Appendix A

[Filed: Jun. 4, 2026]

FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25–12004
Non-Argument Calendar

AHMED SHAIKH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

FOX NEWS NETWORK, LLC,
PARAMOUNT GLOBAL,
WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, INC.,
NBCUNIVERSAL MEDIA, LLC,
THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D. C. Docket No. 6:24–cv–01894–WWB–RMN

Before NEWSOM, BRASHER, and TJOFLAT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Ahmed Shaikh, proceeding pro se, sued five media companies for violating the federal Electronic Com-

munications Privacy Act ("ECPA") and Florida's Security of Communications Act and for committing the Florida torts of intrusion and intentional infliction of emotional distress. He alleged both diversity jurisdiction and federal question jurisdiction. The media companies moved to dismiss, arguing, among other things, that the District Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The District Court agreed and dismissed the case. We affirm.

I.

In a 267-page complaint, Shaikh alleged that while he was a student at St. Thomas University College of Law in Miami, Florida, professors at the school hacked his cell phone and laptop and installed hidden cameras with audio capability in his apartment and car. Then, with the help of law enforcement, they disseminated remote access to the devices and hidden cameras to various businesses. Shaikh later withdrew from law school and moved to Orlando, Florida. He alleged that, similar to what occurred in Miami, workers installed cameras with audio capability in his Orlando apartment, and people and businesses in Orlando were given access to those cameras.

Shaikh claimed that Fox News Network, LLC ("Fox News"); Paramount Global; Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc.; NBCUniversal Media, LLC ("NBC"); and The Walt Disney Company ("Disney") all illegally accessed the devices and cameras and used AI mind-

reading technology provided by the federal government to read his thoughts.[1]

As support for his claims, Shaikh explained, among other things, that various entertainment programs run by the media companies referenced phrases he had stated in his car, stated in Zoom interviews, searched on the internet, and typed in the complaint he was drafting for his lawsuits. They referenced specific songs he had listened to and memories he had. They showed images that mirrored expressions he made, chose guests based on his thoughts, and chose sponsors based on his internet search history. People in the various entertainment programs wore clothing similar to what he wore at home, engaged in actions similar to what he did in his car, and visibly and audibly reacted to his thoughts and actions while on screen. They also used and emphasized certain words to mock him, let him know they were watching him, and acknowledge their wrongful conduct.

The media companies filed motions to dismiss on various grounds.[2] They argued, as relevant here,

---

[1] Shaikh made similar allegations against various other individuals and entities, including Publix, Starbucks, Moe's, all NBA players, the NBA Commissioner, Ron Desantis, Ashley Moody, Merrick Garland, Chris Wray, the University of Central Florida, the University of Florida, and various law firms for which Shaikh has worked. Because none of these businesses or individuals are named defendants in this case, we omit their details for simplicity.

[2] Paramount Global, WarnerBros. Discovery, and NBC filed a joint motion. Fox News and Disney each filed their own motions.

that (1) the Court had no jurisdiction over the case because the complaint's allegations were insubstantial and frivolous and (2) the complaint failed to state a claim because it was devoid of plausible allegations. Shaikh responded to their motions and filed a Rule 11(c)(2) motion for sanctions against Disney for allegedly making false representations. The Magistrate Judge agreed with the media companies' jurisdictional arguments and did not address their other arguments. He issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") to grant the media companies' motions, to dismiss Shaikh's claims as "patently insubstantial under Rule 12(b)(1)," and to terminate all pending motions.

Shaikh objected,[3] arguing that the Magistrate Judge failed to properly consider evidence, disguised a merits-based challenge as a jurisdictional one, and made factual misrepresentations in his R&R. Shaikh also argued that the recommendation to terminate all pending motions was an attempt to "protect Disney from perjury." Shaikh then filed more motions, including a motion to submit a forensic report he prepared and a motion to supplement his pleadings regarding the media companies' agency relationships. The District Court overruled Shaikh's objections and adopted and confirmed the R&R. It dismissed Shaikh's complaint for lack of jurisdiction and directed the Clerk of Court to terminate all pending motions and close the case.

