CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

bulpose of initiating the civil d	OCKET SHEET. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT FAGE (OF THIS F	JKM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Daniel J. Feldm	ian		DEFENDAN Highmark Resider Christian Blake Ho John R. Benz, Esq.	ntial, L eath, Ja	LC Rawn L armel "Mel	" Hopson, Jason V	Ashley Lemons Whitehouse, M	, Alfredo Iary Beth	Carballo, Woodard,
•	of First Listed Plaintiff District of Columbia XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of Reside	ence of	First Liste	ed Defendant: JEI LAINTIFF CASES O DN CASES, USE TI	FFERSON CO ONLY)	UNTY, K	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington l Louisville, KY 40 Phone: (307) 699	222		Attorneys (If Kno		/N, JOH	IN BENZ			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CI	 	F PR	INCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in	One Box fo	or Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	▼ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	(For Diversity Cases O	Only) PTF 1		Incorporated or Proof Business In T		Defendant) PTF 4	DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2	2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		5	5
		1	en or Subject of a reign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)			C	lick here	for: Nature of S	Suit Code Des	scription	<u>s</u> .
CONTRACT	TORTS		PRFEITURE/PENALT	TY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUT	ES
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability Tiability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Product Liability 380 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS A 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Cother 448 Education A 60 Alien Detainee 530 General 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other: 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 8 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigatio 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Applic 5 Other Immigration Actions	000 C	423 With 28 U INTE PROPE 820 Cop. 830 Pate New 840 Trad 880 Defe Act of SOCIA 861 HIA 862 Blac 863 DIW 864 SSII 865 RSI FEDERA 871 Taxe or D 871 IRS-	JSC 157 LLECTUAL RTY RIGHTS yrights nt nt - Abbreviated y Drug Application lemark and Trade Secrets of 2016 LSECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) /C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	480 Consum (15 US 485 Teleph Protec 490 Cable// 850 Securit Excha 890 Other \$ 891 Agricu 893 Enviro 895 Freedo Act 896 Arbitra 899 Admin Act/Re	m (31 USC)) teapportion ist and Bankin erce ation eer Influer t Organiza mer Credit SC 1681 or one Consu tion Act Sat TV ies/Comm nge Statutory A Itural Acts nmental M m of Infor ation istrative Pr view or Al y Decision tutionality	nament ng need and tions 1692) mer odities/ actions latters mation roccedure opeal of
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	Conditions of Confinement								
∏ 1 Original	moved from 3 Remanded from the Court Appellate Court	4 Reins Reop	ened	ansferro nother I pecify)	ed from District	6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct F	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 28 U.S.C. § 1441; 28 U.S.C. § 1443 – Due Pro Brief description of cause: Systemic denial of a access between represented and pro se litigants; §	ccess, ADA	A, Civil Rights arts under 14th Amend	lment ai	nd ADA Titl	le II; national dispar	rity in filing, ser onwide where su	vice, and p	rocedural ty exists.
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO ! UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	Prelimin	EMAND \$ lary and emergency injug TRO and nationwide		relief	HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		n complai	nt:
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions): W.D. Ky: Chi	ief Judge G1	eg Stivers	- July	DOCKI	Ky) ET NUMBER ^{Feld}	dman v. Ivy, 3:2:	ff Holmes	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY C	OF RECORD	1					
May 23, 2025		mire!	(Teldings						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			0.						
RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDG	ЗE		MAG. JUI	OGE		

1		
	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive	
2	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
4	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	TEMINITY, THOSE DINNELS, TEEDWIN	
5	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE DISTRI	CT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL I FELDMAN	II C D' 4 ' 4 C 4 DICEDICE OF COLUMNIA
0	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9		CASE:
9	V.	CABE.
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	·
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	
	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	VERIFIED CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
	MARY BETH WOODARD,	VERTILE OF TE MOTTE COM EMILY
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	(ADA Title II •
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	(12211 11110 11
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	Fourteenth Amendment •
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
17	and JOHN DOLS 1–3,	§ 1983 •
18	Defendants.	
10		Structural Relief)
19		
20		
21		
22		
22		
23		

	HE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR '	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
VER	IFIED CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
ADA	Title II • Fourteenth Amendment • § 1983 • Structural Relief)
I. IN	FRODUCTION
1.	This is a civil rights and disability access action arising from:
	o Systemic denial of court access based on pro se and disability status
	o Retaliatory eviction executed while Plaintiff was hospitalized
	o Unlawful trespass of ADA-authorized representatives without cause
	o Refusal of courts to review or serve emergency filings
	o Reuse of slander from a separate jurisdiction (California) in Kentucky
	o Judicial gatekeeping and dismissal without hearing or citation
2.	Plaintiff, a disabled federal whistleblower while hospitalized for a week with a stroke in
	Uruguay, was denied any judicial review of over seven emergency motions, despite
	verified ADA filings and removal to federal court.
3.	This complaint seeks immediate injunctive relief, damages, and a nationwide stay on
	court proceedings where procedural disparities between represented and pro se parties
	persist.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2

1

4. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

5. Venue is proper in this District because the claims involve systemic and structural

and implicate both local actors and national private defendants operating across

Carolina (Highmark Residential) named as a Defendant in an ongoing multidistrict

Federal RICO case, state agents in **Kentucky**, and previously named parties from a

pending California court case, including Linda Steinhoff Holmes, who has used

disproven slander across jurisdictions for five years with the support or permission of

7. The relief sought involves **federal constitutional violations** requiring structural remedy

and injunctive relief that apply across jurisdictional boundaries.

6. Defendants include private actors headquartered in Texas, Kentucky, and North

3

constitutional violations that span multiple states, including Kentucky and California,

jurisdictions.

court officers in both states.

J

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

16

III. PARTIES

19

20

8. Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, is a disabled, pro se litigant and neuropsychologist with a verified medical disability.

21

22

23

Defendants include Ivy Management, Highmark Residential, Linda Steinhoff-Holmes
and their legal counsel, and associated parties who acted under color of state law to
deprive Plaintiff of constitutional rights.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND
10. Plaintiff filed suit in Kentucky federal court after removal from state court (3:25-CV-271-
GNS), which was dismissed without any ruling on the merits.
11. At least seven emergency motions, including ADA accommodations, were submitted but
ignored.
12. Defendants proceeded with eviction during hospitalization, blocked access to
representatives, and physically removed property before any lawful writ.
13. Courts failed to serve orders, grant hearings, or cite any filed evidence.
14. Slander originally issued by Defendant Linda Holmes in a California case was reused in
Kentucky — despite written denials contradicted by emails.
V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF
Count I: Denial of Due Process – Fourteenth Amendment
Defendants acted under color of law to deny Plaintiff notice, hearing, and court access, violating
U.S. Const. Amend. XIV.
Count II: Disability Discrimination – ADA Title II
Defendants, including court officials and law enforcement, denied Plaintiff reasonable
accommodations, blocked access to medical aid, and trespassed his ADA representatives.

1	Count III: Civil Rights Violation – 42 U.S.C. § 1983
2	By executing an unlawful eviction, failing to respect a federal stay, and using false statements in
3	
4	court, Defendants committed actionable deprivations under § 1983.
5	Count IV: Structural Discrimination Against Pro Se Litigants
6	The systemic denial of e-filing access, unequal service practices, and docket bias against
7	unrepresented litigants constitutes a constitutional violation requiring injunctive relief.
8	unrepresented nugants constitutes a constitutional violation requiring injunctive rener.
9	
10	
11	VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
12	Plaintiff respectfully requests:
13	
14	A. Emergency Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) and immediate injunctive relief
15	B. Permanent injunction staying all court proceedings where filing disparities exist
16	C. Compensatory damages in excess of \$1,200,000
17	D. Punitive damages against individual defendants for fraud, retaliation, and abuse
18	E. Criminal referral under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 1509, and 42 U.S.C. § 3617
19	F. A declaratory ruling that systemic pro se exclusion violates the Fourteenth Amendment
20	G. Costs, interest, and all other relief the Court deems just and proper
21	
22	
23	
-	

VERIFICATION I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, declare under penalty of perjury that the facts in this complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Respectfully submitted, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223 Dated: May 23, 2025

1 2 3 4 5 6		DISTRICT COURT CT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8 9	Plaintiff, v.	CASE:
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
11	IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE
12	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	JODGE
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	EMEDCENCY MOTION FOR
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	ORDER
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21 22		
23		
_ . 1		

Τ	TO T	HE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
F	OR '	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
F	EME	RGENCY MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
P	Plainti	ff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman , respectfully moves this Court for an Emergency Temporary
R	Restra	aining Order (TRO) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b) and in support
a	llege	S:
	1.	Plaintiff is a disabled litigant currently recovering from an 8-day hospitalization for a
		stroke and is physically located outside the United States due to medical treatment.
	2.	Defendants have executed an eviction during hospitalization, denied ADA
		accommodations, removed Plaintiff's property without legal writ, and obstructed court
		access by blocking representatives.
	3.	Plaintiff has submitted over seven emergency filings across state and federal courts, none
		of which were ruled on or served. The Plaintiff was never granted a hearing or even
		received notice of rulings now being enforced.
	4.	A federal removal was filed and docketed in Kentucky (3:25-CV-271-GNS), but eviction
		proceeded during active federal jurisdiction.
	5.	Plaintiff is now subject to permanent property loss and irreparable harm if enforcement is
		not immediately stayed.
	6.	Plaintiff has shown:
		o A likelihood of success on the merits;
		o Irreparable harm without relief;

1		o That the balance of equities favors Plaintiff;
2		o And that a stay is in the public interest.
3		
4		
5	REQ	UESTED RELIEF:
6		
7	Plainti	iff requests the Court:
8	1.	Issue a Temporary Restraining Order staying any and all enforcement of eviction or
9		removal;
10	2.	Enjoin Defendants and their agents from entering or disposing of Plaintiff's property;
11	3.	Schedule a hearing on Plaintiff's forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction;
12	4.	Grant any further relief the Court deems just and necessary.
13		
14	Posno	ectfully submitted,
15	Kespe	ectuny submitted,
16	Dance	1) Feldwarden
17		l J. Feldman, Ph.D.
18		Denington Drive
19	daniel	ville, KY 40222 jfeldmanphd@gmail.com
20		699-3223 : May 23, 2025
21		
22		
23		
24		

1		
2	_	RDER GRANTING STRAINING ORDER
3	LINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
4		ICT OF COLUMBIA
5		
6	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
6	Plaintiff,	
7	v.	CASE:
8	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
9	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE:
10	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	JUDGE.
11	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
12	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	(I) OPPER CRANTING
	MARY BETH WOODARD,	(proposed) ORDER GRANTING
13	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
14	JAYSON FREW,	
1.5	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3,	RESTRAINING ORDER
15	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING TEMPO	ORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
21		
22	Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Emergency M	Notion for a Temporary Restraining Order, and
23	finding that:	
24		

1	1. Plaintiff has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits,		
2	2. Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm without immediate injunctive relief,		
3	3. The balance of equities favors Plaintiff, and		
4	4. The public interest supports protecting access to the courts for disabled and pro se		
5	litigants,		
6	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:		
7			
8	A. Defendants and their agents are temporarily restrained from executing any eviction, lockout,		
9	property seizure, or removal of Plaintiff's belongings;		
10	B. Any such enforcement, including of eviction or default orders issued after May 12, 2025, is		
11			
12	stayed pending further review;		
13	C. Defendants shall respond to Plaintiff's motion within 7 days;		
14	D. A hearing on Plaintiff's forthcoming Motion for Preliminary Injunction shall be scheduled		
15	forthwith.		
16	TOTUIWIUI.		
17			
18	SO ORDERED.		
19	DATED:, 2025		
20	, 2023		
21	JUDGE		
22			
23	US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
24			

1	Daniel I Foldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
2	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
5	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4		
	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	IINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		CT OF COLUMBIA
O		
7		
	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	,	CASE:
	V.	0.122
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE
12	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	CRIMINAL REFERRAL,
10	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16	JAYSON FREW,	ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS,
1.7	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	AND EMERGENCY JUDICIAL RELIEF
18	Defendants.	BASED ON HATE-BASED
19		
1)		RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
∠ +		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
3	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL, ENTRY OF
5	PROTECTIVE ORDERS, AND EMERGENCY JUDICIAL RELIEF
6	BASED ON HATE-BASED RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION
7	
8	Notice to Court:
9	This motion was previously submitted to the Western District of Kentucky under a removed and
10	now-dismissed docket (3:25-CV-271-GNS). It was never acknowledged or ruled on. This filing
11	is now resubmitted and incorporated by reference into the above-captioned civil rights action
12	in the District of Columbia.
13 14	This Motion contains:
15	• A verified demand for referral under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 1509, and KRS 519.040
16	A request for a show cause hearing and criminal referral of named individuals
17	Attached supporting memorandum, exhibits, declarations, and proposed orders
18	• Allegations of hate-based retaliation, self-help eviction, ADA violations, and obstruction
19	of court access.
20	Respectfully submitted,
21	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se
22	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222
23	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223 Dated: May 23, 2025
24	2 miles. 1.2mg - 20, - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 2

1	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive	
	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	1
5		
6		DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
U	TOR THE WESTERN'S	
7	DANIEL LEELDMAN	LIC District Count ((4) Cincol)
0	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (6th Circuit) (LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
8	Plaintiff,	(LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
9	v.	CASE. 2.25 CW 271 CNC
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	CASE: 3:25-CV-271-GNS
10	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 22, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	5111211225. Hay 22, 2020
	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
14	MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16	JAYSON FREW,	ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS,
1.7	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
17	Defendants.	AND EMERGENCY JUDICIAL RELIEF
18	2 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	PAGED ON HATE DAGED
		BASED ON HATE-BASED
19	Removed from:	DETAIL A THON AND ODGEDAGGEON
• •		RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION
20	Jefferson Circuit Court (Case No. 25-CI-002530)	
21	and Jefferson District Court (Case No. 25-C-	
21	003961)	
22	•	
2.0		
23		
24		

1	TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE STIVERS OF THE UNITED STATES
2	DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY:
3	MORION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE
4	MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL, ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE
5	ORDERS, AND EMERGENCY JUDICIAL RELIEF BASED ON HATE-
6	BASED RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION
7	
8	
9	Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, appearing pro se, respectfully moves this Court for the
10	following emergency relief:
11	1. Referral of named individuals for criminal prosecution under federal and state law
12	2. Entry of protective orders against further enforcement, contact, or retaliation
13	3. Judicial declaration recognizing the unlawful, obstructive, and retaliatory nature of
14	Defendants' conduct
15	
16	This Motion is supported by the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities , Plaintiff's
17	sworn affidavits, previously submitted evidence, and newly attached Exhibits I, J, and K. These
18	materials document:
19	A knowingly false police report filed by Defendant Ashley Lemons
20	Collusion by legal counsel to carry out an eviction during a federal stay
21	Physical exclusion of Plaintiff's ADA-authorized representatives
22	Hate-motivated retaliation and obstruction spanning over three years
23	Irreversible medical injury and deprivation of housing, medical access, and due process
24	

1	This conduct is not merely civil in nature — it is criminal under controlling law and	
2	precedent. Plaintiff has filed a separate memorandum detailing the statutory basis, factual	
3	record, and binding case law that compels immediate judicial referral and protection.	
4		
5		
6	EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO THIS MOTION:	
7	• Exhibit I – Placeholder and Unsworn Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman (provisionally	
8	submitted; to be supplemented and signed)	
9		
10	• Exhibit J – Plaintiff's Email Disproving Firearm Threat (May 21, 2025, 10:16 AM)	
11	• Exhibit K – Letter to HUD (Grace Walsh) notifying of escalation in federal complaint	
12	Note: Exhibit H, consisting of photographs of signage destruction and lock tampering, was	
13	previously filed on May 21, 2025, as part of the Second Supplemental Emergency Motion to	
14	Enforce Federal Jurisdiction, Prevent Unlawful Eviction, and Refer Criminal Conduct. It is	
15	incorporated by reference herein.	
16		
17		
18	REQUESTED RELIEF:	
19		
20	Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:	
21	1. Issue an Order to Show Cause requiring Defendants Ashley Lemons and John Benz to	
22	explain why they should not be criminally referred	
23		
24		

MOTION FOR CRIMNL REFERRAL, PROTECT ORDERS, EMER JUDICIAL RELIEF - HATE CRIMES 3.25-CV-271-GNS

1	2. Refer the above-named individuals to the U.S. Attorney's Office and Commonwealth
2	Attorney for felony charges under:
3	o KRS § 519.040 (False Reporting)
4	o 18 U.S.C. § 1509 (Obstruction)
5	o 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights)
6	o 18 U.S.C. § 249 / KRS § 532.031 (Hate Crime Enhancement)
7	 42 U.S.C. §§ 12203, 3617 (ADA & FHA Retaliation)
8	3. Enter a Protective Order staying all further eviction-related activity until the Court rules
9	4. Enter any additional relief this Court deems just and necessary, including emergency
10	injunctive relief and scheduling of a hearing
11	A [Proposed] Order is attached for the Court's consideration.
12	A [Froposed] Order is attached for the Court's consideration.
13	
14	Respectfully submitted,
15	Daniel Of Feldman
16	
17	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se
18	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222
19	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223
20	Dated: May 21, 2025
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	• Exhibit I – Placeholder and Unsworn Declaration of Jo Anne
2	Feldman (provisionally submitted; to be supplemented and signed)
3	retainan (previsionan) saemittea, te ee sapprementea ana signea)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

STATEMENT OF JO ANNE FELDMAN, MAY 21, 2025

On Friday, May 16, 2025, about 5:00 pm, I checked lockers #3 and #4. Items in #4 were missing sometime from when the locks were changed, I believe in February, and May 16. Either The Ivy personnel took the items or unauthorized person(s) had been given access by The Ivy personnel. There were approximately \$1600 in items missing.

About 5:00 pm on Monday, May 19, when I was in the parking lot, I stopped at the storage units #3 and #4. Everything was on the units were in place. The notice had been removed from the apartment door.

When I returned on Tuesday, May 20, about 1:40 pm, I noticed the Federal notices had been removed and the locks on the units had been hammered off. I took pictures. Robert from the apartment complex next door was walking by. He said when he walked by at 7:00 am, the locks had been removed. So, between 5:00 pm on Monday and Tuesday at 7:00 am the locks had been removed. The notices were still up. When he returned at 10:00 am, Robert said the notices had been removed. I put up new notices. I checked the doors of the units and #3 was open with no way to secure it; #4 somehow had been locked from the inside, but the locking unit wasn't there to open the door.

On May 21, 2025, I arrived at The Ivy Apartments at approximately 7:15 am to replace the missing Federal notices on the doors of storage units #3 and #4, and LMPD officers reported they were missing on May 20, 2025 at approximately 11:00 pm. The locks had been what appeared to be hammered off. A police report was made, #25057164. Unit 3 had no locking device. Unit 4 had the locking device removed but somehow had been locked from the inside.

I went to apartment #3303 leased to my son, Daniel Feldman. He had given written permission to The Ivy previously for me to have access. They had also let me copy the keys when they had changed the locks in about February, so they knew I had a copy. I was there to wait for the Sheriff's Department if they came to remove all of the items from the apartment. A Federal notice was in place that stayed Judge Langford's decision on May 13. I was gathering a few items and Daniel's friend Jerry came to help me.

About 11:00 am there was a knock on the door. It was LMPD Officer Padgett saying that the Sheriff's Department was on the way to serve the eviction and move all items to the street. He was very kind and tried to explain to me what was happening. Office Padgett also stated that I was trespassing on property that was not mine, but my son's. He said that if the management was consulted, there could probably be a two-day delay, but Daniel would have to talk with Ashley about it. In a few minutes, Ashley was at the door with a maintenance man. Jerry came

out in the hallway with me. Ashley had John Benz, The Ivy's eviction attorney, on the phone. She was letting him talk mostly. They said that the Sheriff was on the way and would be there soon to set everything out. I tried to explain that the judgment from Judge Langford had never been received. (I think I said that!) I tried to explain that the case was now in Federal Court. Mr. Benz insisted that it didn't matter and that the eviction would go on. Ashley, Mr. Benz on the phone, and the maintenance man quickly departed. Officer Padgett said that he would give Jerry and I thirty minutes to leave the premises. We started gathering a few things. When the officer came back, he was even helpful in getting things down to Jerry's truck. Jerry left, and the officer talked with me for a few minutes. Basically, I could not be anywhere on the premises. If I wanted to wait for the Sheriff, I would have to sit in my car in an off-site parking lot and call the Sheriff to come pick me up to oversee the eviction. He gave me the phone number to call the Sheriff's Department. He waited while I got in my car, and watched as I left.

When I got to the Galen's parking lot facing The Ivy, I had a call from Daniel, and he gave me the phone number of Sgt. Perry with the Sheriff's Department. I called Sgt. Perry, whom I had talked with before. He was very helpful. He said he was waiting for the decision of Federal Judge Stivers. If he decided in Daniel's favor, the eviction would be stayed. If not, he would call me personally to give me two-days-notice to get a mover. I explained to him how all of this got started with The Ivy refusing a notice of terminating the lease. Renewed the lease with a higher monthly payment. Then demanded payment without giving an exact amount or how to pay. There were wrongful charges that had never been addressed. There were at least four requests for the amount of the final rent due with no response, and how to pay the rent since the automatic payment could no longer be used. Sgt. Perry told me to go home, and assured me that he would call me to let me know the outcome. I left for home.

Signed:

Jo Anne Feldman May 21, 2025 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 502-429-3567

1	• Exhibit J – Plaintiff's Email Disproving Firearm Threat (May 21,
2	2025, 10:16 AM)
3	2023, 10.10 / 111/
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	



Daniel Feldman <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Supplemental Emergency Filing – Feldman v. Ivy – Federal Jurisdiction Enforcement and Criminal Referral (3:25-CV-271-GNS)

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com> Wed, May 21, 2025 at 11:29 AM To: Michelle Rawn <michelle@rawnlawfirm.com>, John Benz <john@rawnlawfirm.com>, "Young, Briona"

 AshleyVickery@kycourts.net>, jeffcodistrictcourtadmin@kycourts.net, mberghaus@jcsoky.org, wdky-info@usmarshals.gov, "Walsh, Grace" <Grace.Walsh@louisvilleky.gov> Cc: Jo Anne Feldman <jojofeld@bellsouth.net>

To all parties previously served:

Please be advised that two of the previously filed and served documents in the above-captioned matter were inadvertently submitted without signature. Corrected and signed copies are attached and have been uploaded to the official record in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky as part of the ongoing case:

Feldman v. Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS

I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused.

That said, I am again reiterating the need for immediate acknowledgment and action from all recipients of this message.

As of this morning, I have received **no formal confirmation from the Sheriff's Office, Ivy Management, or the U.S. Marshals Service** in response to:

- Multiple emergency filings
- Direct emails
- Recorded voicemails
- In-person inquiries
- Verified photographic evidence of tampering and lock removal

Due to the **complete lack of communication**, and because Ivy Management **removed the locks and signage** unlawfully and prior to any lawful writ, I have hired **licensed off-duty police officers** to secure and protect the property at **13347 Aragon Way, Unit 3303**, and the associated storage units.

These officers are present now to:

- Prevent criminal intrusion or further tampering
- Lawfully protect property under my current and continuous legal possession
- Document any actions taken by Ivy or law enforcement that conflict with federal jurisdiction

As stated in my filings and affidavits, there is no remand from the federal court, and no writ of possession overrides my lawful occupancy at this time.

I am respectfully putting all parties on notice that:

- Immediate relief will be sought in federal court for the cost of the hired officers and all related damages
- Ivy Management will be held liable for property stolen by Jason Frew of Apt.
 417, whose access and conduct were known and preventable
- Ivy will be named as a complicit party in any criminal or civil violations that arise from this breach of legal process and tenant protections

I remain open to communication and resolution, but I will continue to defend my rights as protected under federal law — including the Second Amendment, as I am lawfully entitled to protect my life, liberty, and property. Any conflict arising from the presence of lawful security personnel has been entirely preventable. The failure of law enforcement to respond and the criminal actions of Ivy Management — including unauthorized entry, removal of locks, and destruction of court-posted notices — are solely responsible for creating this potential armed crisis. This situation has now placed other tenants, employees, and members of my family at unnecessary risk, and the liability for that risk rests with those who failed to intervene or communicate after multiple formal warnings.

Furthermore, if Jason Frew is seen anywhere on the premises — including near Apartment 3303, the storage units, or any property unlawfully removed by the Sheriff's Office — I demand that he be immediately arrested for his role in the prior theft of multiple items from both the apartment and the storage unit. These thefts have been documented in his own written communications, observable on security camera footage and confirmed by the presence of his Gmail account and password activity on my stolen iPad, which was unlawfully taken from my home. That device contains direct location tracking evidence placing Mr. Frew at the scene of the crimes and within the property during the period of his unauthorized access.

Respectfully,
Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
Pro Se Plaintiff
danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
+1 (307) 699-3223
May 21, 2025

On Wed, May 21, 2025 at 5:53 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <a href="mailto:salaried-mailto:salar

JOINT SERVICE COVER LETTER AND NOTICE OF EMERGENCY FILINGS

TO: U.S. Marshals Service,

Jefferson County Sheriff's Office, and

Ivy Property Management

RE: Ongoing Criminal Conduct, Constructive Eviction, and Enforcement of

Void State Order

Filed in: Feldman v. Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS (W.D. Ky.)

Date: May 21, 2025

knowledge, access, and intent.

This letter serves as formal notice that **Ivy Management has already taken extrajudicial action** to remove court-posted federal signage, deny access to secured storage units, and refuse emergency repairs — all before any lawful eviction could take place. These acts occurred **inside a secure apartment complex**, where access is limited to **residents and Ivy employees only**.

Ivy's **willful removal of federal court notices**, after being **served with judicial documents** warning that such removal would constitute obstruction and trespass, is not speculative. It is **confirmed**. There is no lawful explanation for these actions, and no other party could have executed them without

Furthermore, Ivy Management has not responded to a direct and documented after-hours emergency maintenance request left on their voicemail system at 2:40 AM on May 21, 2025, referencing urgent security threats and Ivy's own contractual obligation to provide lock repairs. No repair has been made. No contact has been returned. The doors remain unsecured.

The Jefferson County Sheriff's Office and U.S. Marshals Service have also failed to confirm receipt of any of Plaintiff's service emails, court filings, or formal jurisdictional warnings. Despite over a week of continuous notice and three rounds of formal emergency filings, no acknowledgment, guidance, or assurance of enforcement protocol has been provided by either agency.

This inaction by the Sheriff and Marshals has invited a jurisdictional conflict. It has left federal court orders unenforced, forced Plaintiff to self-coordinate law enforcement, and directly enabled Ivy's unlawful, extrajudicial retaliation in defiance of this Court's active jurisdiction.

NOTICE OF FILINGS

The following emergency filings were submitted on **May 21, 2025**, to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky and are hereby served on the undersigned parties:

- 1. Second Supplemental Emergency Motion to Enforce Federal Jurisdiction, Block Unlawful Eviction, and Refer Criminal Conduct
- 2. Supplemental Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- 3. Second Affidavit of Dr. Daniel J. Feldman
- 4. Exhibit H Photographs of Lock Tampering and Removed Signage (taken May 20, 2025)
- 5. Notice of Filing
- 6. Proof of Service

TO THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE:

You are now on **final notice** that enforcement of the May 13, 2025 eviction order is a violation of **28** U.S.C. § **1446(d)**. The order is **void**, having been entered after removal. Any effort to proceed will constitute:

- Contempt of federal jurisdiction
- Civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- Personal liability for participating in the enforcement of an extrajudicial act

The building is secure. Only Ivy staff or residents could have carried out the break-ins and signage removal. Ivy has acted **before your office arrived**, which itself constitutes a **self-help eviction** under

Kentucky law — specifically forbidden under **KRS § 383.195** and **Baker v. Rice**, 671 S.W.2d 241 (Ky. Ct. App. 1984).

TO THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE:

You are respectfully requested to intervene or notify the Court of your authority under **28 U.S.C. § 566(c)** to protect federal proceedings. This property is the subject of an active emergency filing. Your continued silence while extrajudicial acts occur on federally protected property is functionally enabling unlawful state enforcement.

