

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA
CIVIL DIVISION

NEELAM TANEJA PERRY a/k/a
NEELAM TANEJA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO.: 24-003892-CI

ROBERT ROCHFORD, et. al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT

THIS CAUSE came before this Honorable Court on Tuesday, September 17, 2024 for an in-person hearing of the Motions to Strike Plaintiff’s Complaint dated September 6, 2024 filed by Defendants Julie Marcus, in her official capacity as Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections, and Amanda Coffey, in her official capacity as Managing Assistant County Attorney with the Pinellas County Attorney’s Office. This Court, having reviewed the record, heard argument and being otherwise fully advised of the premises, **FINDS** as follows.

1. Neelam Taneja Perry also known as Neelam Taneja, and formerly known as Neelam Taneja Uppal, initiated the present action pro se by filing a purported complaint seeking to contest the August 20, 2024 primary election results in Pinellas County and requesting injunctive relief.

2. In 2019, Plaintiff was sanctioned by the Honorable Amy M. Williams and Honorable Thomas Ramsberger in case number 18-000022-AP and definitively “barred from filing any further actions in the Sixth Judicial Circuit without an attorney currently licensed by the Florida Bar Association.” (hereinafter “2019 Sanctions Order). The sanctions were based on

Plaintiffs pattern of filing pro se misleading, frivolous, unfounded and outlandish claims. The Court also noted Plaintiff's extensive history of filing frivolous pro se claims, failure to follow applicable rules and procedures, asserting untimely claims, and prior sanctions. The Court identified fifteen (15) pro se suits filed by Plaintiff in which she was unsuccessful.

3. When a pro se litigant files frivolous law suits or pleadings in a lawsuit, the court has the authority to restrain such a litigant from abusing the legal system and prevent [her] from abusing, annoying or harassing those against whom such suits or pleadings have been filed.” *Balch v. HSBC Bank, USA, N.A.*, 128 So. 3d 179, 181 (Fla. 5th DCA 2013). “A pro se litigant who files frivolous pleadings [may] be prohibited from any further filings unless signed by a licensed attorney. *Id.*

4. A pro se litigant with a history of frivolous filings and abusive misuse of the judicial process may be sanctioned with a bar from further filings “unless submitted and signed by a member in good standing of The Florida Bar.” *Day v. Vinson*, 713 So. 2d 1016, 1016-17 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998). Further pro se filings in contradiction to a court's order should be summarily stricken. *Id.* at 1017; *see also Slizyk v. Smilack*, 734 So. 2d 1166 (Fla. 5th DCA 1999) (finding that the court has “inherent power to prevent abuse of court procedure by *inter alia* prohibiting *pro se* parties from appearing without the assistance of counsel); *Pettway v. State*, 725 So. 2d 428 (Fla. 2d DCA 1999) (imposing a bar against further pro se filings and ordering that future pro se filings be summarily stricken).

5. Plaintiff initiated review of the 2019 Sanctions Order by a writ of certiorari to the Second District Court of Appeal but filed a stipulation of settlement and dismissal which was treated as a notice of voluntary dismissal of the writ prior to obtaining any relief. Accordingly, the 2019 Sanctions Order and bar from filing pro se suits remains in effect.

6. Plaintiff acknowledged the existence of the 2019 Sanctions Order during the preliminary hearing before this Court on September 9, 2024, but incorrectly asserted that was not still in effect. Plaintiff has not identified any basis to conclude that the 2019 Sanctions Order was vacated, modified, or otherwise does not remain in full force and effect.

7. The 2019 Sanctions Order remains in full force and effect.

8. Plaintiff willfully and directly violated the 2019 Sanctions Order by filing the present action pro se, without an attorney licensed in Florida.

WHEREFORE, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Julie Marcus' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Complaint and Amanda Coffey's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Complaint are hereby **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's pro se Complaint titled "Emergency Injunction and Complaint to Contest to Primary Election Results of August 20, 2024 Based on Misconduct, Fraud, Corruption" dated August 29, 2024 is hereby **STRICKEN** and Plaintiff is prohibited from any further pro se filings in the present action. Plaintiff shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order to seek representation by an attorney licensed by the Florida Bar. This Court reserves jurisdiction to award sanctions including but not limited to attorney's fees and costs upon an appropriate motion.

DONE AND ORDERED at Clearwater, Pinellas County, Florida, this ____ day of

_____, 2024


24-003892-CI 9/17/2024 3:15:16 PM

Circuit Judge Patricia A. Muscarella
24-003892-CI 9/17/2024 3:15:16 PM

PATRICIA A. MUSCARELLA
Circuit Court Judge

Copies furnished to:

Neelam Taneja Perry, Plaintiff, Nneelu123@aol.com

Matthew D. Wolf, Esq., Attorney for Robert Rochford Matt@IWFFirm.com

Andrew Keefe, Esq., Attorney for Julie Marcus and Amanda Coffey, akeefe@pinellas.gov

John Peters, P.O. Box 6934, Lakeland, FL 33807

Ehsan Joarder, info@joarderforcongress.com, 2238 Passion Flower Way, 202, Odessa, FL 33556