

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FILED 3/20
LOGGED
ENTERED
RECEIVED
MAR ' 6 / 1990

BY
AT BALTIMORE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
DEPUTY

MICHAEL SINDRAM,
Plaintiff,

v.

HOWARD E. WALLIN, et al.,
Defendants.

Civil No. S 90-800

* * * * *

ORDER

For the reasons stated in a Memorandum Opinion entered herein this date, it is, by the Court this 16th day of March, 1990, ORDERED:

1. That plaintiff BE, and he hereby IS, DENIED leave to file or to proceed in forma pauperis;

2. That the complaint BE, and it hereby IS, DISMISSED, without service of process, as legally frivolous and filed in bad faith, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d);

3. That leave to appeal in forma pauperis from Judge Black's denial of a TRO this date BE, and it hereby IS, DENIED, upon this Court's certification that such an appeal is taken in bad faith, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a); and

4. That the Clerk of this Court is hereby DIRECTED not to accept any further complaints or other papers filed by Mr. Sindram in any case assigned to the undersigned other than Civil No. S 90-689 unless and until a Magistrate of this Court certifies that the complaint or other paper is filed in good faith, and not for any improper purpose, and that it has a colorable basis in law and fact; and

5. That the Clerk mail copies of this Order and of the

Handwritten signature/initials

Handwritten circled 'S' and date 3/16/90

aforegoing Memorandum Opinion to plaintiff and the named defendants, and place copies of it in all of Mr. Sindram's cases referred to in the foregoing Memorandum Opinion.



Frederic N. Smalkin
United States District Judge

FILED 3/20
 LOGGED
 ENTERED
 RECEIVED
 MAR 16 1990
 AT BALTIMORE
 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
 DEPUTY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MICHAEL SINDRAM,
 Plaintiff,

v.

HOWARD E. WALLIN, et al.
 * * *

*
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *

Civil No. S 90-800

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This is the third in plaintiff's series of federal complaints against various state and federal officials to receive this Court's attention this day. See Sindram v. Sweeney, et al., Civil No. S 90-687 (D.Md. March 16, 1990) and Sindram v. McKenna, et al., Civil No. S 90-688 (D.Md. March 16, 1990). Mr. Sindram also has pending a removed case against, inter alia, various federal judges and officers, in which the Court has this day issued an order denying his motion to strike the petition for removal. Sindram v. Ahalt, et al., Civil No. S 90-689 (D.Md. March 16, 1990). Earlier today, in the present case, Judge Black of this Court, as Chambers Judge, denied plaintiff's motion for a TRO. Plaintiff immediately noticed an interlocutory appeal.


In this, his latest case, he continues his vendetta against the Maryland judicial system by complaining again about the denial of jury trial rights, a factor common to cases 90-687 and 90-688. For reasons stated in District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), these claims are legally frivolous beyond any doubt. This action, like plaintiff's other similar cases (Nos. 90-687 and 90-688), was clearly filed in bad faith and for the purpose of harassing the named defendants.

3/20
 [Handwritten signature]

4
 3/16/90

Accordingly, an order will be entered separately, denying plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismissing the complaint without service of process, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d). The Order will also deny leave to appeal Judge Black's denial of a TRO in forma pauperis, because that appeal is also obviously taken in bad faith. 28 U.S.C. §1915(a). It will provide that copies of it and of this Memorandum Opinion be mailed to the named defendants. Finally, in view of plaintiff's torrent of baseless and harassing filings, the Order will instruct the Clerk not to accept for filing any further civil suits instituted, or other papers filed, by Mr. Sindram in any case assigned to the undersigned, other than Civil No. S 90-689, unless and until a Magistrate of this Court reviews the same and determines that the suit or paper is filed in good faith, and not for any improper purpose, and that it has a colorable basis in law and fact.

Dated: March 16, 1990



Frederic N. Smalkin
U.S. District Judge