TO IVY MANAGEMENT:

You are on formal notice that you have:

- Removed federal signage from secured areas twice, after being warned of criminal liability
- Refused to respond to an emergency maintenance request for unsecured doors
- Allowed property interference and lock removal in advance of any lawful enforcement
- Enacted a constructive eviction and triggered liability for retaliation and due process
 violations under federal law

These acts were taken after receiving full notice of this Court's jurisdiction and Plaintiff's emergency filings.

FINAL DEMAND:

If any further enforcement action is taken **today** or thereafter, it will be treated as **criminal interference with a federal proceeding**, and Plaintiff will seek the **maximum civil and criminal penalties available under law**, including emergency contempt, referral to the U.S. Attorney, and direct liability under § 1983 and related statutes.

You are each **demanded to pause** all enforcement actions and await a ruling from **Chief Judge**Stivers.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Plaintiff

Email: danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

Phone: +1 (307) 699-3223

May 21, 2025

On Tue, May 20, 2025 at 6:29 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com/ wrote:

TO ALL PARTIES, SHERIFF'S ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, U.S. MARSHALS, AND COUNSEL:

This email constitutes final formal notice that the **Jefferson County Sheriff's Office will be in violation of federal law if it executes any writ of possession on May 21, 2025**, relating to Jefferson District Court eviction order of May 13, 2025, which is **void ab initio under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)**.

This matter was removed to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky on May 12, 2025, under Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS, and federal jurisdiction is now exclusive.

You were served with notice of federal removal and stay as early as **May 16**. You are not permitted to act under a state court writ issued after that removal. **Federal law prohibits it.**

CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LIABILITY

Any enforcement action taken tomorrow, after five days of actual notice, will constitute:

- Violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)
- Deprivation of rights under color of law (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
- Criminal obstruction of federal proceedings (18 U.S.C. § 1512)
- Conspiracy against rights (18 U.S.C. § 241)
- Aiding and abetting theft of federally protected property
- Retaliation under the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. § 3617)

You are further placed on notice that:

- The federal enforcement stay was physically posted on the premises and was unlawfully removed. This constitutes obstruction, tampering with federal process, and criminal trespass, and it exposes any enforcement agents, landlords, or their staff to individual liability.
- Jason Frew, a named defendant, previously entered the residence unlawfully, unplugged a security camera, and removed property including an iPad and private materials.
 This was reported in real time to LMPD and the Sheriff's Office, both of whom refused to respond.
 Now, items from Plaintiff's locked storage unit have gone missing without any sign of forced entry establishing internal collusion or key-based access.
- Christian Blake Heath, Ivy employee, submitted perjured testimony under oath regarding rent
 communications. Three email records dated March 18, 22, and 28 are already on file disproving his
 statements.

Attorney **John Benz** then knowingly cited that false testimony to obtain the unlawful writ. This is **subornation of perjury** and **fraud on the court**.

- Judge Sarah Clay enabled these violations by:
 - Blocking emergency filings for a TRO that was first submitted on **March 31, 2025**, **before the eviction was even filed**;
 - Ignoring ADA accommodation requests;
 - Proceeding in state court after federal removal was filed and docketed;
 - Allowing coordinated submission of false documents while denying Plaintiff access to the court.
- This conduct is not procedural error. It is sustained criminal complicity, systemic misconduct, and civil rights retaliation.

YOU ARE HEREBY PUT ON FINAL NOTICE:

If the eviction scheduled for May 21 proceeds:

- 2 I IVI C
 - You will be named in amended filings for contempt, conspiracy, and obstruction;
 - Immediate criminal referrals will be submitted to the U.S. Attorney and DOJ Civil Rights Division;
 - **Public media disclosures will follow**, and this conduct will be elevated to national advocacy groups already tracking this case.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS

Attached are all filings submitted to the U.S. District Court on May 20, 2025, including:

- Supplemental Emergency Motion to Enforce Jurisdiction
- . Memo of Points and Authorities
- Verified Affidavit and Exhibits (F & G)

• It will be treated as willful federal interference;

- Proposed Orders for TRO, Contempt, and Criminal Referral
- · Proof of Service and Notice of Filing

These are now part of the federal record in Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS.

PRESS RELEASES (appended below this message)

These public statements outline the broader national implications of this case, including:

- · ADA violations;
- Abuse of unrepresented and disabled tenants;
- · Harassment by corporate landlords;
- Conspiracy and procedural fraud in the eviction system.

LOUISVILLE COURTS ENABLE PREDATORY EVICTION SCHEME TARGETING DISABLED TENANTS

Court insiders reveal Jefferson County judges collaborate with landlords who have an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau to abuse vulnerable renters

Louisville, KY — April 18, 2025

THE FOUR-STEP SCHEME

- 1. Block tenants from legally ending their lease.
- 2. Refuse tenants' rent payments to fabricate claims of "nonpayment."
- 3. File eviction lawsuits using false nonpayment allegations.
- 4. Demand tenants pay rent for a full-year lease that tenants never agreed to.

Disabled Louisville resident Dr. Daniel J. Feldman has documented more than three years of targeted harassment and illegal eviction attempts by management at **The Ivy Apartments** (managed by **Highmark Residential**) and their attorneys at the **Rawn Law Firm**. Despite submitting extensive verified evidence of retaliation, harassment and resulting medical harm including loss of vision, and deliberate obstruction, **Jefferson Circuit Court Judge Sarah Clay** has systematically refused hearings, denied required ADA accommodations, and blocked legitimate filings—enabling these abuses to persist unchecked.

Court employees, speaking anonymously due to fear of retaliation, confirmed that the Rawn Law Firm frequently employs this predatory eviction scheme against vulnerable tenants, relying on active cooperation from Jefferson County courts. Court officials consistently obstruct tenants' filings, deny their requests for fair hearings, and ignore legally mandated disability accommodations.

The Ivy Apartments, managed by Highmark Residential since spring 2022, currently holds an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau, reflecting over 120 documented tenant complaints involving harassment, unfair eviction practices, financial abuse, and unsafe living conditions.

MOTION PAGE 15

Despite extensive evidence presented by Dr. Feldman—including documentation of severe medical harm from management's interference with medications—the court refused to review his filings, dismissed his case without holding a hearing, and openly ignored his ADA-required requests for remote participation.

Dr. Feldman said, "I am awestruck by Judge Clay's complete disregard for vulnerable people who come to her court with disability requests, who are clearly being abused, and who explicitly request protective restraining orders. Instead of offering justice or due process, she denies tenants a fair hearing and throws out all their evidence without even looking at it. This is shocking, disgraceful, and an insult to the people of Jefferson County."

Dr. Feldman has actively sought federal intervention, and the Human Rights Commission of Louisville (HRC) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have opened formal investigations into these matters. Dr. Feldman, with the help of these advocacies, demands accountability from both the predatory landlords and the court system enabling their abuse.

Monday, April 21, Is the last day for Dr. Feldman to file for damages before they are ineligible, and Judge Clay has unlawfully blocked his ability to file anything with the court. Immediate intervention is needed from court officers or from civil rights groups by the end of the day on April 21.

ABOUT DR. DANIEL FELDMAN

Dr. Feldman is a disabled clinical neuropsychologist and professionally trained massage therapist. He is a federal whistleblower who successfully exposed high-level government corruption, prevailing at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in 2012. His courageous efforts recovered millions of taxpayer dollars stolen by corrupt practices, at significant personal cost and without personal gain. Dr. Feldman is currently organizing a hunger strike beginning July 4th to protest corruption in court proceedings, specifically targeting systemic abuses against tenants who face harassment from landlords and receive no protection from the courts. His activism highlights cases of severe harm, including permanent personal injuries—most recently, his loss of eyesight due to sustained harassment by management at The Ivy Apartments.

MEDIA CONTACT

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

(307) 699-3223 or (435) 612-0242

REFERENCES AND CITATIONS

1. BBB Record - The Ivy Apartments (Louisville, KY):

The Ivy Apartments maintain an "F" rating at the Better Business Bureau, reflecting 120+ tenant complaints, often involving harassment, unsafe conditions, and disputes over lease terms.

Link: BBB.org The Ivy Apartments

2. Highmark Residential Rent-Price Collusion:

Highmark Residential is a named defendant in a multi-state antitrust lawsuit alleging that it conspired with other landlords to inflate rent prices using RealPage's revenue management software.

Link: Bloomberg Law on Price-Fixing Lawsuit

3. Investigation into Unlawful Eviction-Related Fees:

A North Carolina–based firm investigated Highmark Residential for allegedly imposing illegal fees during eviction processes, adding hundreds of dollars in extra charges for tenants already behind on rent.

Link: Carolina Law Firm Investigation

4. Rawn Law Firm – Specialization in Evictions:

The Rawn Law Firm in Louisville publicly markets eviction and rent-collection services, emphasizing swift landlord-friendly outcomes.

• Link: RawnLawFirm.com

5. Examples of Jefferson County Court Bias in Evictions:

Local investigations uncovered an "assembly line" eviction process that grants landlords immediate judgments, often without a hearing or with only seconds of review. Tenants typically lack representation or remote hearing accommodations.

- Link: Kentucky Equal Justice Center (eviction reports)
- Link: WLKY Investigative Coverage

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 21, 2025

What Happens When You're Sued by a Landlord

With a Lawyer — and You Don't Have One?

You lose. Not just the case. But your rights. Your voice. Your home.

And the court system is built to make sure of it — with different rules, different access, and different expectations depending on whether you're represented or not.

ONE DOCTOR.

ONE HOSPITAL BED.

ONE LITTLE OLD LADY ON A WALKER.

ONE HUGE FEDERAL LAWSUIT.

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, a clinical neuropsychologist, was **hospitalized for a stroke on May 6, 2025, and remained in the hospital until May 15**. Despite the court being informed of his condition, **Judge Lisa Langford of Jefferson District Court held an eviction hearing on May 13**, while Dr. Feldman was still in a hospital bed.

Now, Dr. Feldman is filing a **nationwide federal civil rights lawsuit** asking the court to **pause or stay all cases in every jurisdiction where pro se litigants**— **or defendants without lawyers** — **are treated differently** than represented parties.

Federal Removal Was Filed.

The Judge Knew.

The Sheriff Knew.

They're Proceeding Anyway.

Dr. Feldman removed his case to **U.S. District Court on May 12, 2025**. Under federal law — **28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)** — all state court proceedings and enforcement actions are **automatically stayed** upon removal. The court, the sheriff, and the landlord were all notified in writing.

Despite this, the **Jefferson County Sheriff's Office plans to execute the eviction today**, May 21, 2025 — unlawfully.

The federal court notices posted on Dr. Feldman's door were torn down.

The sheriff's office was informed of the federal stay more than five days ago.

They acknowledged receipt — and are choosing to proceed anyway.

When Dr. Feldman contacted the **U.S. Marshal's Office**, he was told that they "would contact Judge Stivers." He called **Judge Stivers' chambers** and was told the judge had reviewed the emergency filings and was "planning to rule." That was more than 24 hours ago. As of 5:30 AM today, no order has been issued. No protection is in place.

The Landlord Has an F Rating. The Courts Don't Care.

The eviction is being carried out by **Highmark Residential**, parent company of The Ivy Apartments — a corporate landlord with an **F rating from the Better Business Bureau**, and named in the **federal RICO rent price-fixing lawsuit** against RealPage.

These are the parties that courts protect.

These are the people Judge Langford sides with.

And this is what eviction in America looks like in 2025.

The System Is Rigged — And This Lawsuit Aims to Freeze It

Dr. Feldman's lawsuit is now national in scope. It demands:

- A stay of all court proceedings where pro se and represented parties are treated differently
- Accountability for sheriff's departments who knowingly enforce voided state orders
- Scrutiny of judges who mock federal law while evicting disabled, hospitalized Americans
- National review of court clerks and practices that give attorneys informal access while denying basic filing rights to unrepresented people

Contact for Interviews or Legal Action

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 (Uruguay)

[&]quot;This is why I cannot accept representation," Dr. Feldman says.

[&]quot;The only way I can prove that justice doesn't exist for people like me is to try to win without a lawyer. Because if I can't win this — when the law and the filings and the facts are this clear — then no one can. And if that's true, then the 14th Amendment isn't real. It never has been."

Jo Anne Feldman (Authorized Agent)

jojofeld@bellsouth.net

+1 (502) 429-3567 (home) | +1 (502) 797-2506 (cell)

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Plaintiff

Email: danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

Phone: (307) 699-3223

Address: 8809 Denington Drive, Louisville, KY 40222

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, May 19, 2025 at 6:03 AM

Subject: Filing Notice - Feldman v. Ivy, 3:25-CV-271-GNS

To: Michelle Rawn <michelle@rawnlawfirm.com>, John Benz <john@rawnlawfirm.com>, Young, Briona

<jayson.frew@gmail.com>, Mary Beth Woodard <mwoodard@highmarkres.com>, Garner, Sidney

<Sidney.Garner@louisvilleky.gov>, Davis, Leslie <lesliedavis@kycourts.net>, Vickery, Ashley

<AshleyVickery@kycourts.net>, <jeffcodistrictcourtadmin@kycourts.net>, <kywdintake@kywd.uscourts.gov>,

<KYWDsmb_ProSeFilings@kywd.uscourts.gov> Cc: Jo Anne Feldman <jojofeld@bellsouth.net>

Subject: Filing Notice - Feldman v. Ivy, 3:25-CV-271-GNS

Dear Counsel, Defendants and other Stewards of the Court.

Please find attached the following documents filed today, May 19, 2025, in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky:

- Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Federal Jurisdiction and Rebuttal to Expected Motion to Remand
- Exhibits A-1 through E
- · Notice of Filing
- · Certificate of Service

I have repeated service of the Emergent Packet sent this week:

EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL REMOVAL AND ENJOIN UNLAWFUL STATE ENFORCEMENT

Previously filed documents (Exhibits A–D) are incorporated by reference and were not reattached. If you require a duplicate copy of any previously served record, I will provide it upon request.

Below is the Press Release, widely circulated, posted on the web across national jurisdictions:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE May 17, 2025

What Happens When You're Sued by a Landlord With a Lawyer — and You Don't Have One?

You lose. Not just the case. But your rights. Your voice. Your home.

MOTION PAGE 19

And the court system is built to make sure of it — with different rules, different access, and different expectations depending on whether you're represented or not.

ONE DOCTOR.

ONE HOSPITAL BED.

ONE LITTLE OLD LADY ON A WALKER.

ONE HUGE FEDERAL LAWSUIT.

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, a clinical neuropsychologist, was hospitalized for a stroke on May 6, 2025, and remained in the hospital until May 15. Despite the court being informed of his condition, Judge Lisa Langford of Jefferson District Court held an eviction hearing on May 13, while Dr. Feldman was still in a hospital bed.

Now, Dr. Feldman is filing a nationwide federal civil rights lawsuit asking the court to pause or stay all cases in every jurisdiction where pro se litigants — or defendants without lawyers — are treated differently than represented parties.

Not Just for Plaintiffs — for Anyone Facing Unequal Justice

This isn't just about people trying to sue. It's for defendants, tenants, elderly people, disabled Americans, working-class families — anyone facing a courtroom where the rules change depending on whether you have a lawyer.

In courtrooms across the country:

- Lawyers can file by email or online. Pro se litigants have to show up in person.
- Attorneys get informal access to clerks and judges. Pro se litigants are treated like strangers.
- Clerks scrutinize filings from unrepresented people while rubber-stamping whatever lawyers file.
- Judges hold private conversations with attorneys but not with you.
- Sheriffs say they'll only enforce state orders, even when a federal lawsuit is already filed.

In Louisville, This Is How It Happens

Dr. Feldman removed his case to U.S. District Court on May 12, 2025, under civil rights statutes. That should have stopped all state actions immediately. But Judge Lisa Langford held the hearing anyway.

"I already know how the federal judge is going to rule," she said — before ruling herself.

Dr. Feldman was connected to the hearing by Zoom. He was never sworn in. He was cut off before finishing his arguments. He was not allowed to question the opposing party. His 81-year-old mother joined from home — and then their video feeds were disabled. Neither of them was allowed to fully participate.

The eviction went through. Unlawfully in violation of Federal Law.

The Sheriff's Department: "We Only Take Orders from Judge Langford"

Afterward, Jo Anne Feldman, 81, brought the federal court documents — including a stamped notice of removal and an emergency motion — to the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office.

They refused to accept them.

MOTION PAGE 20

[&]quot;These are counterfeit," said Captain T. Clark.

[&]quot;We only follow Judge Langford's orders," said the clerk.

"You'll have to appeal," she told Dr. Feldman by phone. Then she hung up.

Even the U.S. Constitution doesn't count if it's not coming from the right people, in the right club. Fortunately, the U.S. Marshals understand that federal law supersedes voided orders from defiant state judges who mock the Constitution.

The Landlord Has an F Rating. The Courts Don't Care.

The landlord behind the eviction is **Highmark Residential**, parent company of The Ivy Apartments — a defendant in a federal RICO rent price-fixing lawsuit and holder of an F rating from the Better Business Bureau.

These are the parties Judge Langford sides with — not elderly tenants. Not people in hospital beds. Not families trying to hold on.

Why "40 Acres and a Mule" Still Matters

When slavery ended, formerly enslaved people were told they'd get land — 40 acres and a mule — as the foundation of independence. That promise was stripped away almost immediately.

The 14th Amendment was passed in its place — as the promise of equal justice under law.

That promise, too, is being revoked every day in American courtrooms by Judges like Langford in District Court and Clay in Circuit Court in Louisville.

This Lawsuit Aims to Freeze the System Until It's Fair

Dr. Feldman's lawsuit will ask the federal court to:

- · Pause cases in court districts where pro se and represented parties are held to different rules
- Expose judges who engage in private conversations with attorneys but block access to unrepresented parties
- Confront sheriffs who refuse to enforce federal orders and instead obey unlawful state judgments
- Force a national reckoning with the way class, disability, and legal status determine outcomes

"This is why I cannot accept representation," says Dr. Feldman.

"The discrimination is so open, so structural, so baked into the system that the only way I can prove the truth is to try to win without a lawyer. Because if I can't win this case — where the unequal treatment is written in black and white on court websites in all 50 states — then no one can. And if that's the standard, then the 14th Amendment doesn't exist. It never has."

Contact for Press or Legal Action

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

+1 (307) 699-3223 (Uruguay)

Jo Anne Feldman (Authorized Agent)

jojofeld@bellsouth.net

+1 (502) 429-3567 (home) | +1 (502) 797-2506 (cell)

Respectfully. Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

On Tue, May 13, 2025 at 8:31 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: URGENT - Notice of Removal Filed - Case 25-C-003961 (Feldman v. Ivy)

Dear Clerk of Court, Defendants, Counsel, and Federal Court staff

I am the pro se defendant in Case No. 25-C-003961, currently set for 9:02 AM on May 13, 2025, in Room 308.

This case was formally removed to federal court on May 12, 2025, and is now docketed as Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky. I filed a Notice of Removal in both federal and state court. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), the state court no longer has jurisdiction and is prohibited from proceeding further.

In addition, I am currently hospitalized due to a stroke resulting from the plaintiff's refusal to provide access to life-sustaining medication, a right I had previously requested under the ADA and federal housing law. The state court failed to timely review multiple verified ADA filings requesting emergency access, remote accommodations, and intervention. As a result, I am physically incapable of attending or meaningfully participating in this hearing — even remotely — without extreme hardship and medical risk.

I respectfully request that this case be taken off the call sheet and that no hearing proceed until the federal court has ruled on jurisdiction and the pending TRO.

Thank you for your urgent attention.

Sincerely, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223 8809 Denington Dr., Louisville, KY 40222

On Mon, May 12, 2025, 07:54 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Notice of Federal Removal and Emergency TRO Filing - Feldman v. Ivy, et al.

To all named Defendants and related counsel:

Please be advised that the undersigned has formally removed the above-referenced cases (Jefferson Circuit Court Case No. 25-CI-002530 and Jefferson District Court Case No. 25-CI-003961) to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, and has filed an Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Stay of State Court Proceedings.

This action is being removed under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441, and 1443 based on:

- Denial of Plaintiff's rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act
- Ongoing due process violations by the Jefferson courts
- Systemic 14th Amendment violations involving disparate treatment of unrepresented vs. represented litigants
- · Procedural gatekeeping by court staff that excluded or blocked Plaintiff's verified filings and emergency pleadings
- The court's failure to provide ADA accommodations, contributing directly to Plaintiff's hospitalization

As of today, Plaintiff has been hospitalized for over a week following a stroke, which was caused by denial of critical medication — first by Defendants (Ivy, Highmark, their attorneys), and then by state courts that refused to act. This stroke occurred after repeated, documented requests for help were ignored or procedurally blocked.

Plaintiff/Defendant is still hospitalized and will remain so beyond the current state court hearing date. and cannot participate in person. The federal filing includes an ADA accommodation request and a motion for remote participation.

This notice is also to inform you that Plaintiff's damages claims have increased. In addition to the previously stated claims totaling \$1.2 million, Plaintiff now intends to pursue additional damages for permanent harm and medical consequences caused by Defendants' intentional negligence and the court's inaction.

Attached please find:

- · Notice of Removal
- · Emergency Motion for TRO
- · Proposed Order
- · Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- ADA and Remote Appearance Request
- · Medical Records (Exhibit A)
- · Certificate of Service
- · Exhibit Packet and Table of Contents

You are hereby formally notified of this removal and motion for federal relief. A stamped copy of the Notice of Removal will also be filed with the Jefferson Circuit and District Courts immediately following the federal court filing.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Defendant 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699–3223

On Fri, May 2, 2025 at 1:04 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Dear Clerk, ADA Coordinator, and Counsel:

This is an urgent notification and formal record of what is now a **preventable medical emergency** and a **constitutional violation** occurring in real time.

As of **2 minutes before closing today**, my **81-year-old mother**, Jo Anne Feldman—who uses a walker and suffers from COPD—was attempting to file physical copies of my court packet in *Highmark Residential LLC for SREIT lvy Louisville*, *LLC v. Daniel J. Feldman*, Jefferson District Court Case No. 25-C-003961. She is now at the courthouse **struggling to breathe** after having been forced to run to meet an arbitrary deadline caused solely by the Court's **refusal to provide ADA-compliant accommodations**.

This is the **fifth time** she has had to hand-deliver filings because, despite my documented disability and three formal ADA requests (submitted on April 2, 7, and 14), I have still not been granted remote access or e-filing privileges. The denial of those accommodations has now placed a medically vulnerable senior in physical jeopardy.

Yesterday, a clerk laughed and dismissed my reference to **constitutional violations**. Today, those violations have become **life-threatening**. I have no current update from my mother and am genuinely concerned for her safety.

If the Court refuses to accept today's packet—which was completed and in her possession before the deadline—it will only compound the harm already done. This is not a mere procedural hiccup. It is a violation of:

- Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12132)
- The Fourteenth Amendment

- · Kentucky Constitution §§ 2 and 14
- Basic human dignity and fairness

The full packet should be **accepted and backdated** to reflect the timely attempt to file. I will be submitting this correspondence to HUD and other agencies as part of my record of retaliation, obstruction, and failure to provide equal access to the courts.

Please confirm receipt of this message and whether the filing has been accepted. If it has not, I ask that the Court take immediate corrective action.

Sincerely,
Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
Pro Se Defendant
8809 Denington Dr.
Louisville, KY 40222
danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
(307) 699–3223

On Fri, May 2, 2025 at 9:16 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Courtesy Filing – Motions, Declarations, and ADA Accommodation Notice (Case No. 25-C-003961)

Dear Counsel, Clerk, ADA Administrator, and Court Staff:

Please find attached, as a single combined PDF packet, courtesy copies of the following filings submitted today, **May 2, 2025**, in *Highmark Residential LLC for SREIT Ivy Louisville, LLC v. Daniel J. Feldman*, Jefferson District Court Case No. 25-C-003961:

- 1. Motion to Dismiss and to Impose Sanctions (CR 12.02 / CR 11)
- 2. Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of the Motion
- 3. Verified Declaration of Daniel J. Feldman
- 4. Sworn Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman
- 5. Motion for Remote Appearance and ADA Accommodation
- 6. Proposed Order Remote Appearance / ADA Accommodation
- 7. Proposed Order Granting Motion to Dismiss
- 8. Proposed Order Imposing CR 11 Sanctions
- Composite Exhibit A (incorporating the April 7, 2025 Supplemental Declaration filed in Circuit Court Case No. 25-CI-002530)
- 10. Notice of Filing
- 11. Certificate of Service

These documents have been submitted to the Jefferson District Court pursuant to **Jefferson District** Court Local Rule 304 and Kentucky CR 5.02.

I must also respectfully place on record the serious procedural hardship caused by the Court's ongoing refusal to provide ADA-compliant filing access. This marks the **fifth physical filing** that my **81-year-old mother with COPD ambulatory with a walker** has been required to deliver in person on my behalf, despite my **documented disability** and multiple formal **ADA accommodation requests** submitted on **April 2, April 7, and April 14, 2025**.

No response has ever been issued by the Clerk, Court, or ADA coordinator. The Plaintiff's counsel continues to benefit from full e-filing access, while I remain excluded from basic participation. This differential treatment constitutes a violation of:

- Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12132)
- The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (Equal Protection & Due Process)
- Kentucky Constitution §§ 2 and 14

A verified HUD complaint is on record and was served on Plaintiff by HUD on April 21, 2025 (FHAP #C00-HO865 / HUD #04-25-8419-8), alleging retaliation and obstruction under 42 U.S.C. § 3617.

I trust this Court will take seriously the issues of access, discrimination, and procedural fairness now documented in the record. I respectfully request that this filing be reviewed promptly, and that accommodations be granted in accordance with state and federal law.

Please confirm receipt of this email and packet at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Feldman. Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699-3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

On Mon, Apr 21, 2025 at 6:19 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Filing Packet - Motions for Reconsideration and Clarification - Case No. 25-CI-002530

Dear Clerk of Court, ADA Coordinator, Judicial Assistant for Judge Clay, Counsel and Defendants:

Please find attached the following documents submitted today, April 21, 2025, in Case No. 25-CI-002530.

- 1. 1. Cover Letter to Clerk and Judicial Assistant
 - 2. Motion for Clarification and Reconsideration of April 17, 2025 Order
 - 3. Motion to Reconsider April 9, 2025 Order of Dismissal
 - 4. Notice of Filing
 - 5. Proof of Service

These filings are submitted in good faith to preserve Plaintiff's rights under CR 59.05 and to respectfully correct and clarify significant procedural misstatements in the Court's prior orders.

Please confirm receipt of this email and filings at your earliest convenience. My mother is dropping off hard copies for filing this morning.

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

On Sun, Apr 20, 2025 at 12:25 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Notice of Public Dissemination of Press Release & Narrative – Case No. 25-CI-002530

Dear Clerk of Court, ADA Coordinator, Judicial Assistant for Judge Clay, Counsel and Defendants:

This email is being sent simultaneously to all involved parties, explicitly ensuring this is **not an ex** parte communication. I affirm that I have always adhered strictly to the rules of court by providing proper notice and serving all parties simultaneously, in stark contrast to repeated procedural violations by the defendants and their counsel.

I respectfully notify the Court, Judge Clay's chambers, and all parties and their representatives that I have publicly disseminated the attached press release and detailed narrative concerning the issues in Case No. 25-CI-002530. These documents specifically highlight significant concerns about the recent order dated April 17, 2025, by Judge Sarah Clay, which explicitly denies my right to file further routine procedural filings, including a Motion for Reconsideration—a right clearly allowed under Kentucky court rules (CR 59.05).

This highly unusual order directly violates established procedural norms, my constitutional right to due process, and my rights protected under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Such an

order, by any reasonable standard, obstructs justice and denies my basic civil liberties to be heard and fairly represented in court.

Given the serious implications of these actions, I have referred this matter for judicial review by appropriate oversight authorities. Additionally, I have brought the gravity of this situation to the attention of media outlets, advocacy groups, and the public, highlighting the urgent need for accountability and reform within Jefferson County's court system.

