

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 22-2406

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Jamie Kreil

Defendant - Appellee

No. 22-2407

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Grace Elizabeth Miller; Catherine Marie Schaefer

Defendants - Appellees

No. 22-2421

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Lindsey E. Middlecamp

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: January 13, 2023

Filed: January 31, 2023

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, BENTON, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, Brock Fredin returns to the court seeking review of various orders filed in his three related diversity tort actions. Having jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, this court affirms.

The last time the parties were before this court, orders were affirmed that (1) imposed an injunction relating to certain videos and websites involving defendants, their counsel, and the district court; and (2) directed Fredin to show cause why he did not comply with the injunction. *See Fredin v. Middlecamp*, 855 Fed. Appx. 314 (8th Cir. 2021) (unpublished per curiam), *reh'g and reh'g en banc denied*, (8th Cir. Nov. 10, 2021), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 1417 (2022). Fredin now appeals district court¹ orders that (1) imposed deferred sanctions for violating the injunction order;

¹The Honorable Susan Richard Nelson, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

and (2) denied his motions to recuse the district court judge, disqualify opposing counsel, and sanction defendants and their attorneys.

This court finds no basis for reversal. The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing monetary sanctions on Fredin. *See Willhite v. Collins*, 459 F.3d 866, 869 (8th Cir. 2006) (standard of review; this court accords substantial deference to district court’s determination that sanctions are warranted because of its familiarity with case); *see also Schlafly v. Eagle F.*, 970 F.3d 924, 937-38 (8th Cir. 2020) (discussing court’s reasonable considerations in imposing monetary sanction). Reversal also is not warranted based on the denial of Fredin’s motions to recuse the district court judge, disqualify opposing counsel, and sanction defendants and their attorneys. *See A.J. by L.B. v. Kierst*, 56 F.3d 849, 859 (8th Cir. 1995) (sanction of disqualification of counsel is reviewed for abuse of discretion); *cf. Gordon v. Unifund CCR Partners*, 345 F.3d 1028, 1030 (8th Cir. 2003) (court abused its discretion in granting Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 motion where party failed to comply with procedural requirements, including serving prepared motion on opposing party in compliance with 21-day “safe harbor” provision).

The district court’s orders are affirmed. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B. Fredin’s pending motion to disqualify and sanction counsel is denied.
