (stating that due process generally requires notice and opportunity to be heard). And Rued is not prevented from filing documents in court so long as he obtains permission and approval from the chief judge in the First Judicial District that his claims are at least "arguably meritorious" and are "compliant with applicable rule of court and procedure."

10. Rued's arguments relating to prior opinions of this court and district court rulings in other cases are not properly before us and we do not consider them. Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 140.01; see *Aaron Carlson Corp. v. Cohen*, 933 N.W.2d 63, 71 (Minn. 2019) (discussing impropriety of collateral attacks on prior rulings); see also *Sigurdson v. Isanti County*, 448 N.W.2d 62, 66 (Minn. 1989) (stating that "when the appellate court has ruled on a legal issue . . . [t]he issue decided becomes law of the case and may not be relitigated in the trial court or reexamined in a second appeal" (quotation omitted)).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The district court's order is affirmed.

2. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c), this order opinion is nonprecedential, except as law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel.

Dated: 9/18/25

BY THE COURT

s/Rachel F. Bond

Judge Rachel F. Bond

Appendix I

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN COURT OF APPEALS

A25-1150

ORDER OPINION

In the Matter of the Welfare
of the Child(ren) of: C.R. and
J.R., Parents

Scott County
District Court File
No 70-JV-25-7699

Considered and decided by Ross, Presiding
Judge; Johnson, Judge; and Ede, Judge.

**BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND
PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:**

The district court dismissed appellants' private child-in-need-of-protection-or-services petition for failing to establish probable cause of abuse, concluding that the petition was merely another in a series of attempts to modify custody and an impermissible collateral attack on prior court decisions. See Minn. Stat. § 260C.141, subd. 1(b) (2024). We have reviewed the district court's thoughtful analysis for an abuse of discretion, see *In re Welfare of D.L.D.*, 865 N.W.2d 315, 318 (Minn. App. 2015), rev. denied (Minn. July 20, 2015), and,

seeing none, we affirm its decision to dismiss the petition.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The district court's judgement is affirmed.
2. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c), this order opinion is nonprecedential, except as law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel.

Dated: November 12, 2025

BY THE COURT

s/Kevin G. Ross
Judge Kevin G. Ross

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**