Shaikh timely appeals.

---

[3] Shaikh filed a "response" to the report and recommendation, which the District Court construed as an objection.

II.

We review de novo a district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *Pillow* v. *Bechtel Const., Inc.*, 201 F. 3d 1348, 1351 (11th Cir. 2000).

Federal district courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. *Patel* v. *Hamilton Med. Ctr., Inc.*, 967 F. 3d 1190, 1193 (11th Cir. 2020). Under diversity jurisdiction, they can hear civil actions between diverse citizens where the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000. 28 U. S. C. §1332. Under federal question jurisdiction, they can hear civil actions "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U. S. C. §1331.

When defendants challenge subject matter jurisdiction, they do so either facially or factually. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1); *Lawrence* v. *Dunbar*, 919 F. 2d 1525, 1529 (11th Cir. 1990). "Facial attacks challenge subject matter jurisdiction based on the allegations in the complaint." *Morrison* v. *Amway Corp.*, 323 F. 3d 920, 924 n.5 (11th Cir. 2003). When presented with one, the district court accepts the complaint's allegations as true and determines if they sufficiently allege jurisdiction. *Id.*; *Lawrence*, 919 F. 2d at 1529. Factual attacks are different. They "challenge the existence of subject matter jurisdiction in fact, irrespective of the pleadings." *Id.* (citation modified). As such, "no presumptive truthfulness attaches to [the] plaintiff's allegations, and the existence of disputed material facts will not preclude the trial court from evaluating for itself the merits of [the] jurisdictional claims." *Id.* (citation modified).

Federal courts have adopted a "standard" for district courts to follow when presented with factual attacks: where they implicate an element of the cause of action, the district court *generally* must "find that jurisdiction exists and deal with the objection as a direct attack on the merits of the plaintiff's case." *Id.* However, the court can dismiss on subject matter jurisdiction grounds "where the alleged claim under the Constitution or federal statutes clearly appears to be immaterial and made solely for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction or where such a claim is wholly insubstantial and frivolous." *Bell* v. *Hood*, 327 U. S. 678, 682–83, 66 S. Ct. 773, 776 (1946). Claims are "wholly insubstantial and frivolous" where they have "no plausible foundation." *Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Alabama* v. *Sanders*, 138 F. 3d 1347, 1352 (11th Cir. 1998).

At the outset, we note that our Court has seemingly never determined whether federal courts lack *diversity* jurisdiction where the claims are frivolous; our cases on the matter concern only *federal question* jurisdiction. *See, e. g., id.* at 1350; *see also Bell*, 327 U. S. at 679, 66 S. Ct. at 774. Shaikh, however, makes no argument that the District Court failed to consider his diversity jurisdiction allegation or that the District Court improperly denied diversity jurisdiction based on its conclusion that his claims were frivolous. We, therefore, will not address the issue ourselves. We treat Shaikh's claim of diversity jurisdiction as abandoned. *See United States* v. *Jernigan,* 341 F. 3d 1273, 1283 n.8 (11th Cir. 2003) (explaining that appellants must, "[a]t the very least, . .

. devote a discrete, substantial portion of his argumentation" to the issue they wish to appeal, otherwise the issue is abandoned).

Here, the media companies argued that there was no subject matter jurisdiction because Shaikh's claims were "wholly insubstantial and frivolous." This was a factual attack on subject matter jurisdiction, and it was excepted from the general requirement that courts must find jurisdiction and treat the attack as one on the merits. The Court therefore properly considered the arguments on subject matter jurisdiction grounds. And it properly dismissed the complaint.