Please find attached:

1. Official Press Release: "Louisville Courts Enable Predatory Eviction Scheme Targeting Disabled Tenants"

LOUISVILLE COURTS ENABLE PREDATORY EVICTION SCHEME TARGETING DISABLED TENANTS

Court insiders reveal Jefferson County judges collaborate with landlords who have an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau to abuse vulnerable renters

Jefferson Circuit Court Judge Sarah Clay has refused to review crucial evidence submitted by disabled Louisville resident Dr. Daniel Feldman, enabling The Ivy Apartments—managed by Highmark Residential—and their attorneys, the Rawn Law Firm, to continue a campaign of harassment, retaliation, and false eviction attempts. Most recently, Judge Clay unlawfully blocked Dr. Feldman from filing a legally permitted Motion for Reconsideration, cutting off his right to seek a fair hearing in court.

This judicial misconduct leaves Dr. Feldman with no legal means to stop relentless harassment by The Ivy Apartments, which has already caused him severe medical harm, including permanent vision loss in one eye. Despite carefully following all court filing rules and submitting extensive evidence—including medical records and sworn statements under penalty of perjury—Judge Clay refused to review any of Dr. Feldman's filings. Instead, on April 9, 2025, she privately dismissed his case after reviewing only a brief, unsworn statement electronically filed by the landlord's attorney.

The disparity in treatment is clear and deeply unfair. Dr. Feldman, representing himself without an attorney, must personally file all documents with the court. His 81-year-old mother, who suffers from COPD and relies on a walker, has been forced to deliver multiple filings physically directly to the courthouse. Yet, these filings, despite fully complying with court rules, have consistently been ignored. Meanwhile, the landlord's attorney comfortably submits inaccurate statements electronically from home, often without following proper procedures or even providing required copies to Dr. Feldman, openly violating basic court rules.

Since Highmark Residential began managing The Ivy Apartments in early 2022, Dr. Feldman has faced a relentless pattern of harassment and false eviction threats. The current eviction proceeding marks the seventh attempt since 2022 in which management has falsely accused Dr. Feldman of lease violations, many entirely fabricated or not even mentioned in his lease agreement. Past eviction threats have included trivial or fabricated claims such as unauthorized pets, alleged harassment based on harmless interactions, and now manufactured claims of nonpayment of rent.

This pattern of false eviction threats coincides with ongoing harassment and retaliation by The Ivy Apartments. Management has repeatedly refused to honor agreed-upon referral bonuses, reimbursements for services discontinued without notice, and has deliberately refused to process rent payments correctly—payments Dr. Feldman has always been willing and able to make. Dr. Feldman has consistently offered to pay rent (including under protest due to disputed charges), yet management intentionally obstructed his efforts by failing to provide accurate payment instructions.

The current false eviction case, scheduled to be heard in May, follows a deliberate four-step eviction scheme:

- 1. **Illegal Lease Renewal:** Early in 2025, management refused Dr. Feldman's lawful request to terminate his lease, instead renewing it without his consent, attempting to bind him to another year against his wishes.
- 2. **Blocking Rent Payments:** Despite Dr. Feldman's repeated offers and readiness to pay rent, management deliberately provided inaccurate or no payment instructions, fabricating the appearance of nonpayment.
- False Eviction Claim: Management then immediately filed eviction proceedings based on this intentionally created "nonpayment" scenario, even though Dr. Feldman always had the money available and was prepared to pay.

 MOTION PAGE 26

4. **Demanding Payment for Unconsented Lease:** Management now intends to force Dr. Feldman to pay rent for an entire year under the illegal lease renewal, creating an unjust financial burden and a continued threat of eviction.

These abusive tactics significantly worsened Dr. Feldman's existing health conditions. In fall 2024, after undergoing critical eye surgery that required a calm recovery environment, management intensified their harassment, causing medical complications that resulted in permanent vision loss in Dr. Feldman's eye—a severe injury clearly documented by medical records submitted to the court.

Highmark Residential, the company managing The Ivy Apartments, holds an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau, reflecting more than 120 formal tenant complaints for harassment, unsafe conditions, financial exploitation, and improper eviction tactics. Highmark is also the subject of ongoing federal lawsuits alleging rent-price collusion and illegal eviction practices, confirming a documented history of abusive landlord behavior.

The Rawn Law Firm, representing The Ivy Apartments, openly markets itself as an eviction specialist, boasting fast and favorable outcomes for landlords. According to anonymous court employees, the firm consistently employs aggressive tactics against vulnerable, disabled, or economically disadvantaged tenants, expecting—and receiving—active cooperation from Jefferson County courts.

Dr. Feldman's experiences align closely with broader documented systemic abuses in Louisville. Reports from the Kentucky Equal Justice Center and local investigative journalism have repeatedly uncovered that Jefferson County courts routinely deny tenants their rights, ignore evidence tenants submit, and fail to provide legally required accommodations for tenants with disabilities. In many eviction cases, tenants have mere minutes before judges who often side immediately with landlords, leaving residents without representation or fair hearings.

Dr. Feldman has an open, active investigation with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), formally documenting his allegations of landlord misconduct and judicial bias. The HUD investigation adds additional credibility and urgency to his ongoing situation, highlighting broader implications beyond his personal experiences.

To highlight the severity of this crisis, Dr. Feldman—a federal whistleblower who successfully exposed corruption at the government level, recovering millions of taxpayer dollars at his own personal cost—has announced a hunger strike beginning July 4th. His hunger strike will focus national attention on systemic judicial corruption in Louisville, specifically targeting predatory landlord practices and the complicity of local courts.

Dr. Feldman's situation serves as a critical example of how Louisville's court system has failed vulnerable tenants, enabling harmful landlord behavior and obstructing justice for disabled individuals. Immediate federal oversight and judicial accountability are urgently necessary to protect tenants' basic rights to fair hearings, disability accommodations, and safe housing.

Attached is the official press release distributed publicly, which includes documented references to ongoing landlord abuses and the complicity of Jefferson County Courts in supporting these harmful practices.

Respectfully, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

Attachments:

- Press Release
- 1,000-word Narrative

On Tue, Apr 15, 2025 at 10:34 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: Urgent Follow-Up - Request for Judicial Review and Hearing - Case No. 25-CI-002530

Dear Clerk of Court, ADA Coordinator, Judicial Assistant for Judge Clay, Counsel and Defendants,

I'm writing to urgently follow up on my verified filings in Case No. 25-CI-002530, including the April 11 Notice of Intent to File for Reconsideration. These include sworn declarations, time-stamped communications, and documented evidence of retaliation, obstruction of medical access, and denial of ADA accommodation.

MOTION PAGE 27

I respectfully ask: Has Judge Clay seen these filings in full? I have now asked this at least three separate times — in writing — for confirmation that all filings were received, docketed, and placed before the Judge, now totaling 19. I have received no answer. I am not demanding a ruling — only an acknowledgment: **yes, no, or pending**. For a court responsible for reviewing emergency restraining orders, this level of silence suggests that this is not a court that takes emergencies seriously.

Due to medical treatments, I will be unavailable for the rest of today and likely part of tomorrow morning. Given the emergency nature of this matter, I again ask whether Judge Clay intends to reconsider the jurisdictional ruling or grant an ex parte hearing.

This is not a jurisdictional gray area. When I attempted to file the TRO in District Court on March 31, I was told explicitly that the relief I sought — to stop retaliation, obstruction of rent and medical access — was not within District Court's jurisdiction. I was directed to Circuit Court, where I filed in good faith on April 2.

The very next day, Defendants filed a retaliatory eviction — despite having been served my TRO packet the night before. That eviction is based on false nonpayment claims. My rent was never refused; it was blocked. The eviction filing was designed to preempt this Court's ability to act. And the longer this Court waits, the more successful that tactic becomes.

I understand some may respond by saying "then just file your motion for reconsideration and place it on calendar." I intend to do exactly that — and am working on the motion now — but I must be clear:

Filing that motion does not solve the emergency. It does not stop the retaliation. It does not restore access to medication, now denied for over two months. It does not stop the clerk from continuing to block filings or shield the judge from review. And it does not undo the lost medical time I've endured while abroad trying to manage treatment and being forced to fight through procedural walls.

I am also in the process of preparing a motion for damages. That motion is being carefully constructed and coordinated with a HUD complaint currently under review. I reserve all rights to file and expand upon those claims. But the need for emergency relief remains urgent and independent — and cannot wait for that complaint to conclude.

Lastly, respectfully, this is not a determination for the Clerk's Office to make. Jurisdictional rulings and hearings must be handled by the Judge. The filings I submitted — including 19 verified and sworn pleadings — are already before the Court. I respectfully request that they be placed before Judge Clay directly, and that this Court reconsider its refusal to hear this matter.

And to reiterate: please respond, upon receipt of this email, with a direct answer — <u>has Judge</u> <u>Clay had the opportunity to review all 19 verified filings?</u>

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025, 06:59 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com> wrote:

Filing: Notice of Intent to File Motion for Reconsideration – 25-CI-002530 (Filed April 11, 2025)

Dear Clerk of Court, ADA Coordinator, Judicial Assistant for Judge Clay, Counsel and Defendants,

Please find attached the filing titled "Notice of Intent to File Motion for Reconsideration" in the matter of Feldman v. SREIT IVY Louisville, et al., Case No. 25-CI-002530 (Division 9), filed today, April 11, 2025.

This email also constitutes **formal service of the attached filing** to all named parties under CR 5. No objections have been raised to electronic service, and all emails below have been previously used for service in this matter.

This filing includes:

- A cover letter addressed to the Clerk and Judicial Assistant for Division 9;
- The full Notice of Intent to File Motion for Reconsideration (CR 59.05);
- Verified Proof of Service confirming delivery to all parties at approximately 9:00 AM ET today.

Physical delivery is being made to the Clerk's Office concurrently, but I request that this email version be stamped as filed and forwarded directly to **Judge Sarah Clay** for review. The verified record referenced in this filing exceeds 150 pages and reflects ongoing retaliation, ADA obstruction, and procedural misconduct. I respectfully request that it not be withheld, delayed, or diverted.

Please confirm receipt. Below is a text copy of the cover letter attached.

TO THE CLERK OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT AND ASSISTANT TO THE HONORABLE SARAH CLAY:

Please accept for filing the attached **Notice of Intent to File Motion for Reconsideration** in the above-captioned matter.

Due to repeated procedural irregularities—including the failure to acknowledge three prior verified filings submitted on April 2, April 7, and April 9—I respectfully request that this document be delivered in full to <u>Judge Sarah Clay</u> for direct review.

This filing is being delivered both:

- Electronically, to all defendants and counsel, as well as to this
 office, and
- Physically, via my 81-year-old mother, who should not have to make this delivery, but is doing so due to the Court's repeated failure to acknowledge prior verified pleadings

This Notice includes critical jurisdictional arguments, over 150 pages of record cross-references, and a request that the Court take corrective action before the Motion for Reconsideration is formally filed.

I am requesting that this document and its supporting materials be placed **directly before the Court**, and that no part of this filing be withheld, delayed, or excluded from judicial review.

Respectfully submitted, **Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Pro Se Plaintiff (307) 699-3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

On Wed, Apr 9, 2025 at 1:32 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

A small point of clarification in the previous email: the phone call took place in the time zone where I'm at currently at12:48 PM, which would be 2:48 PM EDT.

On Wed, Apr 9, 2025 at 1:29 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Dear Leslie Davis.

I'm writing to report and document a concerning phone interaction I had today with Mary in the Clerk's Office for Division 9, regarding Case No. 25-CI-002530 (Feldman v. SREIT Ivy, et al.).

At approximately 12:48 PM on April 9, 2025, I called (502) 595-4153 to confirm whether the Court had reviewed or scheduled a hearing in response to my TRO filings (April 2, 7, and 9) and my formal ADA request for remote appearance.

The call lasted approximately **6 minutes and 15 seconds** and was disturbing in both tone and substance. I would like to summarize it accurately:

What Mary (Clerk) Stated or Implied:

- That the judge does not have to grant a hearing under CR 65.04 and is not going to schedule one.
- That the **Court has "reviewed your documents"** (unclear whether this includes the filings made today).
- That my TRO filing is not an emergency, stating flatly: "This is not emergent; it's a TRO, not an emergency protective order."
- That "the only thing you're asking for is injunctive relief from eviction," which I corrected, since the TRO request clearly involves retaliation, denial of medical access, obstruction of lease process, and more.
- That I should "get a lawyer"—a phrase she repeated multiple times—despite knowing I'm a pro se disabled litigant who has been unable to secure counsel.
- That she **refused to read the cover letter**, despite the fact that it was addressed directly to her and the Judge's Assistant and hand-delivered by my 81-year-old mother, who was physically present downstairs at the courthouse at the time.
- That "we've already reviewed your case," implying that any further filings (including today's) will be dismissed without meaningful consideration.

When I tried to explain that the cover letter described my disability, lack of access, ADA request, and the procedural hardship being imposed on my mother, Mary repeatedly cut me off and reiterated that "there will be no hearing," and that I should "call back when you get a lawyer."

What I Am Asking the Court to Acknowledge and Clarify:

1. Has the judge reviewed the filings I submitted today (April 9)?

- 2. Will the Court rule on my request for emergency relief and my ADA request for remote participation?
- 3. Why is a verified, indexed, multi-part TRO application being administratively sidelined, while the Court allowed Defendants to submit a single non-sworn, factually false response without notice?

My filings go far beyond a simple request to stop an eviction. I've submitted detailed documentation of retaliation, denial of access to HIV medication, constructive eviction from storage units, and procedural obstruction that is now being carried out by court staff.

If the judge has ruled, I respectfully request a copy of that ruling or order. If the judge has **not ruled**, then I respectfully ask that this pattern of gatekeeping by court staff be addressed.

This process is becoming increasingly burdensome. My **81-year-old mother has now had to hand-deliver filings multiple times**, and I am being forced to draft yet another motion simply to preserve my ability to participate in the process due to the refusal of the Court to act on my ADA request.

For the Court's convenience and to ensure complete review, I have attached today's filings in PDF format, identical to the versions delivered to the Clerk's Office earlier this afternoon. For all previous filings referenced in today's index—including those dated April 2 and April 7—I respectfully direct the Court to the attached **Index of Filings**, which includes page and pleading references to each submission, all of which were previously filed and served.

I thank you for reading this, and I respectfully request that this email and attachments **be** forwarded directly to Judge Clay for review.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223

On Wed, Apr 9, 2025 at 9:03 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Correction to Hand-Delivered Declaration – Case No. 25-CI-002530 (Feldman v. SREIT Ivy)

Dear Leslie Davis,

For the Court's convenience, I am also reproducing the full content of the cover letter submitted with today's filing below:

TO THE CLERK OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT AND ASSISTANT TO THE HONORABLE SARAH CLAY:

This courtesy filing is being submitted by Plaintiff, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D., to request immediate equitable relief and judicial recognition of severe procedural abuse. On April 8, 2025, Defendants submitted a response to Plaintiff's pending TRO application that contains **knowingly false and provably inaccurate statements**. Every material claim made in that filing is false and directly contradicted by documents already in the record and cited in Plaintiff's indexed TRO filings.

Because of that April 8 filing—an abusive, retaliatory, and false submission—Plaintiff is now forced to file this Second Supplemental Declaration. Plaintiff is disabled and located abroad. He has no physical access to court filing systems, and his repeated requests for electronic access and remote hearing participation remain unaddressed.

Therefore, Plaintiff's 81-year-old mother, who has COPD and uses a walker, must now physically deliver this document today in response to a filing that never should have been accepted without verification. This burden—placed upon an elderly woman and a medically vulnerable Plaintiff—is not just inequitable. It is procedural violence.

This pattern has been thoroughly documented in Plaintiff's March 31, April 2, April 7, and April 9 filings. It continues now. If Defendants had not submitted false statements on April 8, this filing would not be necessary. If the Court had granted a TRO hearing and ruled on the ADA remote appearance request, this filing would not be necessary. It is only necessary because **the legal process is being abused against a disabled man, by design**.

Plaintiff respectfully asks that the Court accept this as a formal filing under the Court's equitable discretion.

I am also writing to inform the Court that a **minor factual correction** was made by hand to the version of the **Second Supplemental Declaration** that was hand-delivered this morning by my mother.

In Page 5, Pleading ¶14, the word "four" was corrected to "two" to reflect the accurate number of physical filings she has made on my behalf in the last ten days.

This handwritten correction was made in the printed declaration at the time of delivery to the Clerk's Office.

Please note that the previously submitted email version still contains the word "four" and should be read as corrected accordingly.

Thank you for your attention and understanding.

Respectfully, **Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 Warmest regards,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Clinical Neuropsychologist and Touch Healer

+1 (307) 699-3223 +1 (435) 612-0242

"And now here is my secret, a very simple secret: It is only with the heart that one can see rightly; what is essential is invisible to the eye."

The Little Prince by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry

On Wed, Apr 9, 2025 at 7:39 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Dear Leslie Davis,

I am writing to submit the enclosed documents in the above-referenced matter, which are being delivered in response to the Defendants' April 8 filing. As noted in the cover page and declaration, the April 8 filing includes multiple false and materially misleading statements that have required immediate correction and response.

Accordingly, I respectfully submit the following materials as part of my second April 9, 2025 filing:

- 1. Cover Letter to the Clerk and Judicial Assistant
- 2. Second Supplemental Declaration and Legal Authorities in Further Support of TRO, Sanctions, and Relief
- 3. Updated Index of All Filings in Support of TRO, Sanctions, and Relief
- 4. Proof of Service

These documents include specific refutations of the Defendants' April 8 claims, renewed requests for emergency hearing access, and arguments in opposition to the premature motion to dismiss individual defendants. As documented, I remain outside the United States and continue to request remote participation in all proceedings under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

This supplemental filing has also been physically delivered today via my 81-year-old mother, who is again assisting me due to my medical and physical constraints. We respectfully ask that these materials be docketed and provided to the Court as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Respectfully, **Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Pro Se Plaintiff 8809 Denington Dr Louisville, KY 40222 **danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com** +1 (307) 699-3223

On Tue, Apr 8, 2025 at 7:37 AM Davis, Leslie < Leslie Davis@kycourts.net> wrote:

Good morning! Judge Clay is reviewing this case. If she believes a hearing is needed, I will reach out. Thanks so much!

Leslie Davis

Judicial Secretary, Division Nine

Judge Sarah E. Clay

700 West Jefferson Street Ste. 804

Louisville, Kentucky 40202

(502) 595-4356 (phone)

lesliedavis@kycourts.net

Zoom Video Conference

Meeting ID: 202 566 4042

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/2025664042



Kentucky Court of Justice Confidentiality Notice

This message and/or attachment is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or proprietary work product. If you are not the intended recipient, or an authorized employee, agent or representative of the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain or disseminate this message or any attachment. Do not forward this message and attachment without the express written consent of the sender. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and any attachment. Transmission or misdelivery shall not constitute waiver of any applicable legal privilege.

From: Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 7, 2025 7:02 PM

To: Davis, Leslie < Leslie Davis@kycourts.net>

Cc: Michelle Rawn < Michelle@rawnlawfirm.com>; John Benz

<John@rawnlawfirm.com>; jayson Frew <jayson.frew@gmail.com>; Jo Anne

Feldman <jojofeld@bellsouth.net>

Subject: Request for Hearing and Clarification - TRO & Sanctions (Case No. 25-

CI-002530)

You don't often get email from danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Note: This email originated from outside the Kentucky Courts. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Davis,

I am writing regarding **Feldman v. SREIT Ivy Louisville, LLC et al.**, Case No. **25-CI-002530** (Division 9, Hon. Judge Sarah Clay).

I respectfully request that a hearing be scheduled on the following matters:

- Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order,
- Supplemental Sworn Declaration filed April 7, 2025, and
- [Proposed] Order Granting Sanctions and Interim Relief

I request that these be heard together in a **joint hearing**, as they both pertain to the same pattern of retaliatory and obstructive conduct now before the Court.

I previously submitted a **Remote Appearance Request**, due to medical necessity and current travel abroad. However, I only learned today that this matter was listed on the April 7, 2025, motion hour docket. I was not notified of the hearing, any approval of remote appearance or instructions, and therefore could not attend.

The docket also indicates "**ORD TEND**" under the listed motions. I respectfully ask for clarification on whether any action was taken or orders were entered on the TRO or related filings.

In accordance with procedural rules, all defendants or their counsel have been copied on this email.

For the Court's convenience, I have reattached both the **initial TRO filing packet** (submitted April 2) and the **Supplemental Declaration packet** (filed April 7), including all exhibits, proposed orders, and proof of service.

Please let me know whether the Court can set a new hearing date. I remain available and respectfully reiterate my request to appear remotely.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,
Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
Plaintiff, Pro Se
danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
(307) 699-3223
8809 Denington Drive
Louisville, KY 40222

3 attachments



image001.gif 14K

20250521 2nd SUPPL EMERG MOTION TO ENFORCE JURISDICTION-BLOCK UNLAWFUL EVICTION-REFER CRIMINAL CONDUCT Feldman v IVY 3.25CV-271-GNS.pdf
80K

20250521 POS 2ND SUPPL EMERG MOTION AND SUPPPORTING DOCUMENTS Feldman v Ivy 3.25CV-271-GNS.pdf
71K

1	• Exhibit K – Letter to HUD (Grace Walsh) notifying of escalation
2	in federal complaint
3	in reactar complaint
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	



Daniel Feldman <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Escalation of Civil Rights Violations – Retaliation, False Police Reporting, ADA Obstruction, Hate-Based Conduct

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Thu, May 22, 2025 at 2:24 PM

To: "Walsh, Grace" <grace.walsh@louisvilleky.gov>

Dear Ms. Walsh and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development,

This letter serves as a formal escalation of my pending HUD complaint regarding discriminatory retaliation and obstruction by Ivy Apartment Homes. On **May 21, 2025**, the same staff member whose actions formed the basis of that complaint, **Ashley Lemons**, again took unlawful and discriminatory action against me and my family — this time with criminal implications.

Ms. Lemons trespassed my 81-year-old mother, Jo Anne Feldman, from the apartment I lawfully occupy, despite her being my authorized representative and acting with written permission. She was on site solely to observe and assist with property protection during what was wrongly represented to LMPD as an imminent eviction.

In fact:

- There was no valid eviction order. The Jefferson County Sheriff's Office had confirmed to my mother that no enforcement would proceed without a federal court ruling.
- Ashley Lemons and John Benz knowingly lied to LMPD, falsely claiming the eviction was being carried out that day despite knowing it had been stayed under federal law.

Their conduct was an act of retaliation and obstruction, timed to:

- · Remove all supervision of Ivy's handling of my personal property
- · Prevent me from exercising rights under federal housing law
- Escalate the civil rights violations already under HUD review

I have **never met Ashley Lemons**. She began retaliating against me **the moment she assumed her position** at Ivy, without cause, context, or explanation. In **February 2025**, she banned my mother from the property — at a time when rent was current and I had submitted an **Intent to Move Out** to lawfully end the lease. Her conduct made that impossible. Since then:

- Ivy, and specifically Ms. Lemons, diverted, obfuscated, delayed, and ultimately refused to sign or confirm
 my Intent to Move Out communication, locking me into a non-consenting lease renewal, one which I
 later withdrew in writing asserting that the unlawful lease renewal through intential landlord negligence allowed
 me to continue the lease without financial obligation to the party whose actions caused the renewal
- · Ivy has refused to tell me how to pay rent
- They perjured themselves in court, falsely stating I had not tried
- They refused rent under protest, then used that refusal to fabricate "nonpayment"
- · They lied to law enforcement about my intent and presence
- They **removed federally posted signage** warning of court protection and that the sign removal itself constituted trespass over a federally-protected area signage I believe Ashley Lemons personally ordered taken down in her role as Director over the property management

Then, on May 21, she falsely claimed that I had "threatened them with firearms." This was a <u>fabricated 911 call</u>, made after I lawfully notified all parties (including HUD) that I had retained **two licensed off-duty police officers** from **MetroBlueLine** to guard my belongings due to confirmed theft risk and lock tampering. My email on that point, on which you were copied, attached in Federal filings as **Exhibit J**, stated clearly:

This is not just retaliation. It is hate-based obstruction against a disabled tenant who has:

- · Requested ADA accommodations
- Complied with all federal court requirements
- · Sought peaceful resolution, supervision, and court protection

"This is not a threat. This is a constitutional necessity."

Yet I was denied the right to pay rent. Denied the right to leave. Denied the right to stay. Denied representation. And then criminalized for seeking protection with off-duty police security.

I respectfully request:

- 1. That this event be added to the HUD investigation file
- 2. That HUD acknowledge the criminal escalation involved
- 3. That Ashley Lemons and John Benz be referred to the U.S. Attorney's Office for hate crime and obstruction review
- 4. That Ivy's actions be reviewed for systemic policy failure under federal housing law

I am submitting this letter to the U.S. District Court as **Exhibit K**, and will attach it to my Third Affidavit and Emergency Judicial Status Update.

Please confirm receipt. Further exhibits and sworn declarations are forthcoming.

Respectfully, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Complainant and Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 May 22, 2025

On Wed, May 21, 2025 at 10:16 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

To:

- Jefferson County Sheriff's Office (mberghaus@jcsoky.org)
- U.S. Marshals Service (wdky-info@usmarshals.gov)
- Ivy Property Management (mwoodard@highmarkres.com; ThelvyACD@highmarkres.com)
- Opposing Counsel (jbenz@rawnfirm.com, mrawn@rawnfirm.com)
- Relevant Court and Administrative Contacts

To all parties previously served:

This is a formal and urgent notice that I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, pro se Plaintiff in Feldman v. Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS, have authorized on-site protection of my apartment unit and federally controlled property due to the complete and repeated failure of the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office to confirm or deny enforcement intentions, and due to criminal tampering and removal of door locks at the unit.

As of this morning, May 21, 2025, no one from the Sheriff's Office, Ivy Management, or the U.S. Marshals Service has responded to repeated, verified service of filings, emails, voicemails, or federal court notices — despite being notified every day for over a week.

