

APPENDIX

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A: Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit dismissing the appeal for lack of jurisdiction, *Washington v. United States*, No. 25-12299 (Oct. 9, 2025) 1a

Appendix B: Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit denying the motion for reconsideration, *Washington v. United States*, No. 25-12299 (Mar. 4, 2026) 2a

Appendix C: Relevant Orders or Opinions of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, *DeBose v. USA, et al.*, No. 8:21-cv-2127 4a

Appendix D: Supplemental District Court Orders (Denied Judicial Notice/Supplementation):

D-1: Order denying motion to vacate injunction (December 19, 2025)..... 8a

D-2: Order denying motion for clarification of injunction (December 19, 2025)..... 9a

Appendix E: Constitutional and Statutory Provisions:

U.S. Const. amend. V 10a

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 10a

11th Cir. R. 25-3 11a

APPENDIX A

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

No. 25-12299

ANGELA W. DEBOSE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

MICHAEL WASHINGTON,

LAVONNE WASHINGTON,

Intervenor Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

**ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION
(Filed March 4, 2026)**

Before JORDAN, ROSENBAUM, and BRASHER,
Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Angela DeBose, LaVonne Washington, and Michael Washington's motion to reconsider our October 9, 2025 order dismissing this appeal as to the Washingtons for lack of jurisdiction is DENIED.¹

1. The Washingtons' "Time Sensitive or Emergency Motion to Reinstate Appeal and for Reconsideration of Jurisdiction" and DeBose's "Motion to Reinstate Appeal and Clarify Jurisdictional Conflict," which supplemented the motion for reconsideration, are also DENIED.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-12299

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL IN PART (Filed October 9, 2025)

Before JORDAN, ROSENBAUM, and BRASHER,
Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Upon review of the record, this appeal is DISMISSED IN PART, sua sponte, for lack of jurisdiction. Angela DeBose, LaVonne Washington, and Michael Washington appeal the district court's order denying DeBose's motion to dissolve a filing injunction that was entered only against her.

We conclude that we do not have jurisdiction over the Washingtons' appeal because they lack appellate standing. *See Wolff v. Cash 4 Titles*, 351 F.3d 1348, 1353-54 (11th Cir. 2003) (providing that we lack jurisdiction over appeals brought by appellants without appellate standing). Because the district court denied the Washingtons' motion to intervene, they are not parties to the action with standing to appeal. *See Marino v. Ortiz*, 484 U.S. 301, 304 (1988) (providing that only parties to a lawsuit, or those who properly become parties, have standing to appeal). Furthermore, the Washingtons were not aggrieved by the order they attempt to challenge on appeal, as it was not directed at

them and did not affect their interests. *See Kimberly Regenesis, LLC v. Lee County*, 64 F.4th 1253, 1259 (11th Cir. 2023) (providing that only litigants who are aggrieved by the order or judgment at issue can appeal).

However, DeBose has appellate standing because she initiated the action and was aggrieved by the district court's order, which denied her request to dissolve the filing injunction against her. *See Marino*, 484 U.S. at 304; *Kimberly Regenesis, LLC*, 64 F.4th at 1259. Accordingly, the Washingtons' appeal is DISMISSED. The appeal may proceed as to DeBose's challenge to the district court's order denying her motion to dissolve the filing injunction. No motion for reconsideration may be filed unless it complies with the timing and other requirements of 11th Cir. R. 27-2 and all other applicable rules.

Accordingly, the Washingtons' appeal is DISMISSED. The appeal may proceed as to DeBose's challenge to the district court's order denying her motion to dissolve the filing injunction.

No motion for reconsideration may be filed unless it complies with the timing and other requirements of 11th Cir. R. 27-2 and all other applicable rules.