Shaikh's allegations—that various media companies are watching him and reading his thoughts via hidden cameras and "clandestine" mind-reading technology "never before seen in the history of mankind" all for the purposes of "content creation," "news production," and "psychological torture"—were utterly divorced from reality. They had no plausible foundation and were clearly frivolous. There was no federal question jurisdiction for the Court to hear the case.[4]

---

[4] Shaikh specifically argued that, in ruling on the motions to dismiss, the Court (1) erroneously adopted the Magistrate Judge's inaccurate findings of fact and (2) erroneously failed to consider the forensic report and agency relationship documents that he had filed. We reject both arguments. First, the Magistrate Judge did not make findings of fact; he simply gave a summary of the allegations Shaikh made. Second, though courts "*may* consider" undisputed documents that are central to the plaintiff's claims when ruling on a motion to dismiss, *Johnson* v. *City of Atlanta*, 107 F. 4th 1292, 1300 (11th Cir. 2024)

III.

We affirm the District Court's dismissal of Shaikh's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED.

(emphasis added), Shaikh provides no cases showing that they *must* consider them. As such, even assuming the documents met the prerequisites for consideration, Shaikh does not show that the Court was required to consider them. We also reject Shaikh's arguments that the Court erred by failing to address the merits of his ECPA claim when it dismissed the case and by denying his Rule 11 motion against Disney without providing any discussion or analysis. For "once a federal court determines that it is without subject matter jurisdiction, the court is powerless to continue." *Univ. of S. Alabama* v. *Am. Tobacco Co.*, 168 F. 3d 405, 410 (11th Cir. 1999). All it can do is "announc[e] the fact [that it has no subject matter jurisdiction] and dismiss[] the cause." *Id.* (citation modified).

Appendix B

[Filed: May 20, 2025]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

AHMED SHAIKH,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 6:24–cv–1894–WWB–RMN

FOX NEWS NETWORK, LLC, PARAMOUNT GLOBAL, WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, INC., NBCUNIVERSAL MEDIA, LLC and THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY,

Defendants.

_____/

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Defendants Paramount Global, Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc., and NBCUniversal Media, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 32), Defendant Fox News Network, LLC's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 36) and Defendant The Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss Complaint (Doc. 47). Magistrate Judge Robert M. Norway issued a Report and Recommendation ("**R&R**," Doc. 71), in which he recommends that all three Motions be granted in part and that this case be dismissed as patently insubstantial under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). Plaintiff then filed

a Response, which the Court construes as an objection under Rule 72(b)(2). ("**Objection**," Doc. 73).

When a party objects to a magistrate judge's findings, the district court must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made." 28 U. S. C. §636(b)(1). The district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." *Id.* The district court must consider the record and factual issues independent of the magistrate judge's report, as de novo review is "essential to the constitutionality of [§] 636." *Jeffrey S.* v. *State Bd. of Educ.*, 896 F. 2d 507, 512 (11th Cir. 1990). The objecting party must state with particularity findings with which it disagrees, along with its basis for the disagreement. *Kohser* v. *Protective Life Corp.*, 649 F. App'x 774, 777 (11th Cir. 2016) (citing *Heath* v. *Jones*, 863 F. 2d 815, 822 (11th Cir. 1989)). The court will not consider "[f]rivolous, conclusive, or general objections." *Marsden* v. *Moore*, 847 F. 2d 1536, 1548 (11th Cir. 1988) (citation omitted).

Plaintiff first objects that the R&R fails to accurately or adequately recite the facts contained in the Complaint (Doc. 1). (Doc. 73 at 2). Although Plaintiff contends that this "raises serious concerns about the thoroughness of the review," the Court disagrees. First, Plaintiff's factual "clarifications" include allegations not found in the Complaint and therefore will not be considered. Further, the R&R contains reference to hundreds of paragraphs in the 267-page Complaint, including citation to general factual alle-

gations and to allegations specific to each Defendant. (*See generally* Doc. 71). Accordingly, after an independent de novo review of the Complaint and the R&R, the Court concludes that Magistrate Judge Norway thoroughly reviewed the Complaint and accurately summarized the facts therein. Plaintiff's objection to the contrary is conclusive and will be overruled without further discussion. The relevant factual background as set forth in the R&R is hereby adopted and made a part of this Order accordingly. (Doc. 71 at 2–3).[11]