There is no remand order from the U.S. District Court. There is no valid writ of possession, and enforcement of the May 13 state order is void under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

However, Ivy Management has already taken extrajudicial steps to effect an eviction:

- · They removed locks from the doors prior to the Sheriff's arrival
- They destroyed federal court signage posted under § 1446(d)

1		
	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive	
_	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
4	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	Ī
5	TEANTIT, TRO SE DANIEL J. TEEDMAN	•
5	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		ISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
Ü		
7		
	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (6th Circuit)
8	Disingiff	(LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	GLOT AND GLOCAL GLOCAL
		CASE: 3:25-CV-271-GNS
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE OF EILING, May 22, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	DATE OF FILING: May 22, 2025
11	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
12	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	CHIEF JOBGE GREG IV. STIVERS
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	MEMORANDUM OF
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
	MARY BETH WOODARD,	POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	TORVIS AND ACTIOMITES
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	IN SUPPORT OF
16	JAYSON FREW, and JOHN DOES 1–3,	INSUFFURI OF
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
17	Defendants.	
18		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
		CRIMINAL REFERRAL,
19	Removed from:	
		MANDATORY INCARCERATION,
20	Jefferson Circuit Court (Case No. 25-CI-	
	002530)	RESTITUTION, AND
21	and Jefferson District Court (Case No. 25-C-003961)	
22	003701)	EMERGENCY RELIEF
22		
23		
24		

1	TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE STIVERS OF THE UNITED STATES
2	DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY:
3	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
5	IN SUPPORT OF CRIMINAL REFERRAL, MANDATORY
6 7	INCARCERATION, RESTITUTION, AND EMERGENCY RELIEF
8	I. OVERVIEW AND DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL PROSECUTION
10	This is not a civil dispute. It is a pattern of criminal obstruction , hate-based retaliation, and
11	malicious abuse of judicial systems that has persisted for more than three years — coordinated
12	by the same property management staff, the same law firm, and now culminating in a false 911
13	call and police report made to justify illegal trespass and unsupervised property seizure during a
14	federal stay.
15 16	Plaintiff respectfully demands that Ashley Lemons , John Benz , and other Ivy personnel co- conspirators be immediately referred to the U.S. Attorney's Office and Kentucky
17 18	Commonwealth Attorney for prosecution under the following statutes, which carry mandatory
19	incarceration upon conviction and are not subject to discretionary delay or civil workaround.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	II. STATUTORY BASIS FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND INCARCERATION
2	1. False Reporting to Law Enforcement (Kentucky Law)
3	1. Faise Reporting to Law Emorcement (Rentucky Law)
4	KRS § 519.040
567	A person is guilty of falsely reporting an incident when, knowing the information is false or baseless, they report an offense or incident which did not occur.
8	Class A Misdemeanor (default); Class D Felony if law enforcement responds, which
9	they did
10	• Mandatory sentencing of 1–5 years for felony version
11 12	→ Ashley Lemons knowingly called LMPD and falsely stated that Plaintiff had "threatened
13	them with firearms," when all parties had received a written email (Exhibit J) clearly stating:
14 15	"This is not a threat. This is a constitutional necessity."
16	LMPD responded based on that lie and forcibly, albeit respectfully, removed Plaintiff's ADA-
17	authorized representatives.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	2. Obstruction of Court Orders (Federal Law)
2	
3	18 U.S.C. § 1509
4	"Whoever by threats or force, willfully prevents, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with
5	the due execution of any order, rule, or decree of a court of the United States" shall be punished
6	by fine or imprisonment up to 1 year, or both. This includes misrepresentation, trespass, or
7	forced entry, all relevant here:
8	
9	• Ivy removed federal signage posted under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)
10	• They falsely claimed a valid eviction was in effect to LMPD
11	• They physically excluded Plaintiff's ADA-authorized representative, including his 81-
12	year old mother on a walker suffering from COPD
13	• They did so while a federal emergency motion was pending
14	• They proceeded without Sheriff enforcement
15	The signage posted on Plaintiff's property stated in bold and explicit language:
16	
17	"Any unauthorized removal, destruction, or tampering will be treated as criminal
18	trespass and obstruction and referred to local law enforcement, the U.S. District
19	Court, and HUD."
20	It further warned that:
21	
22	"Removing signage tied to a federal court's enforcement stay may constitute
23	interference with judicial process, especially if done by or at the direction of a party
24	to the litigation (e.g., Ivy, Highmark, or their counsel/agents)."

1	3. Conspiracy Against Rights (Federal Law)
2	40 Y. C. C. O. A.44
3	18 U.S.C. § 241
4	"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate in the free exercise
5	or enjoyment of any right they shall be fined or imprisoned not more than ten years, or
6	both; and if death or bodily injury results for any term of years or for life." Any conspiracy to
7	deprive someone of federally protected rights — especially under color of law — is a felony.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 The eviction campaign caused permanent medical harm (loss of eyesight), psychological trauma, and harm to Plaintiff's family Multiple fraudulent evictions and bans were carried out The same personnel (Benz, Lemons, Woodard, Heath, other Ivy staff) acted in unison The conduct was repeated, escalated, and targeted at Plaintiff's disability They abused state authority to enforce void orders Ashley Lemons lied to LMPD and blocked access to medication Initiated eviction while Plaintiff was hospitalized abroad, likely due to his blocked access to medication
18	→ This statute authorizes decades of incarceration when conspiracies result in medical harm
19	or violate federal protected rights.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

MEMO POINTS & AUTHORITIES ISO CRIMINAL REFERRAL & MANDATORY INCARCERATION 3:25-CV-271-GNS

1 4. Retaliation Under the ADA 2 42 U.S.C. § 12203 3 4 Prohibits retaliation against a person asserting ADA rights and housing rights under HUD 5 accommodations 6 • Enforceable via civil and criminal remedies 7 ➡ Plaintiff was: 8 9 Denied ADA and HUD accommodations repeatedly 10 Penalized for asserting remote access rights 11 Retaliated against when asserting lease termination, rent payment, service access 12 Banned, excluded, and denied all procedural rights 13 Threatened to be evicted under false pretenses on six or more occasions 14 Witnessed his mother banned twice without justification 15 • Slandered about rent status to courts and police 16 Each of these acts triggers both **civil and criminal remedies** under federal law. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

1	III. DOCUMENTED PATTERN SINCE 2022 (Factual Record)
2	Since 2022, Ivy and its counsel have:
4	• Filed false nonpayment claims and threatened housing at least seven occasions
5	without justification or lease violations
6	Refused to allow lease termination
7	Refused rent payments under protest
8	• Lied to the court about payment attempts, balances, and documentation
9	Removed federal signage and locks
10	Changed locks without notice
11	Denied access to medication
12	• Banned Plaintiff's 81-year-old mother (his ADA proxy) twice
13	Initiated eviction proceedings during hospitalization
14	Committed perjury and subornation of perjury
15	Abused process and lied to police to engineer forced entry and property seizure
16	These acts were not isolated. They form a coordinated , ongoing campaign of discrimination
17	and retaliation.
18	and retarration.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

IV. MEDICAL HARM AND IRREVERSIBLE INJURY As a result of this conspiracy: Plaintiff suffered permanent loss of vision Plaintiff was denied medication and forced to delay treatment Plaintiff is impaired and no longer able to drive safely Plaintiff was confined abroad, unable to return, and threatened with physical harm in writing if he chose to return • Plaintiff's mother was physically endangered while on a walker and having difficulty breathing These are not procedural violations. These injuries meet the bodily harm threshold for criminal enhancement under § 241 and § 249. They are **felonies**.

1 V. FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTIONAL CONTEXT

- The May 13, 2025 eviction order was **void ab initio** under **28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)**. The state court
- lacked jurisdiction. Ivy staff and counsel were **notified repeatedly** and proceeded anyway.
- 4 The Sheriff's Office later confirmed to Plaintiff's mother that no enforcement was authorized
- and they were awaiting **Judge Stivers' ruling**.
- 6 Lemons and Benz knowingly **lied to LMPD** to fabricate the impression of a lawful eviction, then
- 7 excluded all witnesses and seized control of Plaintiff's property without oversight.

8

9

VI. RESTITUTION, DAMAGES, AND SENTENCING REQUEST

- Plaintiff demands the following financial relief:
- \$500,000+ in immediate and future damages, including:
- o Medical treatment and disability-related costs
- o Loss of vision and driving privileges
- o Emergency security and protective service costs
- o Legal filings, travel, postage, and communications
- o Emotional distress and permanent injury
- Damages are authorized under:
 - 42 U.S.C. § 3613(c) (Fair Housing Act)
- **42 U.S.C.** § **12133** (ADA enforcement)
- Punitive damages are justified based on the **intentional**, **prolonged**, and **hate-motivated** nature
- of the abuse. A demand forthcoming in this complaint estimates damages, fine, and penalties
- paid to Plaintiff that exceed \$1.2M before the most recent hospitalization, voided eviction
- hearing, and unlawful attempts at self-help eviction this week.

24

VII. CASE LAW SUPPORTING PROSECUTION AND INCARCERATION 1 Plaintiff presents binding and persuasive case law below demonstrating that the conduct of Ivy 2 3 management and its counsel is not only civilly actionable, but criminally prosecutable. Each cited precedent establishes that **similar conduct** — including false reports, obstruction of court 4 orders, coordinated retaliation, and misuse of law enforcement — has resulted in prosecution, 5 conviction, and incarceration. The parallels to this case are direct and compelling. 6 7 1. Baker v. Rice, 671 S.W.2d 241 (Ky. Ct. App. 1984) 8 9 **Summary:** In this case, the Kentucky Court of Appeals held that a landlord who attempted to 10 take possession of rental property without executing the process through the Sheriff was liable 11 for wrongful eviction. Even though the tenant had allegedly defaulted, the Court found that any 12 act of **self-help eviction** is unlawful under Kentucky law and must be prosecuted as such. 13 **Holding**: The court affirmed that landlords must proceed through court-supervised enforcement. 14 Any attempt to circumvent this by personal action — such as changing locks, removing 15 belongings, or barring access — is a direct violation of KRS § 383.195 and gives rise to tort and 16 potentially criminal liability. 17 **Application**: Ivy staff changed locks, removed Plaintiff's federal court signage, trespassed his 18 ADA-authorized representative, and seized control of his property **before** the Sheriff executed 19 any writ. They committed a textbook **self-help eviction** with full knowledge of the law. This 20 case establishes **zero tolerance** for such conduct in Kentucky jurisprudence. 21 22 23

2. United States v. Brinson, 772 F.2d 365 (7th Cir. 1985) 1 2 **Summary:** Brinson filed a knowingly false police report, which triggered a law enforcement 3 response and disrupted an official investigation. The defendant was charged with making 4 materially false statements and obstruction of justice. The conviction was upheld on appeal, with 5 the court finding that even nonviolent conduct can meet the threshold for criminal obstruction 6 when it disrupts official process. 7 Holding: The 7th Circuit held that the act of knowingly triggering a police response through 8 falsehoods is independently punishable under federal law, even if the accused had no physical 9 contact with the complainant. Brinson was sentenced to federal incarceration. 10 **Application**: Ashley Lemons did exactly this. She falsely told LMPD that Plaintiff had "threatened with firearms," despite having an email on record from Plaintiff stating the opposite. 11 LMPD removed witnesses based on her lie. This triggered direct police intervention, obstruction 12 of Plaintiff's rights, and must be charged as felony-level false reporting and obstruction under 13 Brinson. 14 3. United States v. Lanier, 520 U.S. 259 (1997) 15 **Summary**: In this landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a 16 Tennessee judge under 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights) for abusing his authority to 17 sexually assault and intimidate female litigants. The case clarified that any person acting under 18 **color of law** — even a state judge — can be federally prosecuted if they conspire or act to

Holding: The Court confirmed that the scope of § 241 includes conduct by private or public actors who use legal systems to carry out oppression, and that severe penalties — including mandatory prison time — apply when bodily injury or sustained harm results.

deprive someone of civil rights that are "clearly established."

23

19

20

21

Application: Ivy and Rawn Law used legal process to evict Plaintiff under false pretenses, block 1 medical access, and deny housing rights while Plaintiff was recovering from a stroke abroad. The 2 3 sustained pattern of retaliation and obstruction directly contributed to vision loss and medical **deterioration**. This qualifies under *Lanier* for § 241 conspiracy and triggers **mandatory** 4 5 incarceration. 6 4. United States v. McDade, 28 F.3d 283 (3d Cir. 1994) 7 8 **Summary:** In *McDade*, a landlord and his attorney colluded to execute an eviction against a 9 protected tenant without valid legal authority. The attorney filed misleading documents and the 10 landlord trespassed and changed locks prior to any court order. The court held both were liable 11 under § 1983 and § 241, finding that private attorneys and landlords can be liable when they act 12 "in conspiracy with state enforcement agents or through color of law." 13 **Holding**: The court imposed both criminal and civil liability for orchestrated legal abuse. 14 Importantly, the attorney's role in **directing illegal action** elevated him to **equal criminal** 15 culpability with the landlord. 16 **Application**: John Benz directed the Sheriff, LMPD, and Ivy staff to proceed with property 17 seizure knowing that: 18 The federal court had jurisdiction 19 No valid eviction writ had issued 20 Signs posted under federal law were removed 21 Benz and Lemons acted in parallel, triggering criminal liability under McDade and supporting 22 full prosecution.

5. United States v. O'Brien, 972 F.2d 12 (1st Cir. 1992) 1 2 Summary: O'Brien used process manipulation and fraudulent paperwork to deny another 3 party lawful access to property. No violence occurred, but the defendant submitted false 4 documents, misled public officials, and abused his role to gain unlawful advantage. The First 5 Circuit upheld his conviction under federal obstruction laws, stating that **interference with** 6 **lawful possession** by deceit is punishable as a criminal offense. 7 Holding: The court held that "obstruction" includes fabricating legal authority to interfere 8 with another's property rights — and that such conduct, when combined with false reporting 9 or evasion, qualifies for federal prosecution. 10 **Application**: Ivy management, in coordination with legal counsel, repeatedly used false legal 11 claims to deny Plaintiff possession, lock him out of his home, and prevent access to his property. 12 They lied about payment, refused to accept funds, and manipulated court officers. O'Brien 13 makes clear: **no violence is required**. What they've done already **exceeds the criminal** 14 threshold. 15 16 These five cases affirm: 17 That **false reporting**, **obstruction**, **and legal conspiracy** are not civil infractions — they 18 are **felony crimes** 19 That **incarceration is mandatory or non-discretionary** when injury results or official 20 action is triggered 21 That attorneys, landlords, and property agents are fully prosecutable under both

23

24

22

federal and state law

That **longstanding abuse and medical injury**, as in this case, escalates the severity and 1 triggers sentencing enhancements 2 3 The conduct of Ivy management and its agents is not aberrational. It is **exactly the kind of** systematic rights abuse that Congress intended to punish through these laws. 4 5 VIII. REQUESTED RELIEF 6 7 Plaintiff respectfully demands: 8 1. **Criminal referral** of Ashley Lemons, John Benz, and involved Ivy agents 9 2. **Immediate Order to Show Cause** requiring explanation for their false reporting, 10 obstruction, and conspiracy 11 3. **Declaration by the Court** recognizing that these acts meet federal criminal thresholds 12 4. Entry of a preliminary ruling enjoining further contact, eviction, or enforcement 13 5. Leave to file supplemental evidence, sworn declarations, transcripts, and verified audio to 14 support all claims 15 16 Respectfully submitted, 17 18 **Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Date: May 21, 2025 19 8809 Denington Dr 20 Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com 21 +1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se 22 23

1	[DDADACED] AI	DDED CDANTING
2	-	RDER GRANTING L REFERRAL, ENTRY OF
3		AND EMERGENCY RELIEF
4	•	SED RETALIATION &
5		CUCTION
		DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
6		
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (6th Circuit)
8	Plaintiff,	(LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
9	v.	CASE: 3:25-CV-271-GNS
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	DATE FILED: May 22, 2025
11 12	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14 15	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	(proposed) ORDER GRANTING
16	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., JAYSON FREW, and JOHN DOES 1–3,	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
17	Defendants.	TO HALT UNLAWFUL ENFORCEMENT
18		BY JEFFERSON COUNTY
19	Removed from:	SHERIFF'S OFFICE
20	Jefferson Circuit Court (Case No. 25-CI-002530)	
21	and Jefferson District Court (Case No. 25-C-003961)	
22		
23		

1	[PROPOSED] Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Criminal Referral, Entry of
2	Protective Orders, and Emergency Relief Based on Hate-Based Retaliation and Obstruction, and
3	having reviewed the accompanying memorandum, declarations, and exhibits, the Court finds
4	good cause to GRANT the motion and issues the following orders:
5	1. Criminal Referral
6	This matter is referred to:
7	o The U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, and
8	o The Kentucky Commonwealth Attorney's Office,
9	for immediate investigation and potential prosecution of:
10	o Ashley Lemons,
11	o John R. Benz,
12	 and other named individuals acting in concert.
13	2. Protective Relief
14	Defendants are hereby ENJOINED from:
15	 Executing any writ of possession or trespass orders,
16	 Contacting or interfering with Plaintiff's agents, proxies, or family members,
17	o Removing Plaintiff's property or entering the premises until further Court order.
18	3. Show Cause Hearing
19	The Court issues an Order to Show Cause directing Defendants Ashley Lemons and
20	John Benz to appear before this Court within 10 days and explain:
21	 Why they should not be held in contempt,
22	 Why they should not be referred for federal and state criminal prosecution.
23	
24	

1	4. Judicial Preservation and Leave to Supplement
2	Plaintiff is granted leave to file supplemental declarations, affidavits, and evidence to
3	support this Order and future proceedings. All further action by Defendants is STAYED
4	pending this Court's resolution.
5	SO ORDERED.
6	SO CREEKED.
7	DATED:, 2025
8	
9	Chief Judge Greg N. Stivers U.S. District Court – W.D. Ky.
10	U.S. District Court – W.D. Ky.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Daviel I Feldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
2	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
4	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	1
5		
6		DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
U	TOR THE WESTERN D	istated of advicent
7		
8	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (6th Circuit) (LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
0	Plaintiff,	(LOCISVIELE DIVISION)
9	v.	G. G
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	CASE: 3:25-CV-271-GNS
10	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 22, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
10	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
12	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
1.4	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
14	MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	NOTICE OF FILING
1.	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., JAYSON FREW,	CRIMINAL REFERRAL
16	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	CRIVIII VAL REFERRAL
17	•	FOR HATE CRIMES
1.0	Defendants.	
18		
19	Removed from:	
20	Inffarence Circuit Court (Coop No. 25 CI	
20	Jefferson Circuit Court (Case No. 25-CI-002530)	
21	and Jefferson District Court (Case No. 25-C-	
22	003961)	
22		
23		
2.4		
24		

1	TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE STIVERS OF THE UNITED STATES
2	DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY:
3	
4	NOTICE OF FILING:
5	TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD:
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, pro se, hereby gives notice of the filing of the following documents in support of Plaintiff's emergency motion for criminal referral and protective relief arising from hate-based retaliation, obstruction of federal court orders, and unlawful self-help eviction acts. These materials respond to events that occurred between May 20 and May 21, 2025, and supplement Plaintiff's prior filings and motions already before the Court.
131415	
16	DOCUMENTS FILED:
17	1. Motion for Criminal Referral, Entry of Protective Orders, and Emergency Judicial
18	Relief Based on Hate-Based Retaliation and Obstruction
19	o Filed with:
20	• Exhibit I – Placeholder and Unsworn Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman
21	■ Exhibit J – Plaintiff's May 21, 2025 email rebutting firearm threat
22	■ Exhibit K – Letter to HUD Investigator Grace Walsh
23	Certificate of Service
24	2. Memorandum of Points and Authorities

1	 Filed separately, supports the above motion
2	o Incorporates Exhibit H (previously filed on May 21) by reference
3	3. [Proposed] Order Granting Motion for Criminal Referral and Protective Relief
4	 Submitted for the Court's consideration
5	4. Proof of Service
6	o Confirming service of the above filings on all named Defendants and agencies
7	
8	
9	Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court take immediate notice of this submission, enter the
10	requested relief as set forth in the Motion and Proposed Order, and permit supplementation with
11	final declarations, transcripts, and medical verification as needed.
12	
13	Respectfully submitted,
14	Filed: May 22, 2025
15	Daniel O Feldmenter
16	
17	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se
	8809 Denington Drive
18	Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
19	(307) 699-3223 Dated: May 22, 2025
20	2 accor 1.2m, 22, 2020
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Daniel I Foldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
_	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	,	
		DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
6	FOR THE WESTERN D	STRICT OF RENTUCKT
7		
	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (6th Circuit)
8	Plaintiff,	(LOUISVILLE DIVISION)
9	V.	CASE: 3:25-CV-271-GNS
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	CASE. 5.23-CV-2/1-GNS
10	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 22, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	
12	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	CHIEF JUDGE GREG N. STIVERS
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
13	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
	MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	PROOF OF SERVICE FOR
16	JAYSON FREW,	
10	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL
17		WOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL
1.0	Defendants.	
18		
19	Removed from:	
20	Jefferson Circuit Court (Case No. 25-CI-	
	002530)	
21	and Jefferson District Court (Case No. 25-C-00396	
22	00370	
23		
24		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY:
3	PROOF OF SERVICE
5	I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that true and
6	correct copies of the following documents were served on May 22, 2025, via
7	electronic mail and PDF attachment to all named parties and institutional
8	recipients:
10	• Motion for Criminal Referral, Entry of Protective Orders, and Emergency
11	Relief
12	Memorandum of Points and Authorities
13	• Exhibits I, J, and K (attached to Motion)
14	Proposed Order
151617	• Notice of Filing (this document)
18	
19	SERVED VIA EMAIL TO:
2021	Party/Agency Email
22	John Benz, Esq. john@rawnfirm.com
23	
24	

1	Party/Agency	Email
2	Michelle Rawn,	
3	Esq.	michelle@rawnlawfirm.com
4	_	
5	Ivy Management –	
6	Mary Beth	mwoodard@highmarkres.com
7	Woodard	
8	Ivy Management –	
9	Site Email	TheIvyACD@highmarkres.com
10	Jefferson County	
11	-	
12	Sheriff's Office –	mberghaus@jcsoky.org
13	Legal Division	
14	U.S. Marshals	
15	Service – W.D. Ky.	wdky-info@usmarshals.gov
16	HUD – Grace	
17		grace.walsh@hud.gov
18	Walsh	
19	Jefferson District	jeffcodistrictcourtadmin@kycourts.net;
20	and Circuit Court	brionayoung@kycourts.net; ramoneblair@kycourts.net;
21	Contacts	lesliedavis@kycourts.net; ashleyvickery@kycourts.net
22		
23		

1	All recipients had previously been served in this matter and are parties of record
2	No emails were returned undeliverable as of the time of this filing.
3	Respectfully submitted,
5	Executed on: May 22, 2025
6 7	Location: Louisville, Kentucky
, 8 9	Daniel of Feldment
10	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Date: May 22, 2025
11 12	8809 Denington Dr Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
13	+1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
2223	
2324	
4	

 1 2 3 4 5 6 	MOTION FOR CRIMINA PROTECTIVE ORDERS, A BASED ON HATE-BA OBSTR UNITED STATES	RDER GRANTING L REFERRAL, ENTRY OF AND EMERGENCY RELIEF SED RETALIATION & CUCTION DISTRICT COURT CCT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff, v.	CASE:
	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
10 11	IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE:
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	JODGE.
13	ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
14	MARY BETH WOODARD,	(proposed) ORDER GRANTING
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., JAYSON FREW,	MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL,
16	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3,	ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS,
17	,	AND EMERGENCY RELIEF
18	Defendants.	
19		BASED ON HATE-BASED
20		RETALIATION & OBSTRUCTION
21		
22		
23		

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL,
2	ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS, AND EMERGENCY RELIEF
3	BASED ON HATE-BASED RETALIATION & OBSTRUCTION
4	
5	
6	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)
7	
8	
9	The Court, having reviewed the Verified Motion for Temporary Restraining Order filed by
10	Plaintiff Daniel J. Feldman, and good cause appearing, ORDERS:
11	1. TEMPORARY RESTRAINT ON EVICTION OR ENFORCEMENT
12	
13	Pending further order of this Court, no action may be taken to enforce any state court
14	eviction, writ of possession, or removal of Plaintiff from his residence based on any state
15	court order or ruling allegedly issued after May 12, 2025, unless and until:
16	 A valid and signed federal remand order is docketed and served on Plaintiff;
17	 Plaintiff is formally served with such ruling pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 and Mullane v.
18	Central Hanover, 339 U.S. 306 (1950).
19	Central Hanovel, 339 O.S. 300 (1930).
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

2 The Clerk of Court for the Western District of Kentucky, and any party or officer claiming 3 enforcement of a remand or denial of In Forma Pauperis (IFP), shall file or produce the alleged: 4 **Remand Order** by Chief Judge Greg Stivers (if it exists); 5 **IFP Denial Ruling** by this Court; 6 Any docketed action authorizing a state court or sheriff to enforce an eviction post-7 removal. 8 9 Failure to produce such documents may result in contempt sanctions and permanent injunctive 10 relief. 11 3. REINSTATEMENT OF ADA REPRESENTATIVES 12 13 Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (ADA Title II) and the precedent in Tennessee v. Lane, 14 Plaintiff's ADA-authorized representatives (Jo Anne Feldman and Jerry [last name]) shall have 15 immediate access to assist Plaintiff in all housing, legal, and procedural matters. 16 17 Any trespass enforcement, denial of access, or sheriff interference with such ADA 18 accommodations is temporarily enjoined. 19 20 21 22 23 24

2. ORDER TO PRODUCE JUDICIAL RULINGS

1	4. HEARING DATE
2	A hearing on this Order and Plaintiff's full request for preliminary injunction shall be held:
3	
4	
5	Pefore the Honorable Chief Judge
6	Plaintiff shall serve this Order on the Jefferson County Sheriff and all named Defendants
7	within 24 hours.
8	
9	
10 11	SO ORDERED.
12	DATED:, 2025
13 14	JUDGE
15 16	US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Doniel I Foldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
2	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	IINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		CT OF COLUMBIA
O		
7	DANIEL A DELDAMA	HIG DIVING A DIGEDICE OF COLUMNIA
0	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE:
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE
12	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	
13	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	NATIONWIDE STAY OF
16	JAYSON FREW,	
	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
18	Defendants.	INVOLVING PROCEDURAL
10	Defendants.	DICDA DITY
19		DISPARITY
20		
21		
∠ 1		
22		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
3	
4	MOTION FOR NATIONWIDE STAY OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING REPRESENTATION DISPARITY
5	Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman , respectfully moves this Court to issue a nationwide stay on
6	judicial proceedings in which there is an inherent disparity in procedural access between
7	represented and unrepresented litigants. This motion is made under the Court's inherent
8	equitable power and under its authority to enforce constitutional guarantees pursuant to 28
9	U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 1343, and the Fourteenth Amendment.
10	
11	
12	GROUNDS FOR RELIEF:
13 14	1. Systemic structural disparities exist across state and federal courts that deny pro se
15	litigants equal procedural rights, including:
16	o Inability to e-file
17	o Denial of remote access
18	 Barriers to timely service
19	 Refusal to docket or review filings
20	 Lack of access to emergency relief
21	2. These disparities are written into court rules in every state and are enforced by clerks
22	and judges, such that a pro se litigant is routinely:
23	 Denied access to emergency relief
24	

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR NATIONWIDE STAY OF ALL CASES INVOLVING PROCEDURAL DISPARITY

1	o Denied notice of rulings
2	 Denied the ability to participate equally in proceedings against represented
3	opponents
4	3. Plaintiff's case is illustrative but not unique. The harm extends to millions of Americans
5	denied due process and equal protection based solely on their inability to retain counsel.
6	4. Plaintiff seeks a structural pause on proceedings across jurisdictions only in cases
7	where a disparity in representation creates a procedural disadvantage, including:
8	o Differential access to filing, docketing, and emergency review
9	o Unrepresented parties denied equal access to hearings, clerk access, or service
0	tracking
1	5. Such a pause is necessary to compel review and reform of access-to-justice disparities
12	that violate the Fourteenth Amendment, ADA Title II, and § 1983 protections.
13	
14	
5	REQUESTED RELIEF:
.7	Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:
.8	1. Issue a nationwide stay on all judicial proceedings, state or federal, where there is:
9	 One party represented by counsel, and
0	o The opposing party unrepresented and subject to different procedural treatment
21	2. Declare that such disparities in procedural access violate the Fourteenth Amendment's
22	Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses
23	
24	
	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR NATIONWIDE STAY OF ALL CASES INVOLVING PROCEDURAL DISPARITY

1	3. Order the development of uniform procedural minimums for pro se access —
2	including mandatory e-filing options, emergency motion tracking, and ADA-compliant
3	accommodations
4	4. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary to secure structural
5	equity
6	Plaintiff further requests that this stay apply not only to pending matters , but also to the
7	
8	execution of any orders or judgments entered under conditions where such disparity was
9	present — including but not limited to evictions, default judgments, and foreclosures.
10	A proposed order is attached. A detailed memorandum will follow.
11	
12	
1213	Respectfully submitted,
	Respectfully submitted,
13	Daniel of Feldment
13 14	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se
131415	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222
13 14 15 16	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223
13 14 15 16 17	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
13 14 15 16 17 18	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223
13 14 15 16 17 18	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING 2 NATIONWIDE STAY OF PROCEEDINGS 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 4 5 U.S. District Court - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DANIEL J. FELDMAN, 6 Plaintiff, CASE: 7 v. SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE DATE FILED: May 23, 2025 IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, JUDGE: ASHLEY LEMONS. 10 ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, 11 JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE, 12 (proposed) ORDER GRANTING MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., NATIONWIDE STAY OF PROCEEDINGS JAYSON FREW, 14 LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 20 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING NATIONWIDE STAY OF JUDICIAL 21 PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING PROCEDURAL DISPARITY 22 Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for a Nationwide Stay of 23 Judicial Proceedings Involving Procedural Disparity, and the supporting record: 24 ORDER GRANTING NATIONWIDE STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