APPENDIX C

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS**

**ORDER DENYING INTERVENTION
(Filed February 24, 2025)**

A September 12, 2022 order (Doc. 81) dismisses with prejudice this action — the ninth successive action by Angela DeBose, an unmistakably vexatious litigant, against these defendants — and enjoins DeBose “from filing pro se in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida any complaint, petition, or claim that is (1) about her employment with USF; (2) about Ellucian, LP; (3) about any firm’s or lawyer’s representation of USF or Ellucian, LP; or (4) about DeBose’s litigation against USF, the members of the Board of Trustees, USF’s lawyers and Ellucian, LP.”

After dismissal, DeBose (1) twice moved (Docs. 83 and 107) to vacate the judgment, (2) moved (Doc. 86) for a new trial, (3) moved (Doc. 95) to compel USF to comply with a subpoena issued after the dismissal, (4) moved (Doc. 100) to hold a non-party in civil contempt after the non-party refused to answer a different subpoena issued after the dismissal, (5) moved (Doc. 102) to re-open the case, (6) and moved (Doc. 108) to disqualify the presiding judge. Several earlier orders (Docs. 89, 96, 98, 101, 106, and 109) deny each motion. DeBose appealed (Doc. 87) the earlier order (Doc. 81) that dismisses this action with prejudice and that imposes a limited filing injunction, and the Eleventh Circuit affirmed¹ (Docs. 114 and 115) each ruling. Almost a year after the

Eleventh Circuit's judgment (Doc. 115), DeBose again moves (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge. Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118) to intervene. The presiding judge in this action also presides over *Angela DeBose v. Primerica Life Insurance Company*, 8:24-cv-2433- SDM-NHA (the Primerica action), in which DeBose is a party.² DeBose moved (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433) to disqualify the presiding judge in the Primerica action, and a December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) denies DeBose's motion (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433). According to DeBose, the presiding judge must recuse himself in this action because the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) in the Primerica action "demonstrates bias against [DeBose], which could impact the fairness of future proceedings." (Doc. 117 at 2)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), judge must "disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." The standard for determining the presence of a "reasonable question" about a judge's impartiality is an "objective" standard. In other words, the issue is whether a reasonable, informed, and disinterested third-party would have a substantial question about the judge's impartiality. But under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), the alleged bias must arise from something other than an adverse ruling. "[I]t is well settled that the allegation of bias must show that the bias is personal as distinguished from judicial in nature. As a result, except where pervasive bias is shown, a judge's rulings in the same or a related case are not a sufficient basis for recusal." *Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234, 1239 (11th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). See

also *Byrne v. Nezhat*, 261 F.3d 1075, 1103 (11th Cir. 2001) (“[A]dverse rulings alone do not provide a party with a basis for holding that the court’s impartiality is in doubt.”). Like every other order, the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) is “judicial in nature,” and my information about DeBose is limited to information disclosed in litigation. Accordingly, DeBose’s motion (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge is **DENIED**.

Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118)) to “intervene on behalf of the Estate of Patricia Ann Washington in this action,” move to reopen this case, and move to disqualify the presiding judge. Under Rule 24(a)(2), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a non-party can intervene as of right if the nonparty timely “claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant’s ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.” And under Rule 24(b)(1), a district court may permit intervention if a non-party timely moves and asserts “a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.”

LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington assert that they are beneficiaries to Patricia Washington’s estate and that DeBose, the personal representative of Patricia Washington’s estate, “cannot fully protect[]” their interest in the estate. (Doc. 118 at 1) Because DeBose’s claims in this action do not involve Patricia Ann Washington’s estate, LaVonne

Washington and Michael Washington have failed to assert a cognizable interest relating to "the subject of the action." And because an earlier order (Doc. 81) dismisses this action with prejudice, no action exists in which to intervene. LaVonne Washington's and Michael Washington's motion (Doc. 118) to intervene is **DENIED**. And because LaVonne Washington and Micheal Washington are not parties, their requests to disqualify the presiding judge and to re-open the case are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on February 24, 2025.

/s Steven D. Merryday
United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS**

SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT COURT ORDERS

D-1: Order Denying Motion to Vacate Injunction (Filed Dec. 19, 2025)

LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington, unsuccessful intervenors,¹ move (Doc. 140) to “vacate the injunction” (Doc. 81) entered on September 12, 2022, against the plaintiff Angela DeBose. Because the injunction is carefully circumscribed, explicit, unambiguous, and applicable to Angela Debose only, the motion is DENIED.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on December 19, 2025.

