

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

**SHAWNDRIKA LAWRENCE,
Plaintiffs**

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO. 20-1615

**JEFFERSON PARISH PUBLIC
DEFENDERS, ET AL.,
Defendants**

SECTION: "E" (5)

ORDER AND REASONS

Before the Court is Plaintiff Shawndrika Lawrence's Motion for Relief from Judgment.¹ For the following reasons, the motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff seeks relief from this Court's November 7, 2022 Order and Reasons, in which the Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss with prejudice,² and the related Judgment,³ on the basis of fraud on the court under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(d)(3).

Rule 60(d)(3) provides a court may "set aside judgment for fraud on the court."⁴ "Fraud on the court is a 'narrow concept' and 'should embrace only the species of fraud which does or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetuated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery cannot perform in the usual manner.'"⁵ "The standard for 'fraud on the court' is [] demanding. '[O]nly the most egregious misconduct,

¹ R. Doc. 121.

² R. Doc. 103.

³ R. Doc. 104.

⁴ FED. R. CIV. P. 60(d)(3).

⁵ *Matter of Teon Maria, LLC*, No. CV 10-2828, 2021 WL 124553 at *1 (E.D. La. Jan. 13, 2021) (quoting *Wilson v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp.*, 873 F.2d 869, 872 (5th Cir. 1989))

such as bribery of a judge or members of a jury, or the fabrication of evidence by a party in which an attorney is implicated, will constitute fraud on the court.”⁶

Although Plaintiff recites a long, convoluted procedural history of the action in her motion, it is not clear what misconduct she argues occurred or by whom.⁷ Plaintiff describes no bribery, no fabrication of evidence, and no other egregious misconduct “perpetuated by officers of the court.” Plaintiff’s allegations, therefore, fail that would rise to the “narrow concept” of fraud required for application of Rule 60(d)(3).

Accordingly;

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Relief from Judgment⁸ is **DENIED**.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 21st day of November, 2023.



SUSIE MORGAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁶ *Jackson v. Thaler*, 348 F. App'x 29, 34 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Rozier v. Ford Motor Co.*, 573 F.2d 1332, 1338 (5th Cir.1978)).

⁷ *See generally*, R. Doc. 121.

⁸ R. Doc. 121.