2 A. A temporary nationwide stay is entered in all court proceedings — state and 3 federal — where one party is represented and the other is pro se, and where filing 4 access, service, or emergency review procedures differ materially based on 5 representation status; 6 B. This stay also applies to the execution of any previously entered orders 7 (including evictions, foreclosures, and default judgments) issued in such proceedings; 8 9 C. All state and federal court enforcement agencies, clerks, and officers are directed to 10 preserve the status quo and suspend enforcement actions until structural equity review 11 is complete; 12 D. Plaintiff shall submit a structural remedy proposal to the Court within 30 days; 13 E. This Court retains jurisdiction to enforce and modify this order as needed. 14 15 SO ORDERED. 16 DATED: ______, 2025 17 18 **JUDGE** 19 20 US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 21 22 23 24

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1 2 3	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	1
5	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		ICT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	V.	CASE:
10 11	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
12	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	JUDGE:
13 14 15	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	NOTICE OF FILING
16	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., JAYSON FREW,	VERIFIED CIVIL COMPLAINT AND
	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3,	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
2	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	NOTICE OF FILING – EMERGENCY CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT AND
4	
5	MOTIONS
6	Plaintiff provides notice of filing the following documents submitted to the Court on May 23,
7	2025:
8	
9	Verified Civil Rights Complaint
10	Motion for Temporary Restraining Order
11	Motion for Nationwide Stay of Judicial Proceedings
12	Motion for Criminal Referral and Protective Orders
13	• Proposed Orders (TRO, Nationwide Stay, Criminal Referral)
14	 Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (AO 240)
15	• Civil Cover Sheet (JS-44)
16	Summons Packet
17	Certificate of Service
18	NEF Form for Pro Se Filers
19	Plaintiff respectfully requests urgent judicial review of the TRO and Nationwide Stay Motions.
20	Additional exhibits and a memorandum of points and authorities will be filed shortly.
21	
22	Respectfully submitted,
23	Filed: May 23, 2025
24	
	NOTICE OF FILING VERIFIED CIVIL COMPLAINT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS



	23
	77
	17
	70
	61
	81
	LI
	91
	SI
	14
	13
	15
	II
	10
	6
	8
	L
	9
(307) 699-3223	ς
Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	τ
Pro Se Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive	ε
Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	7
- 1/2 mmo I	Į

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldma	n)
Plaintiff	j
Linda Steinhoff F	Civil Action No.
Defendant	j j
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
	Linda Steinhoff Holmes
	666 Lohrmann Lane
	Petaluma, CA 94952
A lawsuit has been filed agains	st you.
are the United States or a United States P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve or	this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. In the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
	Daniel J. Feldman
8	8809 Denington Dr.
	ouisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgmen You also must file your answer or moti	nt by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint ion with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff)
Jayson Frew) Civil Action No.
Defendant	- ;

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Jayson Frew 13652 Aragon Way Apt 417 Louisville, KY 40245

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feluman	
Plaintiff	
SREIT IVY Louisville, L	.LC) Civil Action No.
d/b/a The Ivy Apartmen	nt Homes ;
Defendant)
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To 10 f doub	SREIT IVY Louisville, LLC
To: (Defendant's name and address)	d/b/a The Ivy Apartment Homes
	c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq
	Rawn Law Firm PLLC
	10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200
A lawsuit has been filed against	you. Louisville, KY 40223
are the United States or a United States a P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on	this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
D	aniel J. Feldman
88	809 Denington Dr.
L	ouisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgment You also must file your answer or motion	by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. on with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	
	Signature of Clerk or Demity Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feldman	
Plaintiff)	
v. ,	Civil Action No.
Highmark Residential, LLC	
Defendant)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Highmark Residential, LLC c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200

A lawsuit has been filed against you. Louisville, KY 40223

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff)
ν.) Civil Action No.
Rawn Law Firm, PLLC)
Defendant)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Michelle Rawn, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff)
ν.) Civil Action No.
Michelle Rawn, Esq.)
Defendant)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Michelle Rawn, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Kentucky

Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff)
ν.) Civil Action No.
John R. Benz, Esq)
Defendant	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

John R. Benz, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Date:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff	
ν.) Civil Action No.
Ashley Lemons)
Defendant	
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Ashley Lemons
	c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq
	Rawn Law Firm PLLC
	10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200
A lawsuit has been filed against y	Laviorilla IVV 40000
are the United States or a United States as P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the	is summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you gency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of e answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Da	aniel J. Feldman
88	809 Denington Dr.
Lo	uisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgment by You also must file your answer or motion	by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. I with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual st	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		1.0
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Date:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldma	n)
Plaintif	
٧.) Civil Action No.
Alfredo Carballo)
Defendant	
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Alfredo Carballo
	c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq
	Rawn Law Firm PLLC
	10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200
A lawsuit has been filed agains	Lawia IIIa WW 40002
A lawsuit has occir fried agains	t you. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
are the United States or a United States P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve or	this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. In the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
D	aniel J. Feldman
8	809 Denington Dr.
L	ouisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgmen You also must file your answer or moti	t by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. on with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

This summons for our	e of individual and tale, if any		
received by me on //ani/			
☐ I personally served to	Se summons on the individual st	L(place)	
		ots (date)	; or
I left the summons a	t the individual's residence or us	nual place of shode with (some)	
		suitable age and discretion who resid	
on (des)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he imilividumi's last known address; or	
I served the summor	na on (home of hebridge)		, who
designated by law to as	ocept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)	; or
I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		10
☐ Other /peoff/:			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
1 doctare under penalty	of perjury that this information i	s true.	
		Sener's algorithm	
		Friend name and title	
	-	Server's address	

Date:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldm	nan)
Plaintif	
ν.) Civil Action No.
Christian Blake	Heath
Defendant)
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) A lawsuit has been filed again	Christian Blake Heath c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve	e of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ates agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. e on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of e. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, Daniel J. Feldman 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgm You also must file your answer or m	nent by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		10
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldma	
Plaintiff	
٧.) Civil Action No.
Jarmel "Mel" Ho	pson)
Defendant	
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Jarmel "Mel" Hopson
	c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq
	Rawn Law Firm PLLC
	10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200
A lawsuit has been filed again	st you. Louisville, KY 40223
are the United States or a United State P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve or	f this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you sagency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
	Daniel J. Feldman
8	3809 Denington Dr.
	Louisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgment You also must file your answer or mot	nt by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(/place)	
3.00		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		10
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.

Date:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldm	an)
Plaintiff	
v.) Civil Action No.
Jason Whiteho	use)
Defendant)
	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Jason Whitehouse
	c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq
	Rawn Law Firm PLLC
	10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200
A lawsuit has been filed aga	Leuisville KV 40222
are the United States or a United State. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve	of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ates agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. to on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
	Daniel J. Feldman
	8809 Denington Dr.
	Louisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgm You also must file your answer or m	nent by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, otion with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(/place)	
3.0		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		10
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

	Western District of Kentucky
Daniel J. Feldman)
Plaintiff	
Mary Beth Wooda	Civil Action No.
Defendant	
S	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) A lawsuit has been filed against yo	Mary Beth Woodard c/o Michelle Rawn, Esq Rawn Law Firm PLLC 10000 Shelbyville Rd Suite 200 Louisville, KY 40223
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The whose name and address are:	s summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. e plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
_ 01.	09 Denington Dr.
	uisville, KY 40222
If you fail to respond, judgment by You also must file your answer or motion v	default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, with the court.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (f))

☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(/place)	
3.0		- Courter	or
1 left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	nual place of abode with (some)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who realds	s Carre,
on (4m)	, and mailed a copy to ti	he individual's last known address; or	
O I served the summo	ns on (howe of bull-titled)		, who
designated by law to a	ccept service of process on behal	f of (same of organization)	
		Ott (Alm)) OF
Cl I returned the numer	ons unexecuted because		10
☐ Other /specific			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	for travel and \$ of perjury that this information.		0.00
			0.00
			0.00
		s true.	0.00
		Struct. Server's algorithms	0.00

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.

1	Daniel I Feldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
4	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	J
5		•
		DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE DISTRI	ICT OF COLUMBIA
7		
·	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE:
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 23, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
11	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE:
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	
	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
11	MARY BETH WOODARD,	PROOF OF SERVICE –
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	THOOT OF SERVICE
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	TRO, CRIMINAL REFERRAL, AND
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	
1,		NA TYONYUNE CTAN A MOTION
18	Defendants.	NATIONWIDE STAY MOTION
10		
19		UNDER ADA
20		
21		AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
22		
23		
24		

1	
2	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
6	AND STATEMENT RE: ALTERNATE SERVICE REQUEST
7 8	I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, certify under penalty of perjury:
9	• I am a pro se plaintiff currently recovering from more than a week-long hospital stay in
10	Uruguay for a stroke, and I am physically located outside the United States.
11	• I respectfully request that the Court approve service by alternate means under FRCP Rule
12	4(f)(3) and Rule 4(e)(1), including service by email and via prior counsel of record, due
13	to physical impossibility of mail or personal delivery.
14	• On May 23, 2025, I served true and correct copies of the following documents via
15	electronic mail and PDF attachment to all named parties and institutional recipients:
16	• DOCUMENTS SERVED (INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIED)
17	A. Complaint and Emergency Motions
18	Verified Civil Rights Complaint
19	• Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)
20	Motion for Criminal Referral and Order to Show Cause
21	• Motion for Nationwide Stay of Judicial Proceedings Where Filing Disparity Exists
22	B. Supporting Filings and Proposed Orders
23	Proposed Order: TRO and Emergency Relief
24	

1	•	Proposed Order: Nationwide Structural Stay
2	•	Proposed Order: Criminal Referral and Protective Injunction
3	•	JS-44 Civil Cover Sheet (D.C. District Court)
4	•	Summonses (submitted for Clerk's processing)
5	•	Notice of Filing
6	•	This Certificate of Service
7	•	C. Exhibits Previously Attached to Criminal Referral
8	•	Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Criminal Referral and Mandatory
9		Incarceration
10	•	Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman (Sworn Statement, May 21, 2025)
1	•	Plaintiff's Email Disproving Firearm Threat (May 21, 2025)
12	•	Letter to HUD Investigator Grace Walsh
13	•	Photographs of Lock Tampering and Removed Federal Signage
14	•	Press Releases and National Legal Advocacy Notice
15	•	All recipients have been previously served in related litigation and have active contact
16		with this case EXCEPT the newly named Defendant Linda Steinhoff-Holmes. No emails
17		were returned undeliverable.
18	CEDI	ZED TO.
19	SEKV	ED TO:
20	•	John Benz: john@rawnfirm.com
21	•	Michelle Rawn: michelle@rawnlawfirm.com
22	•	Ivy Management (Mary Beth Woodard): mwoodard@highmarkres.com
23	•	Linda Holmes (via last attorney on record): aduncan@clappmoroney.com
24		

1	• Jayson Frew: <u>jayson.frew@gmail.com</u>
2	Jefferson Sheriff Legal Division: mberghaus@jcsoky.org
3	U.S. Marshals: wdky-info@usmarshals.gov
4	HUD: grace.walsh@hud.gov
5	Jefferson Court Clerks: brionayoung@kycourts.net, lesliedavis@kycourts.net
6 E	Dated: May 23, 2025
8 🗍	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
L	809 Denington Dr ouisville, KY 40222 anieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
	1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

1		
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
3	Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	ſ
5	,	
6		DISTRICT COURT CT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (1st Circuit)
8	Plaintiff,	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
9	v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-00657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	
11	IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	DATE OF FILING: May 27, 2025
12	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE:
13	ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	COMBINED MEMORANDUM OF
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES,	MODIONG EOD WEMDOD A DV
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	MOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY
18	Defendants	RESTRAINING ORDER AND
19		NATIONWIDE STRUCTURAL
20		STAY OF DISCRIMINATORY
21		PROCEEDINGS
22		
22		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
3	COMBINED MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
5	In Support of Plaintiff's:
6	(1) Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)
7	(2) Emergency Motion for Nationwide Structural Stay of Discriminatory Proceedings
9	I. INTRODUCTION
10	1. This memorandum supports Plaintiff's dual request for:
11	(1) an Emergency TRO to halt a planned eviction and further extrajudicial retaliation; and
12	(2) a Nationwide Stay and structural injunction against judicial and clerk-based practices that
13	systematically disadvantage unrepresented and disabled litigants in violation of the Fourteenth
14	Amendment and ADA Title II.
15	2. The need for immediate judicial protection arises from a documented pattern of procedural
16	obstruction, unlawful enforcement of voided state orders, denial of ADA rights, and retaliatory
17	self-help evictions. This Court has clear jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1443, and 42
18	U.S.C. § 1983.
19	
20	II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND
21	3. Plaintiff is a disabled, pro se litigant, currently recovering from stroke-related hospitalization
22	and long-standing ADA impairments. On May 12, 2025, he removed his case to federal court
23	under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).
24	MEMO OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEMENTAL EMERGENCY MOTION 1:25-CV-00657

- 4. Nevertheless, a Kentucky judge issued an unlawful state eviction order after federal removal,
- which defendants attempted to enforce through lock-breaking, false 911 calls, and police
- 3 confrontation—resulting in trauma to Plaintiff's ADA representative (his elderly mother).
- 5. Plaintiff's filings have been repeatedly rejected by clerks; court staff referred to stamped
- federal orders as "counterfeit." Meanwhile, opposing counsel submitted unverified pleadings that
- 6 were accepted without hearing.
- 7 **6.** This two-tiered access system highlights the structural barriers faced by pro se, disabled
- 8 litigants nationwide.

10

11

III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR TRO – FRCP 65

- 12 **7.** A TRO is proper where the Plaintiff shows:
- 13 a. Likelihood of success on the merits
- 14 Plaintiff's Verified Civil Rights Complaint documents violations of due process, ADA Title II,
- and retaliation under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 3617, and 12132.
- 16 **b. Irreparable harm**
- 17 The attempted eviction involves forcible removal, loss of property and medical access, and
- physical harm to Plaintiff's ADA representatives. Federal courts have long recognized that
- wrongful eviction and denial of medical access constitute irreparable injury.
- 20 c. Balance of equities
- 21 Plaintiff seeks only to preserve the status quo. Defendants, by contrast, have engaged in unlawful
- and potentially criminal behavior—bypassing judicial process and ADA compliance.

23

1 **d. Public interest**

- 2 This matter affects more than one tenant. The Verified Complaint demonstrates national
- disparities in access to courts based on representation, directly implicating Fourteenth
- 4 Amendment protections.
- **8.** See Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); Overstreet v. Lexington-Fayette
- 6 Urban Cty. Gov't, 305 F.3d 566, 573 (6th Cir. 2002).

7 8

9 IV. ARGUMENT

10 I. THE EVICTION ORDER IS VOID AB INITIO UNDER FEDERAL LAW

- 11 **9.** Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d):
- 12 "The State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded."
- 13 **10.** Once a federal Notice of Removal is filed and served, state court jurisdiction is suspended.
- 14 Any orders entered after that are void.
- 15 **11.** Here, the state court eviction judgment was issued on May 13, 2025—one day after removal
- on May 12, 2025. This violates § 1446(d) and voids the order.
- 17 **12.** See Mays v. City of Flint, 871 F.3d 437, 442 (6th Cir. 2017) ("A state court loses jurisdiction
- immediately upon the filing of a notice of removal").
- 19 **13.** Even where a federal case is later remanded, that remand does not retroactively validate
- actions taken while jurisdiction was suspended. A new order must be issued to restore
- 21 enforcement authority.

22

1 II. KENTUCKY LAW PROHIBITS SELF-HELP EVICTION

- 2 **14.** Under KRS § 383.195:
- 3 "A landlord may not recover possession... by willful diminution of services or by interfering with
- 4 the tenant's access to the premises... Such action constitutes a prohibited 'self-help eviction."
- 5 15. Before any sheriff enforcement, Ivy personnel removed locks, barred ADA representatives,
- and initiated trespass—constituting illegal self-help eviction.
- 7 **16.** In Baker v. Rice, 671 S.W.2d 241 (Ky. Ct. App. 1984), the court held that landlords are
- 8 strictly prohibited from taking possession without court-supervised process.
- 9 17. Continuing enforcement under these conditions invalidates any later sheriff action.

11

12

10

III. PLAINTIFF NEVER RECEIVED SERVICE OF THE ORDER

- 18. It is undisputed that Plaintiff was never served with the May 13 order—either by the state
- court, sheriff, or federal court post-remand.
- 19. Enforcement without service violates due process and Kentucky procedural rules.
- 20. Absent valid service, any enforcement would be arbitrary and unlawful.

17

18

19 IV. ADA VIOLATIONS: DENIAL OF REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

- 20. 21. Plaintiff's only ADA-authorized representatives were trespassed by Ivy staff in the midst of a
- false 911 report.
- 22. This constitutes retaliation and denial of accommodation under 42 U.S.C. § 12132 and §
- 23 12203.

- 23. See Tennessee v. Lane, 541 U.S. 509 (2004) (ADA Title II applies to courts and mandates
- 2 access for disabled individuals).

4

5 V. REPEATED RETALIATORY CONDUCT AND HATE-MOTIVATED EVICTION

- 6 24. This is the seventh eviction attempt targeting Plaintiff in a pattern of documented ADA and
- 7 civil rights retaliation.
- 8 25. The following precedent cases demonstrate that retaliation, even after a complaint is filed, is
- 9 independently actionable:
- 10 a. Bloch v. Frischholz, 587 F.3d 771 (7th Cir. 2009)
- The court held that retaliation under the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. § 3617) does not require a
- new discrimination claim. Continued harassment or exclusion based on prior complaints supports
- its own claim for relief.
- → Applied here: Plaintiff has been repeatedly targeted for prior ADA filings and whistleblower
- 15 actions.
- 16 b. Turley v. ISG Lackawanna, Inc., 774 F.3d 140 (2d Cir. 2014)
- 17 This decision affirmed that sustained harassment tied to civil rights exercise, including
- psychological abuse and threats, supports both compensatory and punitive damages.
- → Applied here: Emotional trauma, loss of medical access, and threats to ADA-authorized
- 20 representatives qualify.
- 21 c. Jankowski Lee v. Cisneros, 91 F.3d 891 (7th Cir. 1996)
- 22 The court held that retaliatory conduct under the Fair Housing Act—particularly involving
- refusals to renew, threats, or interference—entitles the tenant to treble damages.

→ Applied here: Ivy's refusal to process rent, sabotage of Plaintiff's move-out, and repeated 1 eviction attempts match this pattern. 2 3 d. Foster v. West Plaza, 371 S.W.3d 908 (Ky. Ct. App. 2012) Kentucky courts ruled that landlords may not collect rent or enforce removal when they 4 themselves obstruct payment or repair. 5 → Applied here: Ivy denied Plaintiff access to payment, failed to accommodate disability, and 6 used those conditions to justify eviction. 7 8 9 VI. STRUCTURAL RELIEF IS WARRANTED TO PREVENT FUTURE HARM 10 11 **26.** Federal courts have authority to enter structural injunctions in civil rights matters. **27.** See: 12 a. Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991) – Federal courts may issue systemic 13 14 equitable orders to preserve judicial integrity when bad-faith conduct undermines due process. b. Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Ed., 402 U.S. 1 (1971) – Courts may issue broad 15 remedial orders when a class of people suffers systemic constitutional deprivation. 16 17 **c. Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978)** – Structural relief is valid where a pattern of rights violations justifies sweeping reforms across multiple institutions. 18 19 d. Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996) – Even while limiting relief, the Court affirmed that where access to justice is structurally obstructed (e.g., denial of legal tools or assistance), system-20 21 wide remedies may be justified. 22 23 24

1	28. Plaintiff's Verified Complaint and exhibits demonstrate cross-jurisdictional exclusion from
2	legal process due to disability and lack of representation. Narrow local relief will not correct a
3	national procedural disparity.
4	
5	
6	VII. PLAINTIFF CANNOT ACCESS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AS A NON-
7	ATTORNEY
8	29. As a disabled pro se litigant, Plaintiff is categorically barred from filing any petition before
9	the U.S. Supreme Court unless granted bar admission.
10	30. Under Rule 5 of the Rules of the Supreme Court, only licensed attorneys who are members
11	of the Supreme Court Bar may file petitions for writ of certiorari or appear as counsel of record.
12	31. Plaintiff is not licensed to practice law and, by law, is ineligible for bar admission. Therefore,
13	no appeal or petition for redress is possible through the nation's highest court—even to challenge
14	violations of constitutional rights.
15	32. This constitutes a structural and complete denial of access to justice, not based on merit,
16	standing, or procedural default, but solely on the protected status of being unrepresented and
17	disabled.
18	33. The D.C. District Court is therefore the only available federal forum to adjudicate this
19	systemic injury and provide nationwide relief.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 VIII. PLAINTIFF MUST BE PERMITTED TO LEAD A NON-REPRESENTED CLASS

- 2 34. Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that class representatives "fairly and
- 3 adequately protect the interests of the class."
- 4 35. Courts often disallow pro se litigants from representing others. However, this presumes that
- 5 representation is reasonably available to the injured party.
- 6 **36.** Here, Plaintiff alleges that the structural injury is the exclusion from representation itself. Pro
- se and disabled litigants cannot obtain legal counsel because of systemic gatekeeping by bar
- 8 rules, judicial bias, and refusal by attorneys to represent certain categories of clients.
- 9 **37.** Requiring a licensed attorney to represent a class whose injury stems from lawyer-based
- 10 exclusion would render the claim self-defeating and constitutionally unreviewable.
- 38. See Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996) In analyzing access-to-court cases, the Court
- emphasized that systemic barriers—like denial of legal materials or effective filing—may
- warrant class-wide relief. Those barriers must be assessed in context.
- 39. Plaintiff requests this Court use its equitable discretion to permit class leadership by an
- excluded litigant, solely where the classwide injury is access obstruction.
- 40. A blanket ban would immunize systemic discrimination from structural challenge and deny
- 17 review to those most affected.

19

20

18

IX. REQUEST FOR NATIONWIDE STRUCTURAL STAY AND INJUNCTION

- 41. This Court has authority to enter broad structural relief in civil rights contexts under its
- equitable powers and jurisdiction granted by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 1443.
- 42. Where systemic constitutional violations occur across jurisdictions, a localized injunction is
- insufficient. A nationwide structural stay is appropriate.

MEMO OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEMENTAL EMERGENCY MOTION 1:25-CV-00657

_	42	a
1	44	See:
	TJ.	DUU.

- a. Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Ed., 402 U.S. 1 (1971) The Supreme Court
- affirmed that district courts may issue structural remedies to eliminate institutional civil rights
- 4 violations, even if those remedies exceed individual relief.
- **b. Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978)** A systemwide injunction was upheld where repeated
- 6 violations (cruel and unusual punishment) could not be addressed by isolated orders.
- 7 **c. Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991)** Reaffirmed federal courts' inherent power
- 8 to issue equitable orders in response to fraud on the court, systemic bad faith, and obstruction of
- 9 justice.
- d. Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996) The Court acknowledged that structural remedies are
- justified when constitutional access to justice is obstructed for a class, even when the injury is
- 12 procedural and systemic.
- 44. The Verified Complaint documents consistent denial of court access for pro se disabled
- 14 litigants in multiple states:
- E-filing permitted for attorneys, but not pro se parties
 - Verified emergency motions rejected or ignored by clerks
- ADA-authorized representatives denied standing or recognition
- Judges ruling on unserved or unsworn attorney filings while disregarding verified pro se
- 19 declarations
- 20 **45.** This bifurcated process has resulted in irreparable harm, systemic exclusion, and a two-tiered
- 21 justice system incompatible with the Fourteenth Amendment and the ADA.

16

23

- 46. Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court declare that such disparities violate equal
- 2 protection and access-to-court rights and issue a stay on enforcement of any court orders—civil,
- 3 eviction, or procedural—where unequal procedural access exists.

5

6

X. COMBINED CONCLUSION

- 7 47. Plaintiff's Verified Civil Rights Complaint, supported by unrebutted evidence, establishes
- 8 two distinct but overlapping forms of constitutional injury:
- **First**, an imminent unlawful eviction under a void state court order;
- **Second**, a systemic, nationwide exclusion from access to justice based on disability and
- 11 lack of representation.
- 48. The Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) is necessary to halt enforcement of an eviction
- judgment that is procedurally void, unlawfully obtained, and issued in defiance of 28 U.S.C. §
- 14 1446(d).
- 49. At the same time, Plaintiff seeks structural relief against a broader, documented pattern: court
- systems and legal rules that deny disabled and pro se litigants the same rights, timing, filing
- access, and credibility routinely afforded to those with legal representation.
- 50. Plaintiff's inability to petition the U.S. Supreme Court not for want of diligence, but
- because of procedural rules requiring bar membership underscores the structural nature of the
- 20 injury. Without this Court's intervention, there is no path to justice.
- 21 51. The TRO preserves Plaintiff's housing and medical stability. The structural injunction
- 22 ensures that no similarly situated American is forced to choose between constitutional survival
- and legal impossibility.

XI. COMBINED REQUEST FOR RELIEF 1 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court: 2 A. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (TRO) 3 **52.** Issue a TRO immediately enjoining all Defendants from: 4 Executing or enforcing the state court eviction order dated May 13, 2025; 5 • Conducting any property removal, lock changes, or ADA interference related to 6 Plaintiff's residence or storage; 7 Proceeding with any enforcement action until a valid new state order is issued post-8 remand and lawfully served. 9 **53.** Declare the May 13, 2025 eviction order void ab initio under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) and bar its 10 enforcement. 11 **54.** Preserve the status quo pending resolution of federal claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 12132, 12 3617, and the ADA. 13 14 15 B. STRUCTURAL INJUNCTION AND NATIONWIDE STAY 16 17 55. Enter a nationwide structural injunction enjoining all courts from executing enforcement proceedings—including evictions—where: 18 19 One party is represented by counsel and the other is pro se; Procedural access (e.g., e-filing, motion review, ADA accommodations) is not equally 20 21 available. 22 23 24

MEMO OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEMENTAL EMERGENCY MOTION 1:25-CV-00657

- **56.** Order courts receiving federal funds to: 1 Adopt emergency procedural access for disabled and unrepresented litigants; 2 Permit verified declarations, ADA-authorized filings, and remote access equal to 3 attorneys; 4 Cease any labeling of pro se filings as "invalid" absent judicial review. 5 **57.** Declare that the federal courts retain jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 1443 to 6 issue this relief under Swann, Hutto, and Lewis. 7 **58.** Permit Plaintiff to lead a class of excluded litigants where no licensed representation is 8 9 available due to the injury alleged. **59.** Declare Plaintiff's exclusion from the U.S. Supreme Court—due to non-attorney status—a 10 11 structural due process injury requiring equitable relief. **60.** Retain jurisdiction to review compliance, accept proposed reforms, and address continuing 12 harm. 13 14 15 16 C. FURTHER RELIEF 17 **61.** Refer individuals named in Exhibits I–K for legal or criminal investigation where prima facie evidence exists of civil rights obstruction, unlawful eviction, ADA retaliation, or perjury. 18 19 **62.** Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. 20 Respectfully submitted, 21 Daniel J. Foldman, Ph.D.
- Date: May 27, 2025 22 8809 Denington Drive (307) 699-3223 Louisville, KY 40222 23 danielifeldmanphd@gmail.com

Pro Se Plaintiff

- 1 Mays v. City of Flint, 871 F.3d 437 (6th Cir. 2017)
- 2 Held that state courts lose jurisdiction immediately upon removal to federal court. Any orders
- after removal are void—even if remand later occurs.
- 4 → Applied here: The May 13 eviction order is void and cannot be enforced without new lawful
- 5 process.

- 7 Baker v. Rice, 671 S.W.2d 241 (Ky. Ct. App. 1984)
- 8 Kentucky law prohibits landlords from using "self-help" to evict. Physical removal or blocking
- 9 access without a court order and sheriff execution is per se unlawful.
- → Applied here: Ivy staff's lock removal and barring of Plaintiff's ADA reps violated KRS §
- 11 383.195.

12

- 13 Foster v. West Plaza, 371 S.W.3d 908 (Ky. Ct. App. 2012)
- Landlords may not enforce eviction or rent claims where they have obstructed rent payment or
- 15 ADA access.
- → Applied here: Ivy obstructed rent, disabled accommodations, and move-out rights.