Plaintiff next argues that the R&R is complicit in an "attempt to weaponize Rule 12(b)(1)" and disguise a merits-based challenge as a jurisdictional one. (Doc. 73 at 3). Attacks on subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1) come in two forms. "Facial attacks" require the Court to examine the complaint, taking the allegations therein as true, and to determine if the Plaintiff has adequately alleged a basis of subject matter jurisdiction. *Lawrence* v. *Dunbar*, 919 F. 2d 1525, 1528–29 (11th Cir. 1990). "Factual attacks" challenge "the existence of subject matter jurisdiction in fact, irrespective of the pleadings, and matters outside the pleadings, such as testimony and affidavits, are considered." *Id.* at 1529 (quotation omitted). However, a district court may "only rely

---

[1] The Court notes that the Complaint contains allegations regarding the perceived impartiality of the undersigned. (*See* Doc. 1, ¶¶ 73–78). However, Plaintiff has not filed a motion to recuse in this case and the allegations set forth in the Complaint do not give rise to a basis for recusal under 28 U. S. C. §455.

on Rule 12(b)(1) [i]f the facts necessary to sustain jurisdiction *do not implicate the merits of plaintiff's cause of action.*" *Morrison* v. *Amway Corp.*, 323 F. 3d 920, 925 (11th Cir. 2003) (quotation omitted). Plaintiff argues that Defendants' Motions implicate the merits of his claims, and thus the issues raised therein cannot be resolved under Rule 12(b)(1). *Id.*

Plaintiff's argument, however, fails to account for the exception that provides that claims may be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction "where the alleged claim under the Constitution or federal statutes . . . is wholly insubstantial and frivolous." *Bell* v. *Hood*, 327 U. S. 678, 682–83 (1946); *see also Neitzke* v. *Williams*, 490 U. S. 319, 327 n.6 (1989) ("A patently insubstantial complaint may be dismissed, for example, for want of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1)."); *Hagans* v. *Lavine*, 415 U. S. 528, 537–38 (1974) (holding that to dismiss a claim on this ground, the claim must be more than "doubtful or questionable," but rather "essentially fictitious" (quoting *Bailey* v. *Patterson*, 369 U. S. 31, 33 (1962))); *Best* v. *Kelly*, 39 F. 3d 328, 330 (D. C. Cir. 1994) (holding that district courts may dismiss claims which are "patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision" (quotation omitted)).

Evaluating the Complaint under this exception, the R&R concludes that Plaintiff's claims are entirely implausible and thus "so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit." (Doc. 71 at 4–5 (quoting *Gilberti* v. *Ctrs. for Disease Control*, No. 8:21-cv-954, 2021 WL 2274183, at *1 (M. D. Fla.

May 12, 2021))). Plaintiff does not rebut this conclusion, but instead merely repeats his allegations. Therefore, after review of the Complaint and the instant Motions, the Court agrees entirely with the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the R&R. Plaintiff's claims are so obviously insubstantial that they are "essentially fictious." *Hagans*, 415 U. S. at 537 (quotation omitted). Plaintiff's objection on this point will be overruled.

Plaintiff's final objection merely repeats his fantastical allegations and is therefore frivolous. It will be overruled without further discussion. *See Marsden*, 847 F. 2d at 1548. On a final note, after independent de novo review of the R&R, and noting no objections, the Court accepts the R&R's recommendation that Plaintiff is not a vexatious litigant. *See Riccard* v. *Prudential Ins. Co.*, 307 F. 3d 1277, 1298 (11th Cir. 2002). Plaintiff is cautioned, however, that sanctions may issue if he files additional lawsuits in this Court asserting similar allegations and claims.

Therefore, it is **ORDERED** and **ADJUDGED** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Objection (Doc. 73) is **OVERRULED**.
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 71) is **ADOPTED** and **CONFIRMED** and made part of this Order.
3. Defendants Paramount Global, Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc., and NBCUniversal Media, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 32), Defendant Fox News Network, LLC's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 36) and Defendant The

Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss Complaint (Doc. 47) are **GRANTED in part** as set forth in the R&R and **DENIED** in all other respects.

4. The Complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** as patently insubstantial under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1).
5. The Clerk is directed to terminate all other pending motions and close this case.

