

App. 145a-148a. Motion to Stay Divorce Proceedings Pending Resolution of Related criminal Matters and Motion to Appoint Forensic Accountant and Digital Investigator

App. 149a-150a Declaration for misleading the court

App. 151a. Affidavit of Service from Unknown third party bearing three or four different dates

App. 152a-155a Motion to Plaintiff, Ms. Neera, in Contempt for Perjury, Fraudulent Asset Transfer, Identity Theft, and Motion to Adjourn Trial

App. 156a-157a Notice of Filing of Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending full disposition of Defendant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari and any subsequent proceedings on remand in Defendant's claims under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983

App. 158a-164a Motion for Awarding Entire House to Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff

=====
END OF PETITION
=====

No. 25-5639

-2-

courts' ability to perform their judicial functions." *New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc. v. Council of City of New Orleans*, 491 U.S. 350, 368 (1989). Abstention is appropriate when "the underlying proceedings constitute an ongoing state judicial proceeding"; those "proceedings implicate important state interests"; and "there is an adequate opportunity in the state proceedings to raise a constitutional challenge." *Tindall v. Wayne Cnty. Friend of Ct.*, 269 F.3d 533, 538 (6th Cir. 2001). "Family relations are a traditional area of state concern," *Moore v. Sims*, 442 U.S. 415, 435 (1979), as is "administering certain aspects of [state] judicial systems," including the recusal of a judge, *Aaron v. O'Connor*, 914 F.3d 1010, 1017 (6th Cir. 2019) (quoting *Pennzoil Co. v. Texaco, Inc.*, 481 U.S. 1, 12–13 (1987)). Further, state courts are presumed capable of safeguarding federal constitutional rights. See *Middlesex Cnty. Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n*, 457 U.S. 423, 431 (1982).

Nonetheless, courts will not abstain if "extraordinary circumstances such as bad faith, harassment, flagrant unconstitutionality, or another unusual circumstance warrant[] equitable relief." *Tindall*, 269 F.3d at 538. None of those circumstances are present here, where Uppal is challenging the "the day-to-day conduct of state hearings," the constitutionality of the procedures used in those hearings, and the rulings made in his divorce proceedings. See *id.* at 539–40 (quoting *Sevier v. Turner*, 742 F.2d 262, 269–70 (6th Cir. 1984)); *Aaron*, 914 F.3d at 1018–19. Thus, abstention was appropriate.

Uppal also moves for an exemption from PACER fees. Courts may exempt indigent litigants from paying these fees, but exemptions "should be granted as the exception, not the rule." See Electronic Public Access Fee Schedule, Judicial Conference Policy Notes (reprinted with 28 U.S.C. § 1913).

Uppal relies only on his showing of indigency to support his request. But Uppal filed most of the docketed items in both the district court and this court. And he may obtain copies of the remainder—mostly court orders or opinions—for free, given that PACER fees are automatically

No. 25-5639

-3-

waived when accessing judicial opinions or viewing information and documents at courthouse public access terminals. *See* Electronic Public Access Fee Schedule (reprinted with 28 U.S.C. § 1913). Uppal fails to show why he could not access the other filings through these terminals.

Therefore, the motions to supplement are **GRANTED**, the petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion to waive PACER fees are **DENIED**, and the remaining motions are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT



Kelly L. Stephens, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

U.S. Mail Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 12/03/2025.

Case Name: In re: Rohit Uppal

Case Number: 25-5639

Docket Text:

ORDER filed : Therefore, the motions to supplement are GRANTED, the petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion to waive PACER fees are DENIED, and the remaining motions are DENIED AS MOOT. DENIED. No mandate to issue; [7439387-2] [7420341-2] [7415485-2] [7386051-2] [7386037-2] [7383295-2] [7379405-2] [7388119-2] [7379396-2] [7379372-2] [7386059-2] . Danny J. Boggs, Circuit Judge; Eugene E. Siler, Jr., Circuit Judge and Raymond M. Kethledge, Circuit Judge.

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Order

Notice will be sent to:

Mr. Rohit Uppal
7922 Knowledge Lane
Knoxville, TN 37958

A copy of this notice will be issued to:

Ms. LeAnna Wilson

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
Rohit Uppal, Petitioner/Appellant,
v.
Neera, Hon. Judge McMillan, Respondents/Appellees
Case No.: 25-5639

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

NOW COMES Rohit Uppal, Petitioner/Appellant, pro se, and respectfully moves this Court for leave to file a Supplemental Appendix containing five notarized affidavits that further substantiate the factual bases for his pending Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc and Emergency Motion for Stay.

In support thereof, Petitioner states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. Petitioner has pending before this Court a timely Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc, filed on December 10, 2025, which remains pending—now more than three months. In the underlying Knox County Court proceedings, Petitioner is the Defendant.
2. On February 20, 2026, the Court orally ruled that exhibits—including a notarized email from a University official, a notarized text message from Petitioner's daughter, and various notarized financial records (bank statements and bank note)—were inadmissible as hearsay and/or lacking proper authentication.
3. Critically, ALL of these exhibits are NOTARIZED. This fact was not fully addressed at the prior hearing, and it fundamentally alters the admissibility analysis for each category of evidence.

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