Page 1 of 3 CUC

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit Chicago, Illinois 60604

August 7, 2007

Before

Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, Circuit Judge

Hon. DANIEL A. MANION, Circuit Judge

Hon. DIANE P. WOOD, Circuit Judge

GOOGLE INCORPORATED, Plaintiff-Appellee,

Nos. 07-1569, 07-1612 and 07-1651

ν.

CENTRAL MANUFACTURING, INCORPORATED, also known as CENTRAL] MANUFACTURING COMPANY, also known as CENTRAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY INCORPORATED, also known as CENTRAL] MANUFACTURING COMPANY OF ILLINOIS, STEALTH INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED, also known as RENTAMARK, also known as RENTAMARK.COM, and RICHARD M. FOGEL, not individually, but as Chapter 7 Trustee for CENTRAL MANUFACTURING, INCORPORATED and STEALTH INDUSTRIES, Defendants.

APPEALS OF: LEO D. STOLLER

] Appeal from the United] States District Court for] the Northern District of l Illinois, Eastern Division.

1 No. 07 C 385

Virginia M. Kendall, Judge.

The following are before the court:

- REQUEST THAT COURT TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE OF 1. PLEADINGS FILED IN OTHER COURT CASES AND DICTIONARY DEFINITION OF THE "TERM' GOOGLE, filed on July 23, 2007, by the pro se petitioner.
- APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO RULE TO SHOW CAUSE 2. **ISSUED ON JULY 25, 2007**, filed on July 31, 2007, by the pro se petitioner.

- GOOGLE INC.'S REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO 3. RESPOND TO NON-PARTY STOLLER'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE, filed on July 30, 2007, by counsel for the appellee.
- APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO GOOGLE, INC.'S REQUEST 4. FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, filed on July 31, 2007, by the pro se petitioner.

Leo Stoller has a long history of frivolous litigation in the federal courts. See Cent. Mfg., Inc. v. Brett, No. 06-2083, 2007 WL 1965673 at *4 (7th Cir. July 9, 2007) (collecting cases). In response, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois barred Stoller from commencing any new lawsuits without permission of the court. See Executive Committee Order, No. 07 C 1435 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 8, 2007). We also warned Stoller that if he continued to submit frivolous filings to this court he would garner sanctions. See Stoller v. Pure Fishing, Inc., et al., No. 07-1936 (7th Cir. June 4, 2007) (order denying certification). When Stoller ignored our warning, we sanctioned him \$2,500. See In re Stoller, Nos. 07-1934 and 07-2536 (7th Cir. July 20, 2007) (order imposing sanction). Stoller, undeterred, filed this frivolous motion requesting unnecessary relief and attacking the character of an individual involved in the underlying litigation.

When we asked Stoller why he should not be sanctioned again, he explained that his motion was essential to his appeal and that he has a constitutional right to defend his appeal. But the constitution does not guarantee Stoller the right to file frivolous documents in this court. See, e.g., United States ex rel. Verdone v. Circuit Court for Taylor County, 73 F.3d 669, 674 (7th Cir. 1995); Coleman v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, 791 F.2d 68, 72 (7th Cir. 1986). Thus, we sanction Stoller again. Stoller paid our last sanction on July 31, 2007. Because he was undeterred by the amount, this time we increase it. We also warn him that continued frivolous or malicious filings will result in increased sanctions. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the #1 and #3 are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Stoller is fined \$10,000, payable to the Clerk of this Court. If this fine is not paid within 14 days, we will enter an order under Support Systems Int'l, Inc. v. Mack, 45 F.3d 185 (7th Cir. 1995), directing the clerks of all the federal courts in this circuit to return unfiled any papers submitted either directly or indirectly by or on behalf of Stoller unless and until he pays in full the sanction that has been imposed against him.