DONE AND ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on May 20, 2025.

/s/ Wendy W. Berger
WENDY W. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Party

Appendix C

[Filed: Mar. 19, 2025]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

AHMED SHAIKH, Plaintiff, vs. FOX NEWS NETWORK, LLC; PARAMOUNT GLOBAL; WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, INC.; NBCUNIVERSAL MEDIA, LLC; and THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, Defendants.	Case No. 6:24–cv–1894–WWB–RMN

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court without oral argument on the following:

1. Defendants Paramount Global, Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc., and NBCUniversal Media, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 32), filed December 23, 2024;

2. Defendant Fox News Network, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 36), filed December 30, 2024; and

3. Defendant The Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 47), filed January 17, 2025.

Plaintiff filed responses opposing each motion. Dkts. 45, 48, 49. Plaintiff also filed a supplemental response to the motion filed by The Walt Disney Company.[1] (Dkt. 56).

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, sues five media companies, Fox News Network, LLC ("Fox News"), Paramount Global ("Paramount"), Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc. ("Warner Brothers"), NBCUniversal Media, LLC ("NBC"), and The Walt Disney Company ("Disney"). Dkt. 1 ("Comp."). In a rambling complaint spanning 266 pages and containing 1,383 numbered paragraphs, Plaintiff asserts, by my count, more than 50 claims based on state and federal law against Defendants. *Id.* ¶¶ 615–849.

These claims are founded on Plaintiff's allegations that hidden cameras and microphones are installed in his apartment and car, and his cell phone and laptop are hacked. Comp. ¶¶ 1–2. According to Plaintiff, videos and audio recordings from these devices are being sent to Defendants, several businesses, law firms, unidentified individuals, municipal and state law enforcement agencies, podcasters, various media personalities, state elected officials, the players and commissioners of the National Basketball Associa-

---

[1] Although Plaintiff's supplemental response is improper, I will consider the arguments made in it. Put simply, Plaintiff's argument appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the relationship between parent and subsidiary corporations. In any event, because I recommend dismissing this case under Rule 12(b)(1), the Court need not dwell on the issue raised in the supplemental response.

tion, and others. *Id.* ¶¶ 3–5 (professors and Fox News), 7–8 (unnamed individuals and law enforcement), 13 (law firm), 17 (another law firm), 20, (Disney), 22 (a third law firm), 25–26 (podcasters), 27 (NBC), 30 (Paramount), 33 (Warner Brothers), 38 (NBA), 39 (state elected officials). And some of these individuals and organizations are using "mind-reading technology to read [Plaintiff's] thoughts." *Id.* ¶ 27.

As a result of this surveillance, Plaintiff contends he was forced to withdraw from law school. Comp. ¶ 6. He also asserts he is being injured by Defendants' use of the information and "content" obtained from this surveillance in their broadcasts. *Id.* ¶¶ 21, 25-26, 28–29, 31-32, 35, 37. The Complaint contains a multitude of other allegations, including that the presiding District Judge cannot "impartially adjudicate this case." *Id.* ¶ 77.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS AND ANALYSIS

As each Defendant argues, *see* Dkts. 32 at 4–7, 36 at 11–12, 47 at 6–8, federal courts lack subject matter jurisdiction over complaints that are "patently insubstantial." *Best* v. *Kelly*, 39 F. 3d 328, 330 (D. C. Cir. 1994) (internal citations omitted); *see also Neitzke* v. *Williams*, 490 U. S. 319, 327 n.6 (1989). To be dismissed on this ground under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), the claims must be "flimsier than 'doubtful or questionable' they must be 'essentially fictitious.'" *Best*, 39 F. 3d at 330 (quoting *Hagans* v. *Lavine*, 415 U. S. 528, 536–37 (1974)). Such claims include those that allege "bizarre con-

spiracy theories, any fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind [or] any sort of supernatural intervention." *Id.* at 330.

