

App-1

Appendix A

United States Court of Appeals
For the District of Columbia Circuit

No. 25-5458

September Term, 2025

1:25-cv-04303-UNA

Filed On: March 24, 2026

Harold Jean-Baptiste,

Appellant

v.

United States Department of Justice, et al.,

Appellees

**ON APPEAL FROM
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Before: Henderson, Pillard, and Pan, Circuit
Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing and the motion for other relief, it is

ORDERED that the motion for other relief be denied. Appellant has failed to demonstrate any entitlement to the relief sought. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's December 12, 2025 minute order be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court erred by denying him leave to file his complaint

App-2

because the complaint fails to satisfy the standard set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and contains the same type of frivolous claims that appellant has been enjoined from asserting. See Jean-Baptiste v. Dep't of Justice, No. 1:23-cv-02298 (D.D.C. Jan. 18, 2024). To the extent appellant challenges the pre-filing injunction on First Amendment grounds, appellant did not appeal that order, and he is thus precluded from litigating the issue in this case. See Allen v. McCurry, 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980); see also Martin-Trigona v. United States, 779 F.2d 72, 73 (D.C. Cir. 1985). Finally, appellant's allegations of judicial bias are without merit. See Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) ("[J]udicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion.").

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk

App-3

Appendix B

[Filed: Dec. 12, 2025]

United States District Court
For the District of Columbia

Harold Jean-Baptiste,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	No. 1:25-cv-04303-
United States Depart-	)	UNA
ment of Justice, et al.	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

[Caption Added in Reproduction]

MINUTE ORDER. The Court DENIES Plaintiff's 2 Motion for Leave to File Civil Action. Harold Jean-Baptiste is enjoined from filing any pro se complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia without first obtaining leave to file upon a showing that the complaint raises new, non-frivolous matters that have not been previously adjudicated. See Civil Case No. 1:23-cv-02298-TNM at Dkt. 18.

Pleadings by pro se litigants are subject to "less stringent standards[.]" *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), but are still governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, see *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) requires a complaint to contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), which "does not require detailed factual allegations, but [] demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation[.]" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (cleaned up). Plaintiff's Complaint fails to comply with the

App-4

minimal standard set forth in Rule 8(a). It does not articulate any actions taken by Defendant that caused the alleged harms to Plaintiff. Plaintiff's request for leave to file is therefore DENIED. Signed by Ana C. Reyes on 12/12/2025. (lcacr1) Modified on 12/12/2025 (zcll). Modified to correct signing judge on 12/19/2025 (znmw). (Entered: 12/12/2025)

App-5

Appendix C

United States Court of Appeals
For the District of Columbia Circuit

No. 25-5458

September Term, 2025

1:25-cv-04303-UNA

Filed On: June 4, 2026

Harold Jean-Baptiste,

Appellant

v.

United States Department of Justice, et al.,

Appellees

**ON APPEAL FROM
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge, and Henderson,
Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Katsas, Rao,
Walker, Childs, Pan, and Garcia, Circuit
Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing en banc, and the absence of a request by any member of the court for a vote, it is

ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

App-6

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk