

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 20-3487

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Lindsey E. Middlecamp

Defendant - Appellee

No. 20-3513

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Grace Elizabeth Miller; Catherine Marie Schaefer

Defendants - Appellees

No. 20-3516

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Grace Elizabeth Miller; Catherine Marie Schaefer

Defendants - Appellees

No. 20-3525

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Lindsey E. Middlecamp

Defendant - Appellee

No. 20-3528

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Jamie Kreil

Defendant - Appellee

No. 21-1132

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Jamie Kreil

Defendant - Appellee

No. 21-1134

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Lindsey E. Middlecamp

Defendant - Appellee

No. 21-1135

Brock Fredin

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Grace Elizabeth Miller; Catherine Marie Schaefer

Defendants - Appellees

Appeals from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: August 3, 2021
Filed: August 10, 2021
[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, KELLY, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals from his actions raising state law claims based on diversity jurisdiction, Brock Fredin challenges the district court's¹ orders (1) denying his motion to extend the discovery deadline; (2) granting summary judgment in favor of defendants; (3) imposing an injunction relating to certain videos and websites involving defendants, their counsel, and the district court; (4) ordering him to show cause why he did not comply with the injunction; and (5) declaring him a vexatious litigant and imposing filing restrictions.² After careful review of the record

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

²To the extent Fredin intended to challenge any other matters, he has waived the opportunity to do so. See Hess v. Ables, 714 F.3d 1048, 1051 n.2 (8th Cir. 2013) (where dismissal of claim is not challenged on appeal, claim is abandoned); Hacker

and the parties' arguments on appeal, we find no basis for reversal. See Jackson v. Reibold, 815 F.3d 1114, 1119 (8th Cir. 2016) (summary judgment standard of review); Life Plus Int'l v. Brown, 317 F.3d 799, 806 (8th Cir. 2003) (district court's decisions concerning its management of discovery process are reviewed for abuse of discretion); Bass v. Gen. Motors Corp., 150 F.3d 842, 851 (8th Cir. 1998) (standard of review of court's sanctions under inherent authority); In re Tyler, 839 F.2d 1290, 1290-91, 1290-95 (8th Cir. 1988) (per curiam) (upholding filing limitation on plaintiff who abused judicial process; courts have a "clear obligation" to exercise their authority to protect litigants from harassing, abusive, and meritless litigation).

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

v. Barnhart, 459 F.3d 934, 937 n.2 (8th Cir. 2006) (issue is deemed abandoned where party does not raise it in appellate brief).