Courts have found that complaints based on allegations of extreme surveillance warrant dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1). For instance, in *Grady* v. *United States Department of Defense*, No. 1:16-cv-14293, 2017 WL 35531, at *2 (S. D. Fla. Jan. 4, 2017), the district court dismissed claims based on a "bizarre conspiracy theory" that involved implanted devices, electromagnetic waves, and other unbelievable allegations about national security letters. Similarly, the court in *Custis* v. *CIA*, 118 F. Supp. 3d 252 (D. D. C. 2015), dismissed constitutional and statutory claims based on the plaintiff's belief that the government had surgically implanted an electronic GPS device in her skull. Likewise, the court in *Curran* v. *Holder*, 626 F. Supp. 2d 30 (D. D. C. 2009), dismissed a pro se plaintiff's Fourth and Fifth Amendment and Privacy Act claims based on allegations of ongoing and pervasive government surveillance and harassment because the claims were so attenuated and insubstantial as to have no merit.

So too here. The complaint alleges that an unbelievably wide range of individuals, law enforcement agencies, government officials, and media companies (including the District Judge assigned to this case) are acting in concert, monitoring Plaintiff's every move, reading his mind, and reacting to this surveillance in real-time. *See, e. g.*, Compl. ¶¶ 196, 199-205, 210–13. Given the nature of these allegations and claims, I find that Plaintiff has failed to meet his

burden to establish that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction, even under the "less stringent standards" to which federal courts hold pro se litigants. *See Haines* v. *Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The allegations are of the type that courts routinely dismiss at this stage as patently insubstantial under Rule 12(b)(1). In other words, the complaint is "so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.'" *Gilberti* v. *Centers for Disease Control*, No. 8:21-cv-954, 2021 WL 2274183, at *2 (M.D. Fla. May 12, 2021) (quoting *Hagans*, 415 U.S. at 536-37). The Court should dismiss the complaint on that basis.[2]

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Accordingly, I respectfully **RECOMMEND**:

1. **GRANT** Defendants Paramount Global, Warner Bros. Discovery, Inc., and NBCUniversal Media, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 32);

2. **GRANT** Defendant Fox News Network, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 36);

3. **GRANT** Defendant The Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 47);

---

[2] Though Defendants ask the Court to prohibit Plaintiff from filing future lawsuits, I respectfully do not believe his actions to date warrant sanctions or a finding that he is a vexatious litigant. *See, e.g., Riccard* v. *Prudential Ins.*, 307 F.3d 1277, 1295 (11th Cir. 2002) (affirming trial court order prohibiting the plaintiff from filing any new action against the defendants because "[t]hree or four lawsuits over one employment relationship is enough"). But the Court should caution Plaintiff that sanctions may issue if he continues filing lawsuits asserting similar allegations and claims.

4. **DISMISS** this case as patently insubstantial under Rule 12(b)(1);
5. **TERMINATE** all remaining motions; and
6. **DIRECT** the Clerk to close this matter.

Notice to Parties

"Within 14 days after being served with a copy of [a report and recommendation], a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). "A party may respond to another party's objections within 14 days after being served with a copy." *Id.* A party's failure to serve and file specific objections to the proposed findings and recommendations alters review by the district judge and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, including waiver of the right to challenge anything to which no specific objection was made. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also* 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B); 11th Cir. R. 3-1.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida, on March 19, 2025.

/s/ Robert M. Norway
ROBERT M. NORWAY
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies to:

Ahmed Shaikh
7940 Wandering Way
Orlando, Florida 32836

Counsel of Record

Appendix D

[Filed: Jul. 21, 2026]

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-12004

AHMED SHAIKH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

FOX NEWS NETWORK, LLC,
PARAMOUNT GLOBAL,
WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, INC.,
NBCUNIVERSAL MEDIA, LLC,
THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D. C. Docket No. 6:24-cv-01894-WWB-RMN

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING AND PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC

Before NEWSOM, BRASHER, and TJOFLAT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

The Petition for Rehearing En Banc is DENIED, no judge in regular active service on the Court hav-

ing requested that the Court be polled on rehearing en banc. FRAP 40. The Petition for Panel Rehearing also is DENIED. FRAP 40.