

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

---

MARCIA COPELAND, M.D.,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, JUDGE  
NAN FAMULAR, ROBERT SALDUTTI,  
ESQ., DEUTCHE BANK,

Defendants.

---

1:18-cv-10554-NLH-JS

**MEMORANDUM  
OPINION & ORDER**

**APPEARANCES:**

MARCIA COPELAND, M.D.  
2 APPLE RIDGE WAY  
EAST BRUNSWICK, NJ 08816

*Plaintiff appearing pro se*

BRETT JOSEPH HAROLDSON  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NJ  
25 MARKET ST, 7TH FL, WEST WING  
PO BOX 116  
TRENTON, NJ 08625

*On behalf of Defendants the State of New Jersey and Judge  
Nan Famular*

REBECCA K. MCDOWELL  
SALDUTTI LAW GROUP  
800 N KINGS HIGHWAY  
SUITE 300  
CHERRY HILL, NJ 08034

*On behalf of Defendant Robert Saldutti, Esquire*

**HILLMAN, District Judge**

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2019, the Court dismissed  
Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice and ordered Plaintiff to

show cause as to why this Court should not enter a preclusion order and enjoin Plaintiff from filing any claims in this District regarding the subject matter of this case without prior permission of the Court (Docket No. 10, 11); and

WHEREAS, the Court provided Plaintiff with 15 days to respond to the Order to Show Cause (Docket No. 11); and

WHEREAS, to date, Plaintiff has not filed a response; and

WHEREAS, the Court noted in its prior Opinion that this is the sixth essentially duplicate federal court action filed by Plaintiff concerning a state court default judgment entered against her in February 2012, and Plaintiff has also instituted three additional complaints in this District of a similar genre<sup>1</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the Court further notes that the Court issued the same litigation preclusion Order to Show Cause in COPELAND v. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:17-cv-12104-NLH-JS ("Copeland V") (Docket No. 95, at 15), to which Plaintiff also failed to respond; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's previous actions concerning the same default judgment are: COPELAND v. ABO & COMPANY, LLC, 1:13-cv-03978-RMB-KMW ("Copeland I"); 1:13-cv-03979-RMB-KMW ("Copeland II"); 1:13-cv-04232-RMB-AMD ("Copeland III"); COPELAND v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 3:15-cv-07431-AET-TJB ("Copeland IV"); COPELAND v. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:17-cv-12104-NLH-JS ("Copeland V"). Plaintiff has filed other actions arising out of different properties, although Plaintiff's claims appear to be of a similar genre. See COPELAND v. TOWNSHIP OF PENNSAUKEN, 1:14-cv-02002-RMB-AMD; COPELAND v. NEWFIELD BANK, 1:17-cv-00017-NLH-KMW; COPELAND v. US BANK, 1:18-cv-00019-NLH-KMW.

WHEREAS, Plaintiff's related cases, Copeland V and Copeland V. US Bank, 1:18-cv-00019-NLH-KMW, are currently on appeal before the Third Circuit Court of Appeals<sup>2</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the Court therefore finds that because the substance of Plaintiff's claims in the actions on appeal overlap with this case, including the Court's intention to issue a litigation preclusion order, the Court shall administratively terminate this action pending the resolution of Plaintiff's appeals, at which time the Court will reactivate the matter and issue a final decision on the outstanding Order to Show Cause.<sup>3</sup>

SO ORDERED.

Date: June 4, 2019  
At Camden, New Jersey

s/ Noel L. Hillman  
NOEL L. HILLMAN, U.S.D.J.

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff has not filed an appeal of this action.

<sup>3</sup> When the Court dismissed Plaintiff's instant complaint with prejudice, the Court did not direct the Clerk to close the action because of the pending Order to Show Cause.