

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion issued as mandate by USCA5 Appeal Judges reformatted and sufficient to SCOTUS case 22-726 standard, (October 7, 2024 [Filed]; October 29, 2024 [Mandate] – Docket #51-1)	1a
Opinion (<u>3rd and final</u>) by TXSD Judge Keith Ellison reformatted and sufficient to SCOTUS case 22-726 standard, (August 01, 2024 – TXSD Docket #118)	3a
<u>Due to unethical legal ruses by the 5th Circuit</u> , the Pro Se Party resubmits an Excerpt from the 5 th Circuit's Pro Se Guidelines from 5 th Cir. Case 23-20432 in lieu of petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc for 5 th Cir. Case 24-20354, in order to remind the US Supreme Court that the issuance of any mandate does not affect his time, or his right, to file with the US Supreme Court. (April 25, 2024 [Filed]; May 17, 2024 [Mandate] - 5 th Cir. 23-20432, Dkt # 41-2)	5a

App. 1a

OPINION ISSUED AS MANDATE BY USCA5 APPEAL
JUDGES REFORMATTED AND SUFFICIENT TO
SCOTUS CASE 22-726 STANDARD, (OCTOBER 7, 2024
[FILED]; OCTOBER 29, 2024 [MANDATE] – DOCKET #51-

1)

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-20354

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

versus

DISNEY CORPORATION; THE WALT DISNEY
COMPANY; DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INCORPORATED;
DISNEY ABC INCORPORATED; DISNEY STORE USA,
L.L.C.; DISNEY/ABC INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION,

App. 2a

INCORPORATED, doing business as DISNEY - ABC
INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION; BUENA VISTA
TELEVISION, L.L.C., doing business as DISNEY - ABC
DOMESTIC TELEVISION; MAGICAL CRUISE
COMPANY, LIMITED, doing business as DISNEY
CRUISE LINES (DCL); BUENA VISTA THEATRICAL
GROUP, LIMITED, DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY
THEATRICAL GROUP,

Defendants – Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-765

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before: GRAVES, DUNCAN, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit*

Judges.

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that Appellees' opposed motion to dismiss
the appeal for lack of jurisdiction is GRANTED.

October 7, 2024 (FILED stamped); October 29, 2024 (5th

Cir. CM/EFC Docketed) by Lyle W. Cayce, Clerk.

OPINION (3RD AND FINAL) BY TXSD JUDGE KEITH
ELLISON REFORMATTED AND SUFFICIENT TO
SCOTUS CASE 22-726 STANDARD, (AUGUST 01, 2024 –
TXSD DOCKET #118)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	CIVIL ACTION
VS.	§	NO. 4:21-CV-0765
	§	
DISNEY CORPORATION, et al,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

FINAL JUDGMENT

On August 30, 2023, the Court issued an Order dismissing
this case. ECF No. 108. The claims against Defendant Walt
Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Inc.; Disney Stores
USA, LLC; Disney/ABC International Television, Inc.;

App. 4a

Buena Vista Television, LLC; Magical Cruise Company, Limited; and Buena Vista Theatrical Group LTD were dismissed without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction. *Id.* The claims against Disney ABC Inc. were dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim. *Id.* That judgment was affirmed by the Fifth Circuit on appeal. ECF No. 117.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a), and for the reasons set forth in that Order, final judgment is hereby **ENTERED** for Defendants. The Clerk is directed to administratively **CLOSE** this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed at Houston, Texas on August 1, 2024.

//SIGNED//
Keith P. Ellison
United States District Judge

DUE TO UNETHICAL LEGAL RUSES BY THE 5TH CIRCUIT. THE PRO SE PARTY RESUBMITS AN EXCERPT FROM THE 5TH CIRCUIT'S PRO SE GUIDELINES FROM 5TH CIR. CASE 23-20432 IN LIEU OF PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING AND REHEARING EN BANC FOR 5TH CIR. CASE 24-20354, IN ORDER TO REMIND THE US SUPREME COURT THAT THE ISSUANCE OF ANY MANDATE DOES NOT AFFECT HIS TIME, OR HIS RIGHT, TO FILE WITH THE US SUPREME COURT. (APRIL 25, 2024 [FILED]; MAY 17, 2024 [MANDATE] - 5TH CIR. 23-20432, DKT # 41-2)

The "MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW" states that: "Pro Se Cases. If you were unsuccessful in the district court and/or on appeal, and are considering filing a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, you do not need to file a motion for stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41. The issuance of

App. 6a

the mandate does not affect the time, or your right, to file
with the Supreme Court."