

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A: United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Opinion, April 9, 2026.	1a
Appendix B: United States District Court of Maryland, Letter Order, February 3, 2026 (ECF No. 1612).	4a
Appendix C: Federal Trade Commission, Letter, January 20, 2026 (ECF No. 1607).	6a
Appendix D: United States District Court of Maryland, Southern Division, Order Granting Receiver's Amended Motion for (I) Approval of Sale of Real Property Commonly Referred to as Sanctuary Belize and Kanantik, as well as Related Personal Property; and (II) Other Related Relief, May 13, 2025 (ECF No. 1588). . . .	8a
Appendix E: United States District Court of Maryland, Letter Order, May 2, 2025 (ECF No. 1581).	23a
Appendix F: United States District Court of Maryland, Deficiency Letter, April 8, 2025, and Letter to Chief Judge George L. Russell III, March 3, 2025 (ECF Nos. 1574 and 1574-1)	26a
Appendix G: United States District Court of Maryland, Memorandum, November 13, 2024 (ECF No. 1547)	30a

Appendix H: United States District Court
of Maryland, TRO Deficiency Letter, October
23, 2024 (ECF No. 1541) 32a

Appendix I: United States District Court
of Maryland, Southern Division, [Revised
Proposed] Orders Implementing Next Phase
of Consumer Redress and Consolidated
Reply to: (1) Represented Defendants'
Opposition to Receiver's Proposed Order
Implementing Next Phase of Consumer
Redress; and (2) FTC's Response in Support
of the Receiver's Proposed Order, Subject
to Revisions, May 11, 2023 (ECF No. 1437) 34a

Appendix J: United States District Court
of Maryland, Southern Division, Order
Regarding Implementation of the Redress
Plan, June 14, 2023 (ECF No. 1446) 63a

Appendix K: United States District Court
of Maryland, Southern Division, Order
Regarding Implementation of the Redress
Plan, August 18, 2022 (ECF No. 1373) 73a

Appendix L: United States District Court
of Maryland, Southern Division, [Proposed]
Order Governing Redress, January 21, 2021
(ECF No. 11171-1) 75a

Appendix M: United States District Court
of Maryland, Ex Parte Temporary Restraining
Order with Asset Freeze, Writs of *Ne Exeat*,
Appointment of a Temporary Receiver, and
Other Equitable Relief, and Order to Show
Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction Should
Not Issue, November 5, 2020 (ECF No. 13) . . . 143a

APPENDIX A

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 26-1130

In Re: BECKIE BODDIE,
Movant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Paula Xinis,
District Judge. (1:18-cv-03309-PX)

Submitted: March 31, 2026 Decided: April 9, 2026

Before WILKINSON, KING, and THACKER, Circuit
Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished
per curiam opinion.

Beckie R. Boddie, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this
circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Beckie Boddie appeals the district court's letter
order striking her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) motion

because she was not a party to the action in which her motion was filed.* Boddie complains that the district court denied her right to be heard, and she seeks to challenge the court's orders establishing a redress plan for fraud victims.

We construe Boddie's motion as a request to intervene in the district court proceedings. We discern no abuse of discretion in the court's refusal to allow Boddie to intervene. *See Gould v. Alleco, Inc.*, 883 F.2d 281, 284 (4th Cir. 1989) (providing standard of review). As for Boddie's challenge to the redress plan, “[g]enerally, nonparties to proceedings in the district court may not appeal from a district court’s judgment.” *Sky Cable, LLC v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 886 F.3d 375, 384 (4th Cir. 2018). “A limited exception arises if a nonparty has an interest in the litigation and actively participated in the particular stage of district court proceedings that is challenged on appeal.” *Id.*; *see Doe v. Pub. Citizen*, 749 F.3d 246, 259 (4th Cir. 2014) (describing exception as “nonparty appellate standing”). Here, Boddie did not actively participate in the district court proceedings, so she lacks nonparty appellate standing.

Accordingly, we affirm the denial of Boddie's request to intervene, and we dismiss the remainder of the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

* Boddie has filed motions for a stay, for injunction pending appeal, to supplement the record, and to address delay in the transmittal of the record. We deny each motion.

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*

APPENDIX B

[LETTERHEAD OF CHAMBERS OF PAULA
XINIS, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

February 3, 2026

Via ECF and U.S. Mail

Beckie Boddie
8210 Greatwood Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 891113

Re: 18-cv-3309, *In re Sanctuary Belize
Litigation*

LETTER ORDER

Dear Ms. Boddie,

As this Court has previously articulated to you at ECF No. 1547, you are not a party in this litigation and cannot move for relief in this action. Accordingly, the filing at ECF No. 1605 is STRICKEN. Please refer to ECF No. 1547 and consult the receiver's website at <https://sanctuarybelizereceivership.com/>.

Despite the informal nature of this correspondence, it constitutes an ORDER of the Court and shall be docketed as such.

Sincerely,

/S/

PAULA XINIS

United States District Judge

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