/s Steven D. Merryday
United States District Judge

¹ A previous order (Doc. 119) denied LaVonne and Michael Washington’s motion (Doc. 118) to intervene because they “failed to assert a cognizable interest relating to the ‘subject of the action.’”

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS

**D-2: Order Denying Motion for Clarification
(Filed Dec. 19, 2025)**

The plaintiff moves (Doc. 141) for clarification of the injunction (Doc. 81) entered against her on September 12, 2022. As stated in the injunction:

Angela DeBose is ENJOINED from filing pro se in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida any complaint, petition, or claim that is (1) about her employment with USF, (2) about Ellucian, LP, (3) about any firm's or lawyer's representation of USF or Ellucian, LP, or (4) about Debose's litigation against USF, the members of the Board of Trustees, USF's lawyers and Ellucian, LP. DeBose must not file such a paper without the signature of a lawyer admitted to The Florida Bar and the bar of the Middle District of Florida. Nothing in this order prevents DeBose from filing an appeal in this action (or in any other action).

(Doc. 81 at 15)

Because the order is carefully circumscribed, explicit, and unambiguous, the plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on December 19, 2025.

/s Steven D. Merryday
United States District Judge

APPENDIX E

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY
PROVISIONS**

U.S. Const. amend. V

No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24. Intervention

(a) Intervention of Right. On timely motion, the court must permit anyone to intervene who:

(1) is given an unconditional right to intervene by a federal statute; or

(2) claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.

(b) Permissive Intervention.

(1) *In General*. On timely motion, the court may permit anyone to intervene who:

(A) is given a conditional right to intervene by a federal statute; or

(B) has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.

11th Cir. R. 25-3. Electronic Case Files (ECF) System

(a) The court's Electronic Case Files (ECF) system is the mandatory method for all filings by an attorney, unless the attorney is granted an exemption for good cause.

(b) A party represented by an attorney must file all documents electronically.

(c) A pro se party is not required to file documents electronically, but is encouraged to do so. A pro se party who is not incarcerated may request to file and serve documents through the ECF system by registering at www.pacer.gov. Once a pro se party has registered to use the ECF system, that party must use the ECF system for all subsequent filings in that case unless the court, for good cause, grants a request to opt out.

(d) Even when a document is filed electronically, the clerk may require the filing of paper copies of the appendix as provided in 11th Cir. R. 30-1.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

ANGELA DEBOSE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS

THE UNITED STATES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

A September 12, 2022 order (Doc. 81) dismisses with prejudice this action — the ninth successive action by Angela DeBose, an unmistakably vexatious litigant, against these defendants — and enjoins DeBose “from filing pro se in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida any complaint, petition, or claim that is (1) about her employment with USF; (2) about Ellucian, LP; (3) about any firm’s or lawyer’s representation of USF or Ellucian, LP; or (4) about DeBose’s litigation against USF, the members of the Board of Trustees, USF’s lawyers and Ellucian, LP.”

After dismissal, DeBose (1) twice moved (Docs. 83 and 107) to vacate the judgment, (2) moved (Doc. 86) for a new trial, (3) moved (Doc. 95) to compel USF to comply with a subpoena issued after the dismissal, (4) moved (Doc. 100) to hold a non-party in civil contempt after the non-party refused to answer a different subpoena issued after the dismissal, (5) moved (Doc. 102) to re-open the case, (6) and

moved (Doc. 108) to disqualify the presiding judge. Several earlier orders (Docs. 89, 96, 98, 101, 106, and 109) deny each motion. DeBose appealed (Doc. 87) the earlier order (Doc. 81) that dismisses this action with prejudice and that imposes a limited filing injunction, and the Eleventh Circuit affirmed¹ (Docs. 114 and 115) each ruling.

Almost a year after the Eleventh Circuit's judgment (Doc. 115), DeBose again moves (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge. Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118) to intervene. The presiding judge in this action also presides over *Angela DeBose v. Primerica Life Insurance Company*, 8:24-cv-2433-SDM-NHA (the Primerica action), in which DeBose is a party.² DeBose moved (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433) to disqualify the presiding judge in the Primerica action, and a December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) denies DeBose's motion (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433). According to DeBose, the presiding judge must recuse himself in this action because the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) in the Primerica action "demonstrates bias against [DeBose], which could impact the fairness of future proceedings." (Doc. 117 at 2)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), judge must "disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." The standard for determining the presence of a "reasonable question" about a judge's impartiality is an "objective" standard. In other words, the issue is whether a reasonable, informed, and

¹ *DeBose v. United States*, No. 22-13380, 2024 WL 4896699 (11th Cir. Feb. 8, 2024)

² In the Primerica action, DeBose brings claims on behalf of Patricia Ann Washington's estate.

disinterested third-party would have a substantial question about the judge's impartiality. But under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), the alleged bias must arise from something other than an adverse ruling. "[I]t is well settled that the allegation of bias must show that the bias is personal as distinguished from judicial in nature. As a result, except where pervasive bias is shown, a judge's rulings in the same or a related case are not a sufficient basis for recusal." *Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234, 1239 (11th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). *See also Byrne v. Nezhat*, 261 F.3d 1075, 1103 (11th Cir. 2001) ("[A]dverse rulings alone do not provide a party with a basis for holding that the court's impartiality is in doubt."). Like every other order, the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) is "judicial in nature," and my information about DeBose is limited to information disclosed in litigation. Accordingly, DeBose's motion (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge is **DENIED**.

Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118)) to "intervene on behalf of the Estate of Patricia Ann Washington in this action," move to reopen this case, and move to disqualify the presiding judge. Under Rule 24(a)(2), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a non-party can intervene as of right if the non-party timely "claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest." And under Rule 24(b)(1), a district court may permit intervention if a non-party timely moves and asserts "a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact."

LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington assert that they are beneficiaries to Patricia Washington's estate and that DeBose, the personal representative of Patricia Washington's estate, "cannot fully protect[]" their interest in the estate. (Doc. 118 at 1) Because DeBose's claims in this action do not involve Patricia Ann Washington's estate, LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington have failed to assert a cognizable interest relating to "the subject of the action." And because an earlier order (Doc. 81) dismisses this action with prejudice, no action exists in which to intervene. LaVonne Washington's and Michael Washington's motion (Doc. 118) to intervene is **DENIED**. And because LaVonne Washington and Micheal Washington are not parties, their requests to disqualify the presiding judge and to re-open the case are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on February 24, 2025.



STEVEN D. MERRYDAY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

ANGELA DEBOSE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS

THE UNITED STATES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

A September 12, 2022 order (Doc. 81) dismisses with prejudice this action — the ninth successive action by Angela DeBose, an unmistakably vexatious litigant, against these defendants — and enjoins DeBose “from filing pro se in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida any complaint, petition, or claim that is (1) about her employment with USF; (2) about Ellucian, LP; (3) about any firm’s or lawyer’s representation of USF or Ellucian, LP; or (4) about DeBose’s litigation against USF, the members of the Board of Trustees, USF’s lawyers and Ellucian, LP.”

After dismissal, DeBose (1) twice moved (Docs. 83 and 107) to vacate the judgment, (2) moved (Doc. 86) for a new trial, (3) moved (Doc. 95) to compel USF to comply with a subpoena issued after the dismissal, (4) moved (Doc. 100) to hold a non-party in civil contempt after the non-party refused to answer a different subpoena issued after the dismissal, (5) moved (Doc. 102) to re-open the case, (6) and

moved (Doc. 108) to disqualify the presiding judge. Several earlier orders (Docs. 89, 96, 98, 101, 106, and 109) deny each motion. DeBose appealed (Doc. 87) the earlier order (Doc. 81) that dismisses this action with prejudice and that imposes a limited filing injunction, and the Eleventh Circuit affirmed¹ (Docs. 114 and 115) each ruling.

Almost a year after the Eleventh Circuit's judgment (Doc. 115), DeBose again moves (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge. Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118) to intervene. The presiding judge in this action also presides over *Angela DeBose v. Primerica Life Insurance Company*, 8:24-cv-2433-SDM-NHA (the Primerica action), in which DeBose is a party.² DeBose moved (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433) to disqualify the presiding judge in the Primerica action, and a December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) denies DeBose's motion (Doc. 9 in 24-cv-2433). According to DeBose, the presiding judge must recuse himself in this action because the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) in the Primerica action "demonstrates bias against [DeBose], which could impact the fairness of future proceedings." (Doc. 117 at 2)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), judge must "disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." The standard for determining the presence of a "reasonable question" about a judge's impartiality is an "objective" standard. In other words, the issue is whether a reasonable, informed, and

¹ *DeBose v. United States*, No. 22-13380, 2024 WL 4896699 (11th Cir. Feb. 8, 2024)

² In the Primerica action, DeBose brings claims on behalf of Patricia Ann Washington's estate.

disinterested third-party would have a substantial question about the judge's impartiality. But under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), the alleged bias must arise from something other than an adverse ruling. "[I]t is well settled that the allegation of bias must show that the bias is personal as distinguished from judicial in nature. As a result, except where pervasive bias is shown, a judge's rulings in the same or a related case are not a sufficient basis for recusal." *Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234, 1239 (11th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). *See also Byrne v. Nezhat*, 261 F.3d 1075, 1103 (11th Cir. 2001) ("[A]dverse rulings alone do not provide a party with a basis for holding that the court's impartiality is in doubt."). Like every other order, the December 4, 2024 order (Doc. 16 in 24-cv-2433) is "judicial in nature," and my information about DeBose is limited to information disclosed in litigation. Accordingly, DeBose's motion (Doc. 117) to disqualify the presiding judge is **DENIED**.

Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington move (Doc. 118)) to "intervene on behalf of the Estate of Patricia Ann Washington in this action," move to reopen this case, and move to disqualify the presiding judge. Under Rule 24(a)(2), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a non-party can intervene as of right if the non-party timely "claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest." And under Rule 24(b)(1), a district court may permit intervention if a non-party timely moves and asserts "a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact."

LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington assert that they are beneficiaries to Patricia Washington's estate and that DeBose, the personal representative of Patricia Washington's estate, "cannot fully protect[]" their interest in the estate. (Doc. 118 at 1) Because DeBose's claims in this action do not involve Patricia Ann Washington's estate, LaVonne Washington and Michael Washington have failed to assert a cognizable interest relating to "the subject of the action." And because an earlier order (Doc. 81) dismisses this action with prejudice, no action exists in which to intervene. LaVonne Washington's and Michael Washington's motion (Doc. 118) to intervene is **DENIED**. And because LaVonne Washington and Micheal Washington are not parties, their requests to disqualify the presiding judge and to re-open the case are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on February 24, 2025.



STEVEN D. MERRYDAY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

ANGELA DEBOSE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 8:21-cv-2127-SDM-AAS

THE UNITED STATES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

The proposed intervenors, Lavonne Washington and Michael Washington, object (Doc. 126) that a clerical error appears in the docket entry for the "Eleventh Circuit Transcript Order Form." The docket entry (Doc. 124) states "TRANSCRIPT information form filed by Angela W. DeBose re 120 Notice of Appeal,. USCA number 25-10872. No transcript(s) requested." Michael Washington signed and filed the transcript order form. The motion (Doc. 126) is **GRANTED** to the extent that the clerk must delete "Angela W. Debose" from the docket text at Doc. 124 and substitute "Michael Washington" as the filer of the form. The proposed intervenors' motion (Doc. 127) to compel is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on June 27, 2025.



STEVEN D. MERRYDAY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE