1	WO	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	David Cramer,	No. CV-16-03522-PHX-JAT
10	Petitioner,	ORDER
11	V.	
12	State of Arizona, et al.,	
13	Respondents.	
14	Danding hafars the Court is Defendant?	s mation for constinue mummont to Federal
15	Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion for sanctions pursuant to Federal Puls of Civil Procedure 11. It is not clear that this Court has the outh criter to arter Puls 11.	
16	Rule of Civil Procedure 11. It is not clear that this Court has the authority to enter Rule 11	
17	sanctions after a case is closed. <i>See</i> Moore's Federal Practice § 11.22(2)(a) ("[T]he court	
18	should ordinarily impose [Rule 11] sanctions before issuing a final order."). However, this	
19	Court can issue a sanction under its inherent power.	
20	The inherent powers of federal courts are those that "are necessary to the exercise of all others." <i>Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper,</i> 447 U.S. 752, 764	
21	(1980) (quoting <i>United States v. Hudson</i> , 7 Cranch 32, 34, 3 L.Ed. 259 (1812)). The most common utilization of inherent powers is a contempt	
22	sanction levied to "protect[] the due and orderly administration of justice" and "maintain[] the authority and dignity of the court." <i>Cooke v. United</i>	
23	States, 267 U.S. 517, 539 (1925) Before awarding sanctions under its inherent powers, however, the court	
24	must make an explicit finding that [the] conduct "constituted or was tantamount to bad faith." <i>Roadway Express</i> , 447 U.S. at 767; see also In re	
25	<i>Keegan,</i> 78 F.3d at 436; <i>United States v</i> (9th Cir.1986).	v. Stoneberger, 805 F.2d 1391, 1393
26	Primus Auto. Fin. Servs., Inc. v. Batarse, 115 F.3d 644, 648 (9th Cir. 1997).	
27	Here, Petitioner has filed several documents into the record of this Court seemingly	
28	to attempt to trick the state officials into releasing him from custody. See Docs. 46, 47, 48,	

and 49. The Court finds this attempt at deception to be in bad faith.

To prevent Petitioner from continuing to attempt to use this Court's record for an improper purpose, the Court will enter the sanction of barring Petitioner or his agents from filing any additional documents in the record of this case. Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** granting the motion for sanctions (Doc. 50) for the reasons specified above.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall reject any future filings from Petitioner or purporting to be on behalf of Petitioner in this closed case.

Dated this 10th day of June, 2019.