

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

TERAH SPRAGUE CHADBROWN,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	2:11-cv-00145-GZS
)	
JAMES REED COLES,)	
)	
Defendant)	

JAMES R. COLES,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	2:11-cv-00219-GZS
)	
SUDIE REID COLES, a/k/a)	
Terah Sprague Chadbrown,)	
)	
Defendants)	

ORDER RE: MISCELLANEOUS FILINGS

Terah Sprague Chadbrown has two complaints pending in the court. One is a federal civil rights complaint filed by her against James Coles (2:11-cv-00145-GZS) and the other is an action removed to this court by Chadbrown from the West Bath District Court, State of Maine (2:11-cv-00219-GZS).¹ Today I have issued recommendations on a motion to dismiss in the former and a motion to remand in the latter.

While those recommendations are pending Chadbrown is not to submit any further miscellaneous filings with this Court, beyond her objection to the recommended decisions and this order, absent leave of court to do so. Pursuant to District of Maine Local Rule 72.1, any

¹ I refer to the defendant by her post-divorce name of Chadbrown, although the removed case was captioned in the state court with her former name.

objection to a dispositive motion recommendation shall not exceed 20 pages and any objection to this order shall not exceed ten pages. Since these cases arrived on the electronic docket, Chadbrown has demonstrated a propensity for filing copious papers and exhibits in addition to her multiple motions (and appeals) relating to recusal, joinder, consolidation, amendment, judge assignment, and sanctions. In both actions the clerk has docketed several sets of filings as miscellaneous correspondence or additional attachments because the documents were not legally cognizable pleadings. These submissions are far outside the purview of judicial review of the motion to dismiss and the motion to remand.

This Court has already forewarned Chadbrown that she could face sanctions, including dismissal of her actions, if she persisted with her frivolous filings. (2:11-cv-00145-GZS, Doc. No. 52.) Chief Judge Woodcock has also sternly cautioned Chadbrown that she could face filing restrictions:

Ms. Chadbrown continues to tread over the line by waging scurrilous personal attacks against the judges who rule against her demands. Ms. Chadbrown's pleadings have all the earmarks of an abusive and frivolous litigant and in accordance with Cok v. Family Court of Rhode Island, 985 F.2d 32 (1st Cir. 1993), the Court formally places Ms. Chadbrown on notice that if she continues this pattern of conduct, restrictions on her ability to file further motions "may be in the offing." Id. at 35

(2:11-cv-00219-GZS, Doc. No 51 at 3.)

For the time being this current order will prohibit further filings by Chadbrown beyond her objections to these orders until the resolution of these matters. If Chadbrown wishes to submit any other pleadings to the court, they must be accompanied by a motion for leave to file the specific pleading. See Cimini v. Massachusetts, C.A. No. 11-10211-GAO, 2011 WL

2119192, 6-7 (D.Mass. May 25, 2011).² In her motion Chadbrown should explain the type of pleading she seeks to file and attach to the pleading a courtesy paper copy of all papers and exhibits she wishes to file with the motion. The motion for leave to file additional pleadings shall not exceed three pages. The motion for leave to file will be presented to a judicial officer for review and, if allowed, Chadbrown may then have the additional motion placed on the docket. In the absence of a motion for leave to file and leave having been given from a judicial officer, the clerk is directed not to accept Chadbrown's miscellaneous filings and correspondence for docketing and all such submissions are to be returned to her immediately. It is further ordered that any direct letter correspondence between Chadbrown and a judicial officer will not be placed on the docket absent order from the judicial officer requiring the matter to be docketed. Duplicitous filings will cease.

CERTIFICATE

Any objection to this Order shall be filed in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72.

² Cimini fully discusses this pattern of frivolous filings and multiple litigation in the context of a state court domestic relations dispute:

[T]his is, essentially, Cimini's third attempt to obtain relief he cannot get in the state courts. It is abundantly clear that Cimini highly disputes orders concerning his child custody and support obligations, and firmly believes his federal due process rights have been violated by the state court actions and rulings because the state court failed to utilize British common law in its decisions. It is also abundantly clear, however, that Cimini continues to ignore the rulings of this Court in this regard. His repeated attempts to alter those state court rulings—despite his claims that he is not attempting to do so but is only seeking to vindicate common law rights—is to no avail, and simply bolsters this Court's view that Cimini's conduct is vexatious, malicious, and/or abusive, particularly in view of his two prior unsuccessful attempts for federal judicial review. The instant action presents nothing new, and the Court will not permit him to waste the judicial resources of this Court by further attempts to alter state court rulings in connection with family matters.

Accordingly, pursuant to this Court's inherent authority to manage cases, and pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Cimini is *PROHIBITED* from filing any further, motions, letters, or any other pleadings seeking to re-litigate the issues contained in this suit or in his two prior civil actions, and he is *WARNED* that he may be subject to sanctions, including an order enjoining him from future lawsuits without prior permission of the Court, should he fail to comply with this directive.

Id. (footnotes with case citations omitted).

So Ordered

November 2, 2011

/s/ Margaret J. Kravchuk
United States Magistrate Judge

SPRAGUE CHADBROWN v. COLES

Assigned to: JUDGE GEORGE Z. SINGAL

Referred to: MAGISTRATE JUDGE MARGARET J.
KRAVCHUK

Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 04/08/2011

Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights:

Other

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

**TERAH SPRAGUE
CHADBROWN**

represented by **TERAH SPRAGUE
CHADBROWN**
50 TUCKER AVENUE
CRANSTON, RI 02905
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

JAMES REED COLES

represented by **JONATHAN M. DAVIS**
POWERS & FRENCH
209 MAIN STREET
FREEPORT, ME 04032
207-865-3135
Email: jon@powersandfrench.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

COLES v. REID COLES

Assigned to: JUDGE GEORGE Z. SINGAL

Referred to: MAGISTRATE JUDGE MARGARET J.
KRAVCHUK

Case in other court: 11-01745

Cause: 28:1441 Notice of Removal

Date Filed: 05/27/2011

Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

JAMES R COLES

represented by **JONATHAN M. DAVIS**
POWERS & FRENCH
209 MAIN STREET

FREEPORT, ME 04032
207-865-3135
Email: jon@powersandfrench.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

SUDIE REID COLES

also known as

TERAH SPRAGUE CHADBROWN

represented by **SUDIE REID COLES**
50 TUCKER AVENUE
CRANSTON, RI 02905
PRO SE