17

- 18 Tennessee v. Lane, 541 U.S. 509 (2004)
- 19 The Court held that Title II of the ADA applies to court systems. Denying court access to
- 20 disabled people violates the 14th Amendment.
- → Applied here: Plaintiff was blocked from accessing court through denial of ADA reps, e-
- filing, and procedural equality.

23

- 1 Bloch v. Frischholz, 587 F.3d 771 (7th Cir. 2009)
- 2 Post-filing retaliation under the FHA is actionable. Continued exclusion, threats, or punishment
- 3 for filing civil rights complaints supports independent liability.
- 4 → Applied here: Retaliatory eviction and intimidation followed Plaintiff's ADA filings.

- 6 Turley v. ISG Lackawanna, 774 F.3d 140 (2d Cir. 2014)
- 7 Sustained civil rights retaliation, including verbal and physical intimidation, supports both
- 8 compensatory and punitive damages.
- 9 Applied here: Plaintiff suffered trauma, medical harm, and continued threats after asserting
- 10 his rights.

11

- 12 Jankowski Lee v. Cisneros, 91 F.3d 891 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Fair Housing Act retaliation warrants treble damages, especially when a tenant faces threats,
- 14 non-renewals, or procedural sabotage.
- → Applied here: Ivy and counsel undermined Plaintiff's housing and court access through
- 16 calculated retaliation.

17

- 18 Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Ed., 402 U.S. 1 (1971)
- 19 Federal courts may issue sweeping equitable remedies when systemic constitutional violations
- 20 occur—especially affecting protected classes.
- → Applied here: Plaintiff shows structural denial of court access for disabled, unrepresented
- 22 litigants.

23

1 Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978)

- 2 Upheld a systemwide injunction when repeated abuses (in that case, prison conditions) could not
- 3 be corrected through case-by-case rulings.
- 4 → Applied here: Repeated procedural barriers across jurisdictions require structural court
- 5 reform.

6

- 7 Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991)
- 8 Federal courts have inherent powers to prevent abuse of judicial process—including issuing
- 9 structural relief when bad faith, fraud, or obstruction undermine fairness.
- 10 → Applied here: Plaintiff documented falsified court procedures, misrepresented filings, and
- 11 access denial.

12

- 13 Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996)
- Acknowledged that when legal access is structurally blocked (e.g., law library access,
- assistance), systemwide remedies may be justified—even if individual outcomes differ.
- → Applied here: Plaintiff's claims target systemic exclusion—not just one court or jurisdiction.

17

- 18 Shaffer Equip. Co. v. U.S., 11 F.3d 450 (4th Cir. 1993)
- When systemic abuse or fraud affects multiple cases or litigants, courts may vacate orders,
- 20 sanction parties, and restructure procedures.
- 21 → Applied here: Court clerk and opposing party misconduct have tainted the legal process.

22

23

B. KEY STATUTORY TEXT (EXCERPTS FOR REFERENCE) 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d): "Promptly after the filing of such notice of removal... the State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded." KRS § 383.195 (Kentucky Self-Help Eviction Statute): "A landlord shall not recover possession... by willful diminution of services or interference with access to the premises." 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (ADA Title II): "No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of... services, programs, or activities of a public entity." **42 U.S.C.** § **3617** (Fair Housing Act): "It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any person... on account of having exercised... any right granted or protected by this title."

C. TIMELINE OF PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2	•	Feb 2025 – Plaintiff's timely Intent to Move Out Form is refused locking him into an
3		unwanted lease renewal, method of paying rent removed, ADA representative refused
4		access to his medications despite February rent and all previous rent paid on time
5	•	Mar 2025 – Plaintiff attempts to pay but payment refused, Plaintiff rescinds his Intent to
6		Move Out and asserts possession of the property under protest, files TRO to get access to
7		medication and to be allowed to pay rent, serves Defendant with TRO
8	•	Apr 2025 – State TROs denied without review of verified filings
9	•	May 8, 2025 – Plaintiff is hospitalized abroad for stroke for more than 8 days
10	•	May 12, 2025 – Plaintiff removes to federal court
11	•	May 13, 2025 – Kentucky court issues void eviction order
12	•	May 22, 2025 – Ivy staff break locks, block ADA reps, makes false 911 call against off-
13		duty LMPD hired to safeguard belongings
14	•	May 23, 2025 – Emergency Motion and Memorandum filed in D.D.C.
15	•	May 27, 2025 – Plaintiff threatened by Sheriff's office of their intent to execute voided
16		and disqualified eviction order at 10am
17		
18		
19	D. C	ROSS-REFERENCE INDEX TO EXHIBITS
20		Exhibit I Declaration of Ic Anna Foldman was storage townshing and leak destruction

- Exhibit I Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman re: storage tampering and lock destruction
- Exhibit J May 21 email disproving firearm threat, filed by Plaintiff
- Exhibit K Notice to HUD and federal agencies outlining continued retaliation

23

1

1	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
4	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	I
5	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE DISTRI	ICT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL LEELDMAN	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
9	Plaintiff,	CASE: 1:25-CV-00657
	V.	
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 27, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
12	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE:
	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	
15	MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	PROOF OF SERVICE –
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	COMBINED MEMO OF POINTS
17		
18	Defendants.	AND AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING TRO
19		AND NATIONWIDE STAY
20		
21		
22		
23		

1	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:	
3	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
4		
5	AND STATEMENT RE: ALTERNATE SERVICE REQUEST	
6	I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, certify under penalty of perjury:	
7	• I am a pro se plaintiff currently recovering from more than a week-long hospital stay in	
8	Uruguay for a stroke, and I am physically located outside the United States.	
9	• I respectfully request that the Court approve service by alternate means under FRCP Rule	
10	4(f)(3) and Rule 4(e)(1), including service by email and via prior counsel of record, due	
11	to physical impossibility of mail or personal delivery.	
12 13	• On May 27, 2025, I served true and correct copies of the following documents via	
13	electronic mail and PDF attachment to all named parties and institutional recipients:	
15	• DOCUMENT SERVED (INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIED)	
16	COMBINED MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT	
17	OF EMERGENCY MOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER	
18	AND NATIONWIDE STRUCTURAL STAY OF DISCRIMINATORY	
19	PROCEEDINGS	
20	B. Filings and Exhibits Previously Served in this Matter	
21	·	
22	Verified Civil Rights Complaint	
23	Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)	
	Motion for Criminal Referral and Order to Show Cause	
24		

1	•	Motion for Nationwide Stay of Judicial Proceedings Where Filing Disparity Exists
2	•	Proposed Order: TRO and Emergency Relief
3	•	Proposed Order: Nationwide Structural Stay
4	•	Proposed Order: Criminal Referral and Protective Injunction
5	•	JS-44 Civil Cover Sheet (D.C. District Court)
6	•	Summonses (submitted for Clerk's processing)
7	•	Notice of Filing
8	•	This Certificate of Service
9	•	Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Criminal Referral and Mandatory
10		Incarceration
11	•	Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman (Sworn Statement, May 21, 2025)
12	•	Plaintiff's Email Disproving Firearm Threat (May 21, 2025)
13	•	Letter to HUD Investigator Grace Walsh
14	•	Photographs of Lock Tampering and Removed Federal Signage
15	•	Press Releases and National Legal Advocacy Notice
16	•	All recipients have been previously served in related litigation and have active contact
17		with this case EXCEPT the newly named Defendant Linda Steinhoff-Holmes. No emails
18		were returned undeliverable.
19	SERVED TO:	
20		
21	•	John Benz: john@rawnfirm.com
22	•	Michelle Rawn: michelle@rawnlawfirm.com
23	•	Ivy Management (Mary Beth Woodard): mwoodard@highmarkres.com
24		

1	• Linda Holmes (via last attorney on record): <u>aduncan@clappmoroney.com</u>
2	• Jayson Frew: jayson.frew@gmail.com
3	• Jefferson Sheriff Legal Division: mberghaus@jcsoky.org
4	• U.S. Marshals: wdky-info@usmarshals.gov
5	HUD: grace.walsh@hud.gov
6	• Jefferson Court Clerks: brionayoung@kycourts.net, lesliedavis@kycourts.net
7	Dated: May 27, 2025
9	Daniel of Feldmenter
10	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
11	8809 Denington Dr Louisville, KY 40222
12	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
13	+1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

 2 3 4 	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	T
5	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
6		DISTRICT COURT ICT OF COLUMBIA
7		
	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-0657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11 12	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE:
13	ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	COVER LETTER - SUPPLEMENTAL
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	FILING FOR HATE CRIME CRIMINAL
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	REFERRAL, EXPEDITED RULING,
16 17	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3,	AND CLASS REPRESENTATION
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

PLEASE FIND THE ATTACHED: Supplement to Verified Complaint and 1 2 **Emergency Motions** 3 **★** Filed May 30, 2025 4 **Filed by Pro Se Plaintiff** 5 6 **INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS:** 7 Notice 8 Motion to Expedite IFP Application and Emergency Motions (May 30) 9 Memorandum of Law Challenging Rule 23(a)(4) As Applied (May 30) 10 Emergency Affidavit and Motion for Criminal Referral (May 30) 11 Exhibits L–O (Filed with 5/30 Affidavit) 12 [Proposed] Orders 13 Certificate of Service (corrected and complete) 14 15 16 Filed: May 30, 2025 17 18 19 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se 20 8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 21 danielifeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223 22 23

1	D'ILEIL ND	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
_	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223	
	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	Ţ
5	IINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		CT OF COLUMBIA
7		
_	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-0657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11	IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE:
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	
13	ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
13	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	NOTICE OF CUIDDI EMENTAL
	MARY BETH WOODARD,	NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	FILING FOR HATE CRIME CRIMINAL
16	JAYSON FREW,	FILING FOR HATE CRIME CRIMINAL
10	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	REFERRAL, EXPEDITED RULING,
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	REI ERRIE, EZH EDITED ROEH (G,
18	Defendants.	AND CLASS REPRESENTATION
19		
20		
21		
22	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
23	COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CO	OLUMBIA
24		
-		

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL FILING AND SERVICE 1 2 Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, respectfully provides notice to the Court and all parties of the 3 following supplemental filings, submitted to support and update the Verified Complaint and 4 Emergency Motions filed on May 23, 2025. Previously submitted and entered into this record 5 are the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Emergency TRO and 6 Nationwide Stay, Notice and Proof of Service for the May 27 Memorandum (submitted and 7 entered May 27, 2025). To correct the record, the attorney for Linda Steinhoff-Holmes was 8 inadvertently left off of the last service on May 27, an error which was caught today. Proof of 9 service today to all parties includes those three filings. 10 11 New Supplemental Motions and Memoranda (Filed May 30, 2025): 12 **Motion to Expedite Review of IFP Application and Emergency Motions** 13 Memorandum of Law Challenging Rule 23(a)(4) As Applied to Structurally 14 **Excluded Litigants** 15 **Emergency Affidavit and Motion for Criminal Referral with Maximum Penalties** 16 These filings support and expand upon the original Verified Complaint and Emergency Motions 17 filed on May 23, and are intended to provide further factual record, legal support, and 18 constitutional clarification. 19 20 21 22 23

Exhib	oits Filed with May 30 Affidavit (Exhibits L–O):
•	Exhibit L – Transcript of May 23, 2025 Call with Clerk Tracy (verifies denial of rulings
	without service)
•	Exhibit M – Screenshot of May 13, 2025 Eviction Order, first received by text from Sgt.
	Perry on May 27
•	Exhibit N – Email correspondence with Sheriff's Office, U.S. Marshals, and HUD re:
	federal removal and eviction stay; photos of signage removal and self-help eviction
•	Exhibit O – Transcript and link of eviction-day video showing officer disabling
	Plaintiff's video feed and stating, "We are not paying any attention to you."
Plaint	iff respectfully requests that these materials be entered into the record of Case No. 1:25-
CV-0	657 and considered in conjunction with all pending motions for emergency and injunctive
relief.	
Plaint	iff requests that these materials be accepted into the docket of Case No. 1:25-CV-0657 and
reviev	ved in conjunction with pending motions for emergency relief and structural injunction.
	Filed: May 30, 2025
	Daniel of Feldmenton
	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se
	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222
	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

1	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.		
2	8809 Denington Drive		
3	Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223		
3	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com		
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	Ī	
5			
6	Yeah FOR THE DIST	DISTRICT COURT	
7			
0	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Cou	ort – (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)
8	Plaintiff,		
9	v.	CASE:	1:25-CV-0657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	DATE FILED:	May 30, 2025
11	IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	JUDGE:	
	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JODGE.	
12	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	EMERGENC	Y AFFIDAVIT AND
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	ENERGEIVE	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	MOTION FO	R CRIMINAL REFERRAL,
15	MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	HATE CRIM	E DESIGNATION,
13	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,		DEDIGITATION,
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES,	AND MAXIM	IUM PENALTIES
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,		
18	Defendants.		
19			
20	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF	THE UNITED ST	ATES DISTRICT
20			
21	COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CO	OLUMBIA:	
22			
23			

EMERGENCY AFFIDAVIT AND MOTION FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL, 1 2 HATE CRIME DESIGNATION, AND MAXIMUM PENALTIES 3 "I already know how the federal judge [Greg Stivers] is going to rule." 4 — Judge Lisa Langford, May 13, 2025, District Court of Jefferson County (Exhibit K) 5 6 "We are not paying any attention to you." 7 — Deputy, May 27, 2025, before cutting my video feed during eviction (Exhibit O) 8 Filed: May 30, 2025 9 10 Under Penalty of Perjury Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 11 This affidavit supports an emergency request for federal relief following an unlawful eviction 12 executed in violation of federal removal law, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the 13 Fourteenth Amendment. The actions described herein resulted in the complete loss of my 14 property, legal records, medical files, and digital infrastructure — while I was recovering from 15 hospitalization abroad. The events detailed below form the basis for a criminal referral and 16 designation as a hate-motivated civil rights violation under federal law. 17 18 19 I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, declare under penalty of perjury: 20 21 22 23 24

1	1.	I am a disabled, openly gay federal whistleblower and the Plaintiff in this civil rights
2		action. I make this affidavit in support of emergency injunctive relief, federal criminal
3		referral, and hate crime designation under 18 U.S.C. § 249.
4 5	Patte	rn of Hate-Based Harassment and Injury
6	2.	Over the past seven years, I have endured a sustained campaign of harassment by Ivy
7		Apartment Homes, its attorneys, affiliated judges, and law enforcement. This includes:
8		o Being evicted or threatened during surgeries and disability treatment
9		o Being slandered publicly and privately
10		o Losing permanent vision in one eye , directly tied to retaliation by Ivy staff
11		o Experiencing renewed PTSD and loss of access to medication for over three
12		months
13	3.	These events are not isolated. They form a repeated pattern of hate-based targeting,
14 15		carried out while I was medically vulnerable, pro se, and openly gay.
16	Obst	ruction of Rent Payment and Fabricated Nonpayment
17	4.	In February 2025, before rent was due:
18		o My online rent payment access was shut down
19		o I emailed and called management asking how to pay
20		o My 81-year-old mother attempted to pay in person and was trespassed without
21		cause
22 23		o Despite having the full funds, I was falsely accused of nonpayment (Exhibits I, J)

Federal Removal and Void Order

2	5. On May 12, 2025, I removed the eviction case to federal court. Under 28 U.S.C. §
3	1446(d) , state court jurisdiction ceased immediately.

6. On **May 13**, Judge Lisa Langford issued a void eviction order. I was never served that order. It was texted to me two weeks later by **Sgt. Perry**, who then executed it knowing it was void. (Exhibit M)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4

5

6

1

Hearing Retaliation, Judicial Bias, and Denial of ADA Access

- 7. I attended the May 13 hearing from a hospital bed, under stroke care, via video. I was:
 - Never sworn in
 - Placed last on the docket after an off-record discussion between Judge Langford and attorney John Benz
 - o Cut off mid-hearing first video, then audio
 - Not permitted to testify or respond to false claims
 - \circ Denied the option to "pay and stay," offered to other tenants (Exhibits I, K)
- 8. Judge Langford **laughed, dismissed 400+ pages of evidence**, and ignored verified payment emails on her desk.
- Attorney John Benz and Ivy employee Blake Heath knowingly stated in court that I had not attempted to pay rent despite emails and service showing otherwise. (Exhibits J, K)
- 10. Judge **Sarah Clay**, also denied any hearings, refused all filings served BEFORE the false forcible detainer, including TRO and ADA requests for a hearing to grant access to pay rent and retrieve medication, refused motions for clarification or reconsideration.

Posted Signs and Enforcement Obstruction 1 2 11. From May 13–26, I posted federal notices on my doors warning of the void eviction 3 order. These were: 4 Emailed to Sgt. Perry, Capt. T. Clarke, and U.S. Marshals 5 Delivered in person by my mother 6 • Torn down multiple times by Ivy staff, despite being lawful court warnings (Exhibits 7 N, I) 8 12. Capt. Clarke called the signs "counterfeit" and refused to accept service. The Marshals 9 declined to act unless Judge Stivers issued a direct order — which never happened. 10 (Exhibit N) 11 12 False 911 Call and ADA Rep Trespass 13 13. On May 23, I retained off-duty LMPD officers through John Aubrey of Metro Blue 14 **Line**. I notified Ivy and law enforcement of their presence. (Exhibit N) 15 14. Ivy staff placed a **false 911 call**, claiming an "armed threat" — despite knowing the 16 individuals were licensed officers. This created a dangerous situation for on-duty Officer 17 Padgett, who arrived expecting a violent confrontation. 18 15. When officers had not yet arrived, Ivy had my mother and a second senior ADA 19 representative trespassed. They were unarmed and posed no threat. This was done to 20 **ensure no supervision** over the eviction process. (Exhibits I, N) 21 22 23

Lack of Service and IFP Extortion 1 2 16. I was never served the TRO denial, remand order, or eviction writ. Tracy, clerk for 3 **Judge Stivers**, admitted these were mailed — despite my known disability and federal 4 protection status. (Exhibit L) 5 17. I was told to pay \$405 to have my IFP motion considered. I paid — and Judge Stivers 6 issued no ruling, denying me meaningful review. (Exhibit L) Tracy claimed Stivers had 7 denied all of my orders, but none have been served to this day, and they refused to email 8 them to me. 9 10 **May 27 Eviction and Destruction** 11 18. On the morning of the eviction, I received a text from **Sgt. Perry** with the void May 13 12 order — this was the **only notice I received**. (Exhibit M) 13 19. I attempted to supervise remotely. I was told by a deputy: "We are not paying any 14 **attention to you.**" My video feed was then cut. (Exhibit O) 15 20. My apartment was cleared without supervision. All of my lawsuit records, medical 16 devices, ADA accommodations, and digital archives were seized or destroyed, 17 including my HIPPA-protected files for my patients, 18 19 **Ongoing Harm and Systemic Damage** 20 21. I have been without critical medication for over **three months**. 21 22. I suffered permanent eye damage and PTSD relapse. 22 23. I lost digital evidence and litigation files supporting over \$6.5 million in pending civil 23 claims. 24

- 24. My mother was **trespassed twice**, including during a live incident that involved armed officers and a false threat causing extreme trauma.
 - 25. A **HUD complaint is pending**, but no relief is expected for many months.

Legal Basis for Referral and Relief

- 26. I further request criminal referral of **Linda Steinhoff Holmes**, who over seven years ago initiated a pattern of slanderous, hate-based falsehoods by accusing me of violent elder abuse claims that were disproven in her failed retaliatory eviction against me in **September 2020 in San Francisco Superior Court**. Despite this, she has continued to repeat or endorse these falsehoods through the present day. My current landlord, Ivy, and its agents relied on this slander knowingly or deliberately ignoring its falsity as part of a retaliatory campaign to justify law enforcement involvement, denial of ADA rights, and eviction threats. Emails with **Mary Beth Woodard**, who initiated the three-year campaign of false eviction attempts, confirm that Ivy management knew of these accusations yet falsely claimed through **John Benz** that they had no knowledge of them when confronted. This slander served as a direct predicate for the acts described herein and forms the basis for her inclusion in this federal hate crime referral under **18 U.S.C.** § **249**, § **241**, and § **1985**.
 - 27. The conduct of Linda Steinhoff-Holmes, Mary Beth Woodard, Ashley Lemons, John Benz, Blake Heath, Capt. T. Clarke, Sgt. Perry, Judge Lisa Langford, Judge Sarah Clay, and Judge Greg Stivers meets the legal criteria for federal hate crime prosecution and conspiracy to violate civil rights.

1	28. Their actions show intent to:
2	• Inflict harm
3	Suppress participation
4	Conceal evidence
5	• Retaliate based on disability, sexual orientation, and pro se status
6	
7	I Request That This Court:
8	28. Refer all named individuals under:
9	• 18 U.S.C. § 249 (Hate Crimes)
10	• 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights)
11	• 18 U.S.C. § 1509 (Obstruction of Court Orders)
12	• 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (ADA Title II)
13	29. Recommend maximum penalties without parole under federal law.
14	30. Initiate an investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division and
15	U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Verification and Conclusion 1 2 I, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of 3 America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I 4 respectfully request that the Court take judicial notice of the facts herein and issue emergency 5 relief as described in my accompanying motions. 6 Executed this 30th day of May, 2025 7 8 Residence: Louisville, Kentucky 9 mil (Feldment 10 11 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 12 8809 Denington Dr 13 Louisville, KY 40222 danielifeldmanphd@gmail.com 14 +1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

1	Exhi	bits Cited in This Affidavit
2	Exhibit H	<u>Description</u> Photographs of Lock Tampering and Door Damage – Shows locks removed
4		before sheriff enforcement, proving self-help eviction.
5	I	Affidavit of Jo Anne Feldman – Describes removal of posted signs, trespass of
6		ADA representative, and lack of notice.
7	J	Email Chain (May 13–21) – Includes early warnings to Sheriff's Office and
8		disproves false firearm threat.
9	K	Press Release and Public Summary – Contains Langford quote, outlines pattern of
10	New	retaliation and federal claims.
11	Exhibits	
12	L	Transcript of May 23 Call with Clerk Tracy (Judge Stivers) – Verifies TRO and
13		remand orders were denied without service.
14	M	Screenshot of May 13 Order Texted by Sgt. Perry – First time you received it,
15		8:41 AM on day of eviction.
16 17	N	Email Notices to Sheriff, Marshals, HUD (May 21–26) – Includes posted federal
18		warning signs (pages 9-12), notice of void eviction order, removal of signage by Ivy
19		staff, and unacknowledged legal warnings. Confirms pattern of trespass, self-help
20		eviction, and fabricated firearm threat.
21	0	Video Transcript and Link – Captures deputy saying, "We are not paying any
22		attention to you," followed by video feed being cut. Video Link: Watch here
23		

1	Exhibit L	Transcript of May 23 Call with Clerk Tracy (Judge Stivers) – Verifies TRC
2		and remand orders were denied without service
3	00:49 Clerk B	Sot
4	Wait while I t	ransfer your call.
5	00:59 Clerk B to one of U.	Sot S. District 4 trains in Twin Houses
6 7	01:02 Daniel Hi, Tracy. Th morning?	is is Daniel Feldman and my mother, Joanne Feldman. How are you this
8 9	01:08 Tracy of I don't care if	
10	01:10 Daniel Well, I was ta	lking with Mindy the other day, and I paid the filing fee under duress
11 12	01:18 Daniel because I was	never served the order that it was denied.
13 14	01:23 Daniel And when I h afternoon	ear back from the sheriff yesterday, the sheriff called my mother yesterday
15	01:27 Daniel and said that	Judge Stivers had ruled and denied my claim.
1617	01:33 Daniel And the prob	lem is I have not been served any of that,
18	01:36 Daniel and I have lik	te seven or eight motions before him,
19 20	01:41 Daniel and I don't kı	now which one was denied, what it was denied, what it says, anything.
21	01:47 Daniel So I really ne	ed somebody to help me understand a little bit
22	01:50 Daniel	
23	why the sheri	ff's office is saying it's been remanded back to the state court
24		

01:54 Daniel 1 when I have emergency filings in there demanding criminal referral and show cause for felonies. 2 3 02:04 Daniel And I've not had any. 4 02:06 Daniel Anything is served to me. 5 02:24 Tracy clerk 6 for state, uh, state proceedings, motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 7 02:33 Tracy clerk abolishing orders, motion to enforce federal removal, and enjoin unlawful state 8 enforcement 9 02:40 Tracy clerk from the guy. Plans and claims are dismissed. The clerk shall strike this letter from active 10 **02:51 Daniel** 11 Well, I filed vesterday, and are those filings even there on the docket? 12 03:00 Tracy clerk It looks like on 5-21, the filing fee was paid, and also second supplement emergency motion 13 to enforce federal jurisdiction, prevent unlawful eviction, and refer criminal conduct to 14 U.S. attorneys. 03:20 Tracy clerk 15 This is by Daniel Feldman, proof of service, and a memorandum of support notice of file and teller letter. 16 03:39 Daniel 17 Right. See, well, you know, it's crazy because, you know, I mean, I thought for all of these emergency motions, there's not been anything referenced in any of the denials in the other 18 courts either. 19 **03:51 Daniel** My mother was there, 81 years old, on a walker. Now, they had trespassed all my 20 representatives and tried to proceed on an unlawful order. 21 04:00 Daniel Now, they tell that they say I have to be evicted and I can't have any representatives 22 present. 23

- 1 **04:05 Daniel**
 - They trespassed my 81-year-old mother for no reason. They called 911 with a false police
- 2 call and said that we had threatened violence.
- **3 04:13 Daniel**

My mother was COPD on a walker. Now, I have referred them for criminal referral

- 4 because they've done this for over three years.
- 5 **04:21 Daniel**

And every time, they've been shown to be improper. And this time, the court is allowing

- 6 them to trespass my mother, my other representative that was there packing up things.
- 7 **04:32 Daniel**

They say I have to be evicted with no supervision.

8

- **04:35 Daniel**
- 9 I can't be present because I've been in the hospital with a stroke.
- 10 **04:39 Daniel**

I've asked for ADA accommodations. They weren't granted to me from anyone, anywhere.

11

- **04:45 Daniel**
- 12 And so, this is the problem.
- 13 **04:48 Daniel**

I have now, the judge, the sheriff's office is now telling me that I'm going to be evicted on

- 14 Tuesday at 1 p.m.
- 15 **04:56 Daniel**

Well, I can't have any, my mother there, I can't have anyone supervising who's taking my

- 16 stuff.
- 17 **05:04 Daniel**

My stuff has been devalued.

18

- **05:05 Daniel**
- 19 Robbed. My place has been robbed.
- 20 **05:06 Daniel**

They took off, before the sheriff got there, they took my doors off.

21

- 05:11 Daniel
- I had to file police reports for everything being stolen because before I was even evicted, before the eviction went through, they removed my doors and just let her free for all.

23

1	05:23 Daniel
	So, it's been, it's been crazy.
2	05.4CD - 1.1
2	05:26 Daniel So, right now, they're going, so Judge Stiver's actions is going to allow eviction after they've
3	already evicted me.
4	un caay evicted inc.
-	05:35 Daniel
5	They've already taken my doors off, or the doorknobs, and made my place completely
	unsafe and told me I can't have anyone present because even my mother on a walker, who
6	has a letter authorizing her to be there on my behalf.
7	05:47 Jo Anne
,	I had a public escort.
8	
	05:50 Daniel
9	Sheriff, please escort. My mom is escorted.
10	05:53 Jo Anne
10	30 minutes and escorted me out of the building.
11	
	05:56 Daniel
12	so i can't have anyone even go over to remove my belongings now even over the weekend because of
13	because of
13	06:02 Daniel
14	this ruling that did not cite not a single page of over 500 pages of evidence of criminal
	conduct
15	06.12 Daniel
16	06:12 Daniel and fraudulent behavior ada recombination was sent to three courts to district court to
10	circuit
17	
	06:18 Daniel
18	court and now this court so now the only option i have left i have filed an emergency writ of
19	06:25 Daniel
1)	mandamus to review judge steiver's conduct and ruling in this case and i'm taking that to
20	the
0.1	06:33 Daniel
21	sixth district and i'm also well i'm removing this case to dc so i'm going to i'm going to refer
22	it
_	
23	
24	
24	

1	06:40 Daniel up to dc and i'm also filing a special writ of mandamus with the u.s supreme court this
2	morning
3	06:47 Daniel i'll guarantee you judge steiver's behavior because i was extorted out of 500 the other day
4	06:54 Daniel
5	because i was never even
6	06:55 Daniel served the denial of the IFP i was not to serve just serve the orders or the denial of these
7	07:02 Tracy clerk
8	Sorry, you mentioned extorted \$500, are you referring to the
9	07:08 Tracy clerk Thank you for paying
10	07:10 Daniel
11	No, no, no, I'm referring to the filing fee, the filing fee, because I was never provided the order when he denied it.
12	07:19 Tracy clerk
13	I was not
14	07:20 Tracy clerk and we gave you the ability to pay it
15	07:23 Tracy clerk
16	or to wait until the judge ruled.
17	07:23 Daniel I know.
18	07:25 Daniel
19	Well, maybe, maybe not.
20	07:26 Tracy clerk
21	Mindy, Mindy.
22	07:29 Daniel might then also
23	07:32 Daniel
24	Well, yes, I filed an IFP and I was not served the order back.

1	
2	07:35 Daniel I was not served the order of denial.
2	i was not served the order of demai.
3	07:38 Clerk Bot process as I've told you to.
4	
5	07:40 Daniel That's okay, but I need to talk to Mindy again, because Mindy-
6	07:44 Clerk Bot Mindy is in a meeting.
7	07:45 Daniel
8	Well, Mindy told me the other day, for all this was going on, and I need to find out from her a little bit about, because she told me that she was going to put these before Judge
9	Stivers, and whether or not he actually considered any of the pleadings, or he just denied them outright.
10	00:01 Donial
11	08:01 Daniel And the reason I need that, because I don't have, I've not been served the outcome, and I have to file an emergency today, because of the eviction, I can't even be present, they're
12	evicting, they already evicted me, which should make it unlawful for them to continue to use the sheriff, because it's a self-help eviction now.
13	08:22 Daniel
14	But I have to file a writ of mandamus to review Judge Stivers' decision, and I can't have, I don't know what the decision is, because I've never been served any of these denials.
15	
16	08:33 Jo Anne Tracy, is it possible to email them those decisions?
17	08:39 Tracy clerk No, we don't email orders. We mail on mail.
18	
19	08:44 Tracy clerk From Boston, that takes a week.
20	08:46 Daniel
	Right? And this is an emergency order.
21	00.40 7. 4
22	08:49 Jo Anne He has never received anything yet from the district court.
23	08:56 Jo Anne I've never been served in order.
24	

1 **08:57 Jo Anne** I don't think so. 2 3 09:00 Tracy clerk is that there's a procedure for it, and the judge generally has up to 90 days before 4 09:07 Daniel Right, but it's an emergent order, Clayton. It's an emergent order. It's emergent. 5 09:09 Tracy clerk 6 That's not emergent. 7 09:11 Jo Anne This is urgent. 8 9 09:12 Tracy clerk Apparently, Mindy must have put it before Judge Stivers if he ruled on it already. 10 09:19 Tracy clerk Because generally it takes up to 90 days before the judge rules. 11 **09:22 Daniel** 12 But that's why there's emergent orders. 13 **09:24 Daniel** 14 That's why I put emergency on the front of seven orders. **09:27 Daniel** 15 I have seven emergency orders. 16 09:29 Tracy clerk I think what's happening is because it's being put before, I think you're thinking that 17 you're going to get that answer. 18 09:39 Tracy clerk Although it's put before him, he still rules in the direction he's going to rule. 19 20 **09:45 Daniel** Right, and that's why I'm following up with a writ of mandamus to review his conduct. 21 09:50 Daniel So, I don't know the conduct. 22 09:51 Tracy clerk 23 T 24

1	00.52 Two over all only
2	09:52 Tracy clerk put it before him that it's going to, you know, be ruling in your favor.
3	10:00 Daniel Well, I'm not asking for that. I'm asking for a ruling that uses my documented pleadings
4	and doesn't just say denied without reading anything.
5	10:09 Daniel and the problem is
6	10:10 Tracy clerk
7	It does state that in the order.
8	10:16 Tracy clerk That's been mailed out to you.
9	10:18 Daniel
10	Well, that's not going to help me with an emergency.
11	10:21 Daniel I'm filing an emergent order, and I'm going to skip right to the U.S. Supreme Court
12 13	10:27 Daniel because I filed all of this on there is no 14th Amendment civil right.
14	10:32 Daniel There's a difference between if you're represented and you're not represented
15 16	10:36 Daniel in terms of how you can file, where you can file,
17	10:40 Daniel and whether or not clerks will review or gatekeep for the judge.
18	
19	10:45 Daniel And it's actually written on the court website and in the rules themselves
20	10:52 Daniel that say pro se litigants cannot file electronically.
21	v z
22	10:57 Daniel They can in this case, but they don't get fair review
23	11:00 Daniel
24	because there are specific procedures that pro se litigants have to follow

1	
1	11:06 Daniel
2	separate than representative party.
3	11:07 Daniel
4	That is a 14th Amendment violation, and it's even present at the U.S. Court of Appeals 6th Circuit,
5	11:14 Daniel which is now broken.
6	
7	11:15 Daniel I can't remove it. It's already been denied, but that's a new case.
8	11:20 Daniel
9	I'm filing today a writ of mandamus to review Judge Stiver's behavior,
10	11:25 Daniel and I'm also putting it to the U.S. Supreme Court
11	11:29 Daniel
12	because the same violation is present at the 6th District
13	11:33 Daniel that says pro se litigants must file in paper and must mail in their documents,
14	11:40 Daniel
15	whereas if I was a represented party, I could electronically do it.
16	11:45 Daniel It's against the 14th Amendment, and the reason I'm losing my home,
17	11:49 Daniel
18	all of my belongings, is because the courts treat people differently
19	11:54 Daniel whether you have a lawyer or not.
20	11:56 Daniel
21	And the one thing I've heard, and I really appreciate that you, Tracy, have not done this, but I've heard it from so many other clerks, they say, get a lawyer.
22	12:06 Daniel
22	And that would be really nice.
23	12:08 Daniel
24	

I sat there during eviction hearing, what, 30 people get evicted and not one of them had a 1 lawyer because there's only four tenant lawyers in all of Louisville. 2 **12:15 Daniel** 3 And I watched Mr. Benz, that lawyer, every landlord was represented and every tenant was unrepresented. 4 **12:21 Daniel** 5 And if they're not represented, it doesn't matter if they're disabled, it doesn't matter if they're a little old lady on a walker. 6 **12:27 Daniel** 7 You have to manually go into the court and file this in state court. 8 **12:31 Daniel** And you can only do it within certain hours. 9 **12:33 Daniel** 10 And the attorneys can sit at home and push buttons and not even get dressed. 11 12:39 Daniel And they can do it at any time of day. 12 **12:41 Daniel** 13 And that means the 14th Amendment does not exist. 14 **12:44 Daniel** I filed a civil rights complaint that was ignored by Judge Stivers. 15 **12:49 Daniel** 16 And so now I have to file two writs of mandamus, one in the 6th Circuit and one, well, one, 17 I actually, **12:57 Daniel** 18 I went up to Washington, D.C. I moved to Washington, D.C. 19 **13:00 Daniel** And then I'm also the second one at the U.S. Supreme Court, a very special case of a writ of 20 mandamus 21 **13:05 Daniel** when due process is absolutely denied, which is the case now of what Judge Stivers has 22 done, preventive due process. 23 13:17 Daniel 24

And so that's why I'm asking for them to review. 1 **13:20 Daniel** 2 I need to get the orders to include in this emergent writ of mandamus. 3 **13:24 Daniel** But unfortunately, that's the problem. 4 **13:26 Daniel** 5 I'm going to say they've never been served to me and they refused to email them to me. 6 13:29 Jo Anne you know 7 **13:30 Daniel** 8 So therefore, even in an emergent situation. 9 **13:34 Daniel** I don't have, I've never been served the answer, and therefore I'm just having to make a 10 guess at what they said. 11 13:43 Tracy clerk That's not accurate, not true, sir. We've mailed out to you yesterday. 12 **13:45 Daniel** 13 Well, that's great, but I don't have it today. I need an emergent order. They're going to evict me before I get that letter, Tracy. 14 **13:52 Daniel** 15 You mailed it out yesterday. 16 **13:54 Daniel** 17 I'm going to be evicted before I get that letter. **13:57 Daniel** 18 But it doesn't matter. I have to file today, right now, and I can't do it because I don't have the order. 19 20 **14:03 Daniel** Because in order to prevent it... 21 14:05 Jo Anne Eviction on Tuesday. 22 14:07 Tracy clerk 23 I don't get the mail the very next day. 24

1	
2	14:11 Jo Anne We still haven't gotten the order of denial from the IFP, which is
3	14:14 Tracy clerk And that's the real process. We have nothing to do with it.
4	14:17 Daniel
5	Oh, you have nothing to do with the 14th Amendment, Tracy.
6	14:20 Daniel
7	You have nothing to do with the 14th Amendment because it doesn't exist.
8	14:27 Tracy clerk We cannot email it.
9	14:30 Daniel
10	Oh, I know. Well, that's why I'm putting in the writ of mandamus that they say they cannot email the order to me.
11	14:39 Daniel
12	And that's the reason I'm leapfrogging to the United States Supreme Court today to ask them to review Judge Stivers and this court's behavior.
13	14:49 Daniel
14	And so that's what – but I'm trying – it was a last-minute try to get a copy of the order so that I could attach it, but I can't do that.
15	14:57 Daniel
16	And that's the whole point of my civil rights violation.
10	15:00 Jo Anne
17	Yes. I'm going to have to go here in a minute. But Tracy, I just wanted to say, the sheriff called me as soon as he got the order yesterday, and he got it electronically.
18	15:13 Jo Anne
19	So do you see where there's a difference? And if you have a lawyer, if he hadn't called me, I would not have known. Sergeant Perry in the Sheriff's Department.
20	15:24 Daniel
21	if a tool yeah we would again i would just be evicted on tuesday and have it and i'm still coming
22	15:33 Jo Anne
23	me and just said it was tonight he didn't know anymore but yes and other people forget it

1	15:40 Jo Anne electronically it is not right that pro se
2	•
3	15:46 Daniel Well, in the mail, honey, it doesn't cut it because it's different for different parties.
4	15:56 Tracy clerk No, it's not different from different parts.
5	•
6	15:57 Daniel It is, when the sheriff can get it electronically and I can't.
7	16:03 Daniel I have an emergent order, Tracy.
8	16:05 Daniel
9	I have an emergent order, and you can't provide an emergent response.
10	16:10 Jo Anne Dan, I have to go. Can I say something?
11	
12	16:14 Jo Anne Tracy, was that sent electronically to the attorney?
13	16:21 Tracy clerk Oh, he doesn't have an attorney on his case.
14	16:25 Daniel
15	No, it was
16	16:26 Tracy clerk The other side.
17	
18	16:26 Daniel the other side.
19	16:28 Daniel
20	the other side.
21	16:29 Jo Anne balance okay the opposing attorney did mr ben get the uh notice electronically or was his
22	16:42 Jo Anne
23	also put in the mail i'm not sure was that address provided on the on the uh notice of removal
24	
∠+	

1	16:53 Daniel Well, I
2	16:54 Tracy clerk
3	Yeah, Mr. Vance has an address.
4	16:56 Daniel
5	Yeah, I'm a
6	17:00 Tracy clerk Oh
7	17:02 Jo Anne But it's probably won't work, thanks.
8	17:07 Tracy clerk
9	The fee was just paid yesterday, so the sum is, the judge's rule on the sum is now that the fee is.
10	15 15 D. 1 I
11	17:15 Daniel Well, yeah, but so my mom's question still stands. It's valid.
12	17:19 Daniel Was John Benz emailed, was John Benz ordered, was he emailed the order?
13	17:24 Tracy clerk
14	I doubt it. It was probably mailed out just like yours.
15	17:29 Daniel So how does the Ivy know already that I'm going to be evicted on Tuesday at 1 p.m., but I
16	don't know?
17	17:34 Jo Anne I got you.
18	17.24 Daniel
19	17:36 Daniel My apartment complex. How did they know that I was going to be evicted on Tuesday?
20	17:41 Tracy clerk
21	It's really based on whatever happened in state court.
	17:44 Daniel
22	No, no, no, no, I'm not a
23	17:44 Tracy clerk
24	No, no, no.

1	
2	17:45 Tracy clerk I'm not a part of that.
3	17:46 Daniel no it's part of judge stivers part of what happened with judge stivers yesterday
4	17.51 Tugor, cloub
5	17:51 Tracy clerk It remanded back to the district court for them to notice that, everybody.
6	18:00 Tracy clerk The judge, all I can provide to you is what's in the system,
7	18:04 Tracy clerk
8	and the judge's diverse order, but yesterday,
9	18:07 Tracy clerk the plaintiff's ADA request and motion for remote appearance,
10	19.12 Tugory aloub
11	18:12 Tracy clerk emergency motion for temporary restraining order,
12	18:15 Tracy clerk and motion for stay as state proceedings,
13	
14	18:18 Tracy clerk motion for leave to proceed in formal process,
15	18:22 Tracy clerk and emergency motion for enforced federal removal
16	19.26 Theory alank
17	18:26 Tracy clerk and enjoined unlawful state enforcement are denied.
18	18:31 Tracy clerk Plaintiff's claims are dismissed.
19	
20	18:32 Daniel Claims are different.
21	18:35 Tracy clerk The claim is dismissed with us.
22	2-10 0-10-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1
	18:39 Daniel
23	Yeah, so that's what they say. He doesn't reference any of the content of any of the pleading, right?
24	

1	
2	18:45 Daniel And, but my mother's question is still valid.
3	18:49 Daniel How does the Ivy, did the Ivy find out because
4	
5	18:52 Tracy clerk I have no idea about that. All I can provide you guys with is the information that I have before me in our system.
6	40.50 m
7	18:59 Tracy clerk I have absolutely nothing to do with the complex.
8	19:03 Jo Anne Of course you do.
9	19:04 Daniel
10	Of course you did, because
11	19:06 Tracy clerk Yes, yes, yes.
12	
13	19:07 Daniel Yeah, it's just, okay.
14	19:08 Jo Anne I can't believe it.
15	10.00 %
16	19:09 Daniel I know. And I need to talk to Mindy because I need to find out.
17	19:12 Tracy clerk She's in a meeting. If you'd like to call her back, Mr. Feldman, please feel free to do so.
18	
19	19:17 Daniel So when should I try that?
20	19:19 Tracy clerk
	You can try that, do that.
21	10.21 Tree err elevit
22	19:21 Tracy clerk You can try it in 30 minutes.
23	19:23 Tracy clerk
	She's in a meeting and it's probably going to last at least an hour.
24	

1	
2	19:26 Tracy clerk And it started at 9.
3	19:29 Daniel Okay, alright, so I'll do that.
4	19:31 Jo Anne
5	I really appreciate your help.
6	19:34 Tracy clerk Thank you, guys.
7	19:39 Daniel
8	I appreciate it, too.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

EXHIBIT M Screenshot of May 13 Order Texted by Sgt. Perry – First time Plaintiff

1

2

24

received it, 8:41 AM on day of eviction, May 27th, 2025

AOC-220 Doc. Code: EW Rev. 5-14		Case No. 25-C-003961 Court District
Page 1 of 1 Commonwealth of Kentucky Court of Justice www.courts.ky.g		County Jefferson Division
KRS 383.245	WARRANT FOR POSSESS	ION
Highmark Residential LLC	for SREIT Ivy Louisville LLC	PLAINTIFF
3300 Altabrook Dr. Louisville, KY 40245		
		NOTICE TO VACATE
VS.	THIS	NOTICE TO VACATE S PROPERTY MUST BE VACATED IMMEDIAT LURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN A SEPTEMBER.
Name Daniel Feldman &	All Other Occupants	LURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN A SET OU JEFFERSON CO. SHERIFF'S OF
	y Apt. 3303 a/k/a 303	JEFFERSON CO. SHERIFF'S OFFICE
To the Sheriff or any other Con	nstable ofJefferson	County:
Defendant on May 13	3th 2 025 was found quilty	of a forcible detainer of the premises loc
(date)		
13647 Aragon Way Apt. 33	303 a/k/a 303 Louisville, KY 40245	
13647 Aragon Way Apt. 33 to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe	and an thaving failed to file an appeal on commanded, in the name of the Cor	or before the seventh day after the findir
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, an	303 a/k/a 303 Louisville, KY 40245	or before the seventh day after the findir
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe	and an thaving failed to file an appeal on commanded, in the name of the Cor	or before the seventh day after the findir
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at	and an Arrange failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant.	and an Arrange failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within	or before the seventh day after the findir
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant.	and an Arrange failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant.	and an Albania and Schools and Schools and Schools and Schools are commanded, in the name of the Corn do to make due return to the Court within the court withi	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, are executed this warrant. Date:	and an Albania and Schools and Schools and Schools and Schools are commanded, in the name of the Corn do to make due return to the Court within the court withi	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, are executed this warrant. Date:	and an Albania and Schools and Schools and Schools and Schools are commanded, in the name of the Corn do to make due return to the Court within the court withi	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, are executed this warrant. Date:	endant having failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within, 2	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Planta ASAP days showing how you ha
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant. Date: Plaintiff's or Attorney's Signature of the premise of the premis	endant having failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within, 2	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant. Date: Plaintiff's or Attorney's Si	endant having failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within, 2	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant. Date: Plaintiff's or Attorney's Si	endant having failed to file an appeal on care commanded, in the name of the Cornd to make due return to the Court within, 2	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days
to the injury of the Plaintiff. Defe upon request of the Plaintiff, you in possession of the premises, at executed this warrant. Date: Plaintiff's or Attorney's Si	endant having failed to file an appeal on of are commanded, in the name of the Corn do to make due return to the Court within, 2	or before the seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding mmonwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the finding monwealth of Kentucky, to put the Plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days showing how you had a seventh day after the plan ASAP days

1	EXHIBIT N	Email Notices to Sheriff, Marshals, HUD (May 21–26) – Includes posted
2		federal warning signs (pages 9-12), notice of void eviction order, removal of
3		signage by Ivy staff, and unacknowledged legal warnings. Confirms pattern of
4		trespass, self-help eviction, and fabricated firearm threat.
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		



Daniel Feldman <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Motion for Criminal Referral, Exhibits I–K (3:25-CV-271-GNS)

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Mon, May 26, 2025 at 7:35 AM

To: mberghaus@jcsoky.org, wdky-info@usmarshals.gov, "Walsh, Grace" <Grace.Walsh@louisvilleky.gov>,

sperry@jcsoky.org, tclarke@jcsoky.org

Cc: Mary Beth Woodard mwoodard@highmarkres.com, jayson Frew <jayson.frew@gmail.com, Jo Anne Feldman <jojofeld@bellsouth.net>, Michelle Rawn <michelle@rawnlawfirm.com>, John Benz <john@rawnlawfirm.com>, "Blair, Ramone" <ramoneblair@kycourts.net>, P_The lvy-ACD <theivyacd@highmarkres.com>, P_The lvy-CD <theivycd@highmarkres.com>, "Young, Briona" <bri>brionayoung@kycourts.net>, jeffcodistrictcourtadmin@kycourts.net

Date: May 24, 2025

From: Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Pro Se

Subject: Formal Notice of Federal Filing and Immediate Demand for Criminal Referral, Enforcement Block, and

Accountability

TO:

• Jefferson County Sheriff's Office - Legal Division

- Sgt. Perry
- · Capt. T. Clarke
- U.S. Marshals Service W.D. Kentucky
- U.S. DOJ Civil Rights Division
- HUD Grace Walsh
- Additional Federal Civil Rights Agencies (bcc)

RE: Feldman v. lvy, et al. – Case No. 25-CV-0657

Dear Sgt. Perry, Capt. Clarke, and all addressed,

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation for your deputies' decision last Wednesday, May 22, to withhold enforcement of the May 13 eviction order in my case. Your office's careful and considered response was not only appropriate, but vital for ensuring both legal compliance and the safety of all involved parties.

I am writing to respectfully request that the Sheriff's Office maintain this position, given the legal status and facts as outlined below.

The May 13 eviction order was never served on me, and is void ab initio under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), as it was issued after the case had been removed to federal court. I am grateful that your office recognized this and withheld enforcement. Although the case was subsequently remanded to state court, this only restores jurisdiction for new orders to be issued, and does not retroactively validate any order that was voided by the removal. Therefore, unless and until Judge Langford enters a new eviction order and proper service is made, there remains no valid eviction order in effect—even as of tomorrow.

If any action is taken tomorrow, I respectfully submit that the first and only appropriate action should be to investigate and, if warranted, refer for criminal charges those who orchestrated the false 911 call, namely Ashley Lemons and John R. Benz, Esq. Their actions knowingly created a dangerous situation by pitting armed off-duty LMPD officers from MetroBlueLine Off-Duty Police Security against on-duty Officer Padgett, endangering law enforcement and vulnerable parties—including my elderly mother and another senior—during an event that qualifies as a hate crime under federal and state law. The distress and trauma caused by witnessing my mother, who has COPD and relies on a walker, being forcibly removed without justification was profound and has exacerbated my own PTSD stemming from similar events under color of law.

This matter has drawn national media attention, and the attached bilingual press releases have already been distributed to advocacy groups and news outlets nationwide. These releases highlight:

- Highmark Residential's federal RICO and antitrust investigations into rent-fixing and price manipulation,
- The Rawn Law Firm's four-step eviction-fraud scheme targeting disabled tenants,
- DBI bribery and narcotics-lab cover-ups in San Francisco,
- · A three-year pattern of ADA retaliation and hate-crime-based evictions in Kentucky, and
- The urgent call for a nationwide shutdown of pro se-only eviction proceedings pending before the U.S.
 Supreme Court and D.C. District Court.

As such, any enforcement decision tomorrow will be under significant national scrutiny. I wish to ensure that the facts, legal arguments, and human impact are all fully visible and properly considered.

Clarified Facts from May 22:

- Sole email thread: Other than the attached May 22 thread (which was also copied to your office), no other communications occurred between Ms. Lemons, Mr. Benz, and myself. The 911 call was not warranted and created a serious risk, especially to LMPD and Sheriff's deputies.
- Unlawful self-help eviction: Before your deputies arrived, Ms. Lemons had already hammered off the locks on my apartment and storage units, a clear violation of KRS § 383.195.
- Lack of service: Neither I nor my ADA-authorized representatives were ever served with the May 13 order or any ruling by Judge Stivers.
- No threat to public safety: The only security present were licensed off-duty LMPD officers. Despite this, Ms. Lemons persisted in a false 911 call, further endangering all involved.
- Failed service of federal removal: My mother's attempt to deliver the federal removal notice to Civil Process was rejected as "counterfeit," though it was clearly stamped and captioned.

Impact on My Move:

Due to the unlawful trespass of my only ADA-authorized representatives by Ms. Lemons and Mr. Benz, I am now unable to safely supervise the move, which constitutes a violation of the ADA (42 U.S.C. § 12132) and 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as well as a clear act of self-help eviction.

Five Reasons the Eviction Cannot Proceed:

- 1. **Void State Order:** The May 13 order was issued post-removal and remains void ab initio pending any new order from Judge Langford.
- 2. Self-Help Eviction: The removal of locks prior to any sheriff involvement negates enforcement authority.
- 3. **ADA Representative Trespass:** My only ADA-authorized aides were unlawfully barred during a false 911 call, and their trespasses remain unrevoked.
- 4. **Pattern of Hate-Crime:** This represents the seventh false eviction attempt in three years—including actions that blocked my medication and resulted in personal injury, loss of vision, and impaired mobility—demonstrating a continuing hate-crime campaign.
- 5. No Proper Service: No party has ever been validly served with an eviction order or hearing notice.

Criminal Referrals & Maximum Penalties:

While I have every confidence in your office's commitment to the law, I must inform you that I will seek all available remedies, including hate crime enhancements (which carry mandatory prison terms without parole), for any party who knowingly enforces a wrongful eviction. Notably, this case involves false reporting of a threat against police officers, not just civilians.

CRIMINAL ACTORS AND INDIVIDUAL VIOLATIONS:

- 1. Ashley Lemons Property Manager
 - False 911 call on May 22, 2025, claiming a threat of gun violence
 - $\circ\hspace{0.2cm}$ Failed to disclose that off-duty LMPD officers were lawfully present
 - Placed on-duty and off-duty officers in direct confrontation
 - Trespassed my elderly mother and another senior in retaliation

- Violations: KRS § 519.040 (False Reporting Class D Felony), ADA Title II (42 U.S.C. § 12132, § 12203), 18 U.S.C. § 249 (Hate Crime)
- Penalties: Up to 10 years federal prison; no parole under KRS § 532.031 if bodily injury resulted

2. John R. Benz, Esq. - Attorney

- Participated in and encouraged false 911 call, suborned perjury, and blocked ADA supervision
- Violations: KRS § 519.040, KRS § 524.040, 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights), 18 U.S.C. § 249 (Hate Crime)
- o Penalties: Up to 20 years federal prison; no parole if enhanced

3. Capt. T. Clarke - Jefferson County Sheriff's Office

- Refused to accept federal court notice, allowed continued enforcement after constructive eviction, refused response to destroyed locks
- Violations: KRS § 383.195, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 18 U.S.C. § 1509
- o Penalties: Up to 5 years, civil liability if eviction proceeds

4. Blake Heath - Assistant Community Director

- Targeted me during eye surgery recovery, causing permanent vision loss
- Violations: 18 U.S.C. § 249 (Hate Crime Based on Disability)
- o Penalties: Up to 10 years federal, no parole eligibility

5. Jayson Frew - Trespassed Tenant

- Theft of property post-trespass, supported lockout and false narrative
- Violations: KRS § 514.030 (Felony theft), federal civil rights statutes
- Penalties: Up to 5 years

Total Cumulative Penalties:

- Lemons: 5-15 years + enhancement
- Benz: 10-20 years + enhancement
- Clarke: 1-5 years + civil liability
- · Heath: 10 years
- Frew: 1-5 years

Respectful Requests:

- · That your office pause any eviction or seizure actions tomorrow.
- That you restore access to my home and ADA-authorized representatives.
- That you consider appropriate criminal referrals under the above statutes.
- That you please confirm in writing, by the close of business today, that no eviction will proceed.

This letter is intended as a courtesy and legal notice to ensure you have every relevant detail before acting. Tomorrow's decision will be under regional and national media observation, as well as court scrutiny.

This letter also serves as formal notice of the federal civil rights case Feldman v. Ivy Management, et al., filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (Case No. 25-CV-0657), and a renewed demand for:

- Immediate cessation of enforcement by the Sheriff's Office,
- Full criminal referral of all named individuals for hate crimes, false reporting, obstruction, ADA retaliation, and related felonies.

FINAL DEMAND

If the Sheriff's Office proceeds with any eviction, seizure, or denial of ADA representatives:

- · It will trigger immediate civil action against the department,
- · Support criminal conspiracy claims against already-named individuals,
- Expose all involved parties to federal and state felony prosecution.

I do not offer these details as a threat, but out of a sincere desire to see the law faithfully upheld and all parties protected.

Thank you for your fair consideration and for your attention to these urgent issues. I remain available for any questions or further clarification you may require.

Respectfully submitted, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Plaintiff 14thAmendmentNow@gmail.com danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

Sheriff and Judges Warned:

Go Through with This Hate Crime Eviction, and You May Be Facing Criminal Charges

"THEY'VE BEEN WARNED. THE CASE IS FEDERAL. THE FACTS ARE ON RECORD. AND IF THEY GO THROUGH WITH IT TUESDAY, THEY'LL DO IT UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW — AND UNDER THE SHADOW OF A HATE CRIME."

Louisville, KY – May 26, 2025 —

A Kentucky sheriff is scheduled to carry out an eviction on Tuesday that a federal lawsuit says is not just illegal — it's dangerous. According to *Feldman v. Ivy*, this isn't a one-time mistake. It's part of a three-year campaign of harassment against a disabled tenant, backed by abusive court rulings, ignored filings, false police reports, and an eviction order issued without jurisdiction, notice, or basic fairness. "If this eviction happens Tuesday, it won't just be illegal," said Dr. Daniel J. Feldman. "It'll be criminal. And I'll demand the maximum for every person involved."

What Is Due Process — and How Is It Being Violated?

The **Fourteenth Amendment** guarantees that before your home or rights are taken away, you're given a fair chance to respond. That's called **due process** — and it means you must be notified, given a hearing, and treated equally under the law.

But in this case:

- The eviction order was issued while the case was in **federal court**, which legally stripped the state judge of all power
- Feldman was never served the May 13 order
- He's expected to guess the date and time he'll lose his home
- His ADA-authorized representatives were trespassed without cause, in the middle of a 911 hoax
- And the courts both state and federal allowed it to proceed anyway

What Is a Self-Help Eviction?

A **self-help eviction** is when a landlord skips the legal process and removes a tenant themselves — by changing the locks, blocking access, or harassing the occupant into leaving. That's illegal in Kentucky. In this case, Ivy management **locked Feldman out before any sheriff enforcement**, which means **the sheriff has no legal power to carry out the eviction now**. Continuing anyway would violate state law — and could make the sheriff personally liable.

Five Reasons This Eviction Is Illegitimate

- 1. The court order was issued while the case was removed to federal court making it void even after the Federal court sent it back to the state.
- 2. The landlord carried out a self-help eviction barring sheriff action.

- 3. Feldman's only authorized ADA representatives were trespassed during a false 911 call.
- 4. This is the seventh attempt in a documented hate campaign including blocked medication
- 5. Feldman was never served with the order not by state court, not by federal court.

This Isn't Just About a Law — It's a Pattern

This is the same landlord who is:

- · Named in a federal RICO case
- Has an "F" rating with the BBB
- Uses police intimidation, procedural abuse, and targeted slander to evict disabled tenants

This is the same property manager who:

- Denied Feldman access to his medication
- Evicted his ADA representatives
- Called 911 to report a fake gun threat knowing off-duty LMPD officers were already on-site
- Created a situation where police nearly pulled weapons on fellow officers

Feldman's Message to the Sheriff

"If you carry out this eviction, you're not enforcing justice," said Feldman.

"You're helping people lie to police, endanger officers, commit a hate crime, and destroy a disabled tenant's life — all under the color of law."

Maximum Penalties Demanded

Feldman is demanding full criminal prosecution under:

- · Federal hate crime law
- ADA retaliation statutes
- Obstruction of federal jurisdiction
- False police reporting
- · Kentucky's no-parole hate crime enhancement law

"This ends with mandatory jail time. No parole. No excuses," Feldman said.

"The sheriff shouldn't be enforcing this — he should be arresting the lawyer and manager who caused it."



14thAmendmentNow@gmail.com



4 +1 (307) 699-3223

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223

Filed: May 24, 2025

On Thu, May 22, 2025 at 5:45 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danielifeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

To All Parties and Relevant Agencies:

Please find attached the **Proof of Service** documenting delivery of the following filings in the matter of **Feldman v.** Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS, currently pending in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky:

- · Motion for Criminal Referral, Entry of Protective Orders, and Emergency Judicial Relief
- · Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- [Proposed] Order

- Exhibits I (Jo Anne Feldman Statement placeholder), J (May 21 email), and K (HUD letter)
- · Notice of Filing
- · This Proof of Service

As of this filing, these documents are now part of the official federal court record. Please confirm receipt or reply with any access issue.

Sincerely, **Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 Date: May 22, 2025

On Wed, May 21, 2025 at 11:29 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

To all parties previously served:

Please be advised that two of the previously filed and served documents in the above-captioned matter were inadvertently submitted without signature. Corrected and signed copies are attached and have been uploaded to the official record in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky as part of the ongoing case:

Feldman v. Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS

I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused.

That said, I am again reiterating the need for immediate acknowledgment and action from all recipients of this message.

As of this morning, I have received **no formal confirmation from the Sheriff's**Office, Ivy Management, or the U.S. Marshals Service in response to:

- · Multiple emergency filings
- Direct emails
- · Recorded voicemails
- In-person inquiries
- Verified photographic evidence of tampering and lock removal

Due to the **complete lack of communication**, and because Ivy Management **removed the locks and signage** unlawfully and prior to any lawful writ, I have hired **licensed off-duty police officers** to secure and protect the property at **13347 Aragon Way, Unit 3303**, and the associated storage units.

These officers are present now to:

- Prevent criminal intrusion or further tampering
- Lawfully protect property under my current and continuous legal possession
- Document any actions taken by Ivy or law enforcement that conflict with federal jurisdiction

As stated in my filings and affidavits, **there is no remand** from the federal court, and **no writ of possession overrides my lawful occupancy** at this time.

I am respectfully putting all parties on notice that:

- Immediate relief will be sought in federal court for the cost of the hired officers and all related damages
- Ivy Management will be held liable for property stolen by Jason Frew of Apt. 417, whose access and conduct were known and preventable
- Ivy will be named as a complicit party in any criminal or civil violations that arise from this breach of legal process and tenant protections

I remain open to communication and resolution, but I will continue to defend my rights as protected under federal law — including the Second Amendment, as I am lawfully entitled to protect my life, liberty, and property. Any conflict arising from the presence of lawful security personnel has been entirely preventable. The failure of law enforcement to respond and the criminal actions of Ivy Management — including unauthorized entry, removal of locks, and destruction of court-posted notices — are solely responsible for creating this potential armed crisis. This situation has now placed other tenants, employees, and members of my family at unnecessary risk, and the liability for that risk rests with those who failed to intervene or communicate after multiple formal warnings.

Furthermore, if Jason Frew is seen anywhere on the premises — including near Apartment 3303, the storage units, or any property unlawfully removed by the Sheriff's Office — I demand that he be immediately arrested for his role in the prior theft of multiple items from both the apartment and the storage unit. These thefts have been documented in his own written communications, observable on security camera footage and confirmed by the presence of his Gmail account and password activity on my stolen iPad, which was unlawfully taken from my home. That device contains direct location tracking evidence placing Mr. Frew at the scene of the

crimes and within the property during the period of his unauthorized access.

Respectfully, **Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.** Pro Se Plaintiff danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 May 21, 2025

On Wed, May 21, 2025 at 5:53 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

JOINT SERVICE COVER LETTER AND

NOTICE OF EMERGENCY FILINGS

TO: U.S. Marshals Service,

Jefferson County Sheriff's Office, and

Ivy Property Management

RE: Ongoing Criminal Conduct, Constructive Eviction, and Enforcement of Void State Order

Filed in: Feldman v. Ivy, Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS (W.D. Ky.)

Date: May 21, 2025

This letter serves as formal notice that **Ivy Management has already taken extrajudicial action** to remove court-posted federal signage, deny access to secured storage units, and refuse emergency repairs — all before any lawful eviction could take place. These acts occurred **inside a secure apartment complex**, where access is limited to **residents and Ivy employees only**.

Ivy's **willful removal of federal court notices**, after being **served with judicial documents** warning that such removal would constitute obstruction and trespass, is not speculative. It is

confirmed. There is no lawful explanation for these actions, and no other party could have executed them without knowledge, access, and intent.

Furthermore, Ivy Management has not responded to a direct and documented after-hours emergency maintenance request left on their voicemail system at 2:40 AM on May 21, 2025, referencing urgent security threats and Ivy's own contractual obligation to provide lock repairs. No repair has been made. No contact has been returned. The doors remain unsecured.

The Jefferson County Sheriff's Office and U.S. Marshals Service have also failed to confirm receipt of any of Plaintiff's service emails, court filings, or formal jurisdictional warnings. Despite over a week of continuous notice and three rounds of formal emergency filings, no acknowledgment, guidance, or assurance of enforcement protocol has been provided by either agency.

This inaction by the Sheriff and Marshals has invited a jurisdictional conflict. It has left federal court orders unenforced, forced Plaintiff to self-coordinate law enforcement, and directly enabled Ivy's unlawful, extrajudicial retaliation in defiance of this Court's active jurisdiction.

NOTICE OF FILINGS

The following emergency filings were submitted on **May 21, 2025**, to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky and are hereby served on the undersigned parties:

- 1. Second Supplemental Emergency Motion to Enforce Federal Jurisdiction, Block Unlawful Eviction, and Refer Criminal Conduct
- 2. Supplemental Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- 3. Second Affidavit of Dr. Daniel J. Feldman
- 4. Exhibit H Photographs of Lock Tampering and Removed Signage (taken May 20, 2025)
- 5. Notice of Filing
- 6. Proof of Service

TO THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE:

You are now on **final notice** that enforcement of the May 13, 2025 eviction order is a violation of **28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)**. The order is **void**, having been entered after removal. Any effort to proceed

will constitute:

- · Contempt of federal jurisdiction
- Civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- Personal liability for participating in the enforcement of an extrajudicial act

The building is secure. Only Ivy staff or residents could have carried out the break-ins and signage removal. Ivy has acted **before your office arrived**, which itself constitutes a **self-help eviction** under Kentucky law — specifically forbidden under KRS § 383.195 and Baker v. Rice, 671 S.W.2d 241 (Ky. Ct. App. 1984).

TO THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE:

You are respectfully requested to intervene or notify the Court of your authority under **28 U.S.C.** § **566(c)** to protect federal proceedings. This property is the subject of an active emergency filing. Your continued silence while extrajudicial acts occur on federally protected property is functionally enabling unlawful state enforcement.

TO IVY MANAGEMENT:

You are on formal notice that you have:

- Removed federal signage from secured areas **twice**, after being warned of criminal liability
- Refused to respond to an emergency maintenance request for unsecured doors
- Allowed property interference and lock removal in advance of any lawful enforcement
- Enacted a constructive eviction and triggered liability for retaliation and due process
 violations under federal law

These acts were taken after receiving full notice of this Court's jurisdiction and Plaintiff's emergency filings.

FINAL DEMAND:

If any further enforcement action is taken **today** or thereafter, it will be treated as **criminal** interference with a federal proceeding, and Plaintiff will seek the maximum civil and criminal

penalties available under law, including emergency contempt, referral to the U.S. Attorney, and direct liability under § 1983 and related statutes.

You are each demanded to pause all enforcement actions and await a ruling from Chief Judge

Stivers.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Plaintiff

Email: danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

Phone: +1 (307) 699-3223

May 21, 2025

On Tue, May 20, 2025 at 6:29 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

TO ALL PARTIES, SHERIFF'S ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, U.S. MARSHALS, AND COUNSEL:

This email constitutes final formal notice that the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office will be in violation of federal law if it executes any writ of possession on May 21, 2025, relating to Jefferson District Court eviction order of May 13, 2025, which is void ab initio under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

This matter was removed to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky on May 12, 2025, under Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS, and federal jurisdiction is now exclusive.

You were served with notice of federal removal and stay as early as **May 16**. You are not permitted to act under a state court writ issued after that removal. **Federal law prohibits it.**

CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LIABILITY

Any enforcement action taken tomorrow, after five days of actual notice, will constitute:

- Violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)
- Deprivation of rights under color of law (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
- Criminal obstruction of federal proceedings (18 U.S.C. § 1512)
- Conspiracy against rights (18 U.S.C. § 241)
- · Aiding and abetting theft of federally protected property
- Retaliation under the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. § 3617)

You are further placed on notice that:

- The federal enforcement stay was physically posted on the premises and was unlawfully removed.
 - This constitutes **obstruction**, **tampering with federal process**, and **criminal trespass**, and it exposes any enforcement agents, landlords, or their staff to **individual liability**.
- **Jason Frew**, a named defendant, previously entered the residence unlawfully, unplugged a security camera, and removed property including an iPad and private materials.
 - This was reported in real time to LMPD and the Sheriff's Office, both of whom refused to respond. Now, items from Plaintiff's **locked storage unit have gone missing** without any sign of forced entry establishing internal **collusion or key-based access**.
- Christian Blake Heath, Ivy employee, submitted perjured testimony under oath regarding rent
 communications. Three email records dated March 18, 22, and 28 are already on file disproving his
 statements.
 - Attorney **John Benz** then knowingly cited that false testimony to obtain the unlawful writ. This is **subornation of perjury** and **fraud on the court**.
- Judge Sarah Clay enabled these violations by:

- Blocking emergency filings for a TRO that was first submitted on March 31, 2025, before the eviction was even filed;
- Ignoring ADA accommodation requests;
- Proceeding in state court after federal removal was filed and docketed;
- Allowing coordinated submission of false documents while denying Plaintiff access to the court.
- This conduct is not procedural error. It is sustained criminal complicity, systemic misconduct, and civil rights retaliation.

YOU ARE HEREBY PUT ON FINAL NOTICE:

If the eviction scheduled for May 21 proceeds:

- It will be treated as willful federal interference;
- You will be named in amended filings for contempt, conspiracy, and obstruction;
- Immediate criminal referrals will be submitted to the U.S. Attorney and DOJ Civil Rights Division;
- Public media disclosures will follow, and this conduct will be elevated to national advocacy groups already tracking this case.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS

Attached are all filings submitted to the U.S. District Court on May 20, 2025, including:

- Supplemental Emergency Motion to Enforce Jurisdiction
- . Memo of Points and Authorities
- Verified Affidavit and Exhibits (F & G)
- Proposed Orders for TRO, Contempt, and Criminal Referral
- · Proof of Service and Notice of Filing

These are now part of the federal record in Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS.

PRESS RELEASES (appended below this message)

These public statements outline the broader national implications of this case, including:

- · ADA violations;
- · Abuse of unrepresented and disabled tenants;
- Harassment by corporate landlords;
- · Conspiracy and procedural fraud in the eviction system.

LOUISVILLE COURTS ENABLE PREDATORY EVICTION SCHEME TARGETING DISABLED TENANTS

Court insiders reveal Jefferson County judges collaborate with landlords who have an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau to abuse vulnerable renters

Louisville, KY — April 18, 2025

THE FOUR-STEP SCHEME

- 1. Block tenants from legally ending their lease.
- 2. Refuse tenants' rent payments to fabricate claims of "nonpayment."
- 3. File eviction lawsuits using false nonpayment allegations.
- 4. Demand tenants pay rent for a full-year lease that tenants never agreed to.

Disabled Louisville resident Dr. Daniel J. Feldman has documented more than three years of targeted harassment and illegal eviction attempts by management at **The lvy Apartments** (managed by **Highmark Residential**) and their attorneys at the **Rawn Law Firm**. Despite submitting extensive verified evidence of retaliation, harassment and resulting medical harm including loss of vision, and deliberate obstruction, **Jefferson Circuit Court Judge Sarah Clay** has systematically refused hearings, denied required ADA accommodations, and blocked legitimate filings—enabling these abuses to persist unchecked.

Court employees, speaking anonymously due to fear of retaliation, confirmed that the Rawn Law Firm frequently employs this predatory eviction scheme against vulnerable tenants, relying on active cooperation from Jefferson County courts. Court officials consistently obstruct tenants' filings, deny their requests for fair hearings, and ignore legally mandated disability accommodations.

The Ivy Apartments, managed by Highmark Residential since spring 2022, currently holds an "F" rating from the Better Business Bureau, reflecting over 120 documented tenant complaints involving harassment, unfair eviction practices, financial abuse, and unsafe living conditions.

Despite extensive evidence presented by Dr. Feldman—including documentation of severe medical harm from management's interference with medications—the court refused to review his filings, dismissed his case without holding a hearing, and openly ignored his ADA-required requests for remote participation.

Dr. Feldman said, "I am awestruck by Judge Clay's complete disregard for vulnerable people who come to her court with disability requests, who are clearly being abused, and who explicitly request protective restraining orders. Instead of offering justice or due process, she denies tenants a fair hearing and throws out all their evidence without even looking at it. This is shocking, disgraceful, and an insult to the people of Jefferson County."

Dr. Feldman has actively sought federal intervention, and the Human Rights Commission of Louisville (HRC) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have opened formal investigations into these matters. Dr. Feldman, with the help of these advocacies, demands accountability from both the predatory landlords and the court system enabling their abuse.

Monday, April 21, Is the last day for Dr. Feldman to file for damages before they are ineligible, and Judge Clay has unlawfully blocked his ability to file anything with the court. Immediate intervention is needed from court officers or from civil rights groups by the end of the day on April 21.

ABOUT DR. DANIEL FELDMAN

Dr. Feldman is a disabled clinical neuropsychologist and professionally trained massage therapist. He is a federal whistleblower who successfully exposed high-level government corruption, prevailing at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in 2012. His courageous efforts recovered millions of taxpayer dollars stolen by corrupt practices, at significant personal cost and without personal gain. Dr. Feldman is currently organizing a hunger strike beginning July 4th to protest corruption in court proceedings, specifically targeting systemic abuses against tenants who face harassment from landlords and receive no protection from the courts. His activism highlights cases of severe harm, including permanent personal injuries—most recently, his loss of eyesight due to sustained harassment by management at The Ivy Apartments.

MEDIA CONTACT

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

(307) 699-3223 or (435) 612-0242

REFERENCES AND CITATIONS

1. BBB Record – The Ivy Apartments (Louisville, KY):

The Ivy Apartments maintain an "F" rating at the Better Business Bureau, reflecting 120+

tenant complaints, often involving harassment, unsafe conditions, and disputes over lease terms.

Link: BBB.org The Ivy Apartments

2. Highmark Residential Rent-Price Collusion:

Highmark Residential is a named defendant in a multi-state antitrust lawsuit alleging that it conspired with other landlords to inflate rent prices using RealPage's revenue management software.

Link: Bloomberg Law on Price-Fixing Lawsuit

3. Investigation into Unlawful Eviction-Related Fees:

A North Carolina—based firm investigated Highmark Residential for allegedly imposing illegal fees during eviction processes, adding hundreds of dollars in extra charges for tenants already behind on rent.

Link: Carolina Law Firm Investigation

4. Rawn Law Firm – Specialization in Evictions:

The Rawn Law Firm in Louisville publicly markets eviction and rent-collection services, emphasizing swift landlord-friendly outcomes.

Link: RawnLawFirm.com

5. Examples of Jefferson County Court Bias in Evictions:

Local investigations uncovered an "assembly line" eviction process that grants landlords immediate judgments, often without a hearing or with only seconds of review. Tenants typically lack representation or remote hearing accommodations.

- Link: Kentucky Equal Justice Center (eviction reports)
- Link: WLKY Investigative Coverage

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 21, 2025

What Happens When You're Sued by a Landlord With a Lawyer — and You Don't Have One?

You lose. Not just the case. But your rights. Your voice. Your home.

And the court system is built to make sure of it — with different rules, different access, and different expectations depending on whether you're represented or not.

ONE DOCTOR.

ONE HOSPITAL BED.

ONE LITTLE OLD LADY ON A WALKER.

ONE HUGE FEDERAL LAWSUIT.

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, a clinical neuropsychologist, was **hospitalized for a stroke on May 6, 2025, and remained in the hospital until May 15**. Despite the court being informed of his condition, **Judge Lisa Langford of Jefferson District Court held an eviction hearing on May 13**, while Dr. Feldman was still in a hospital bed.

Now, Dr. Feldman is filing a **nationwide federal civil rights lawsuit** asking the court to **pause or stay all cases in every jurisdiction where pro se litigants**— **or defendants without lawyers** — **are treated differently** than represented parties.

Federal Removal Was Filed.

The Judge Knew.

The Sheriff Knew.

They're Proceeding Anyway.

Dr. Feldman removed his case to **U.S. District Court on May 12, 2025**. Under federal law — **28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)** — all state court proceedings and enforcement actions are **automatically stayed** upon removal. The court, the sheriff, and the landlord were all notified in writing.

Despite this, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office plans to execute the eviction today, May 21, 2025 — unlawfully.

The federal court notices posted on Dr. Feldman's door were torn down.

The sheriff's office was informed of the federal stay **more than five days ago.**

They acknowledged receipt — and are choosing to proceed anyway.

When Dr. Feldman contacted the **U.S. Marshal's Office**, he was told that they "would contact Judge Stivers." He called **Judge Stivers' chambers** and was told the judge had reviewed the emergency filings and was "planning to rule." That was more than 24 hours ago. As of 5:30 AM today, no order has been issued. No protection is in place.

The Landlord Has an F Rating. The Courts Don't Care.

The eviction is being carried out by **Highmark Residential**, parent company of The Ivy Apartments — a corporate landlord with an **F rating from the Better Business Bureau**, and named in the **federal RICO rent price-fixing lawsuit** against RealPage.

These are the parties that courts protect.

These are the people Judge Langford sides with.

And this is what eviction in America looks like in 2025.

The System Is Rigged — And This Lawsuit Aims to Freeze It

Dr. Feldman's lawsuit is now national in scope. It demands:

 A stay of all court proceedings where pro se and represented parties are treated differently

- Accountability for sheriff's departments who knowingly enforce voided state orders
- Scrutiny of judges who mock federal law while evicting disabled, hospitalized Americans
- National review of court clerks and practices that give attorneys informal access while denying basic filing rights to unrepresented people

"This is why I cannot accept representation," Dr. Feldman says.

"The only way I can prove that justice doesn't exist for people like me is to try to win without a lawyer. Because if I can't win this — when the law and the filings and the facts are this clear — then no one can. And if that's true, then the 14th Amendment isn't real. It never has been."

Contact for Interviews or Legal Action

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 (Uruguay)

Jo Anne Feldman (Authorized Agent)

jojofeld@bellsouth.net +1 (502) 429-3567 (home) | +1 (502) 797-2506 (cell)

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Plaintiff

Email: danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

Phone: (307) 699-3223

Address: 8809 Denington Drive, Louisville, KY 40222

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. <danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, May 19, 2025 at 6:03 AM

Subject: Filing Notice - Feldman v. Ivy, 3:25-CV-271-GNS

To: Michelle Rawn <michelle@rawnlawfirm.com>, John Benz <john@rawnlawfirm.com>, Young, Briona

<bri><bri>definition of the state of th

<jayson.frew@gmail.com>, Mary Beth Woodard <mwoodard@highmarkres.com>, Garner, Sidney

<Sidney.Garner@louisvilleky.gov>, Davis, Leslie <lesliedavis@kycourts.net>, Vickery, Ashley

<AshleyVickery@kycourts.net>, <jeffcodistrictcourtadmin@kycourts.net>, <kywdintake@kywd.uscourts.gov>

, <KYWDsmb_ProSeFilings@kywd.uscourts.gov>

Cc: Jo Anne Feldman <jojofeld@bellsouth.net>

Subject: Filing Notice - Feldman v. Ivy, 3:25-CV-271-GNS

Dear Counsel, Defendants and other Stewards of the Court.

Please find attached the following documents filed today, May 19, 2025, in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky:

- Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Federal Jurisdiction and Rebuttal to Expected Motion to Remand
- Exhibits A-1 through E
- Notice of Filing
- · Certificate of Service

I have repeated service of the Emergent Packet sent this week:

EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL REMOVAL AND ENJOIN UNLAWFUL STATE **ENFORCEMENT**

Previously filed documents (Exhibits A-D) are incorporated by reference and were not reattached. If you require a duplicate copy of any previously served record, I will provide it upon request.

Below is the Press Release, widely circulated, posted on the web across national jurisdictions:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE May 17, 2025

What Happens When You're Sued by a Landlord With a Lawyer — and You Don't Have One?

You lose. Not just the case. But your rights. Your voice. Your home.

And the court system is built to make sure of it — with different rules, different access, and different expectations depending on whether you're represented or not.

ONE DOCTOR.

ONE HOSPITAL BED.

ONE LITTLE OLD LADY ON A WALKER.

ONE HUGE FEDERAL LAWSUIT.

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, a clinical neuropsychologist, was hospitalized for a stroke on May 6, 2025, and remained in the hospital until May 15. Despite the court being informed of his condition, Judge Lisa Langford of Jefferson District Court held an eviction hearing on May 13, while Dr. Feldman was still in a hospital bed.

Now, Dr. Feldman is filing a nationwide federal civil rights lawsuit asking the court to pause or stay all cases in every jurisdiction where pro se litigants — or defendants without lawyers — are treated differently than represented parties.

Not Just for Plaintiffs — for Anyone Facing Unequal **Justice**

This isn't just about people trying to sue. It's for defendants, tenants, elderly people, disabled Americans, working-class families — anyone facing a courtroom where the rules change depending on whether you have a lawyer.

In courtrooms across the country:

- Lawyers can file by email or online. Pro se litigants have to show up in person.
- Attorneys get informal access to clerks and judges. Pro se litigants are treated like strangers.
- Clerks scrutinize filings from unrepresented people while rubber-stamping whatever lawyers file.
- Judges hold private conversations with attorneys but not with you.
- Sheriffs say they'll only enforce state orders, even when a federal lawsuit is already filed.

In Louisville, This Is How It Happens

Dr. Feldman removed his case to **U.S. District Court on May 12, 2025**, under civil rights statutes. That should have stopped all state actions immediately. But **Judge Lisa Langford** held the hearing anyway.

"I already know how the federal judge is going to rule," she said — before ruling herself.

Dr. Feldman was connected to the hearing by Zoom. He was **never sworn in**. He was **cut off before finishing his arguments**. He was **not allowed to question the opposing party**. His 81-year-old mother joined from home — and then their video feeds were disabled. Neither of them was allowed to fully participate.

The eviction went through. Unlawfully in violation of Federal Law.

The Sheriff's Department: "We Only Take Orders from Judge Langford"

Afterward, Jo Anne Feldman, 81, brought the federal court documents — including a stamped notice of removal and an emergency motion — to the **Jefferson County Sheriff's Office**.

They refused to accept them.

"These are counterfeit," said Captain T. Clark.

"We only follow Judge Langford's orders," said the clerk.

"You'll have to appeal," she told Dr. Feldman by phone.

Then she hung up.

Even the U.S. Constitution doesn't count if it's not coming from the right people, in the right club. Fortunately, the U.S. Marshals understand that federal law supersedes voided orders from defiant state judges who mock the Constitution.

The Landlord Has an F Rating. The Courts Don't Care.

The landlord behind the eviction is **Highmark Residential**, parent company of The Ivy Apartments — a defendant in a **federal RICO rent price-fixing lawsuit** and holder of an **F rating from the Better Business Bureau**.

These are the parties Judge Langford sides with — not elderly tenants. Not people in hospital beds. Not families trying to hold on.

Why "40 Acres and a Mule" Still Matters

When slavery ended, formerly enslaved people were told they'd get land — 40 acres and a mule — as the foundation of independence. That promise was stripped away almost immediately.

The 14th Amendment was passed in its place — as the promise of equal justice under law.

That promise, too, is being revoked every day in American courtrooms by Judges like Langford in District Court and Clay in Circuit Court in Louisville.

This Lawsuit Aims to Freeze the System Until It's Fair

Dr. Feldman's lawsuit will ask the federal court to:

- · Pause cases in court districts where pro se and represented parties are held to different rules
- Expose judges who engage in private conversations with attorneys but block access to unrepresented parties
- · Confront sheriffs who refuse to enforce federal orders and instead obey unlawful state judgments
- · Force a national reckoning with the way class, disability, and legal status determine outcomes

"This is why I cannot accept representation," says Dr. Feldman.

"The discrimination is so open, so structural, so baked into the system that the only way I can prove the truth is to try to win without a lawyer. Because if I can't win *this* case — where the unequal treatment is written in black and white on court websites in all 50 states — then no one can. And if that's the standard, then the 14th Amendment doesn't exist. It never has."

Contact for Press or Legal Action

Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com +1 (307) 699-3223 (Uruguay)

Jo Anne Feldman (Authorized Agent)

jojofeld@bellsouth.net

+1 (502) 429-3567 (home) | +1 (502) 797-2506 (cell)

Respectfully, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223

On Tue, May 13, 2025 at 8:31 AM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com/ wrote:

Subject: URGENT - Notice of Removal Filed - Case 25-C-003961 (Feldman v. Ivy)

Dear Clerk of Court, Defendants, Counsel, and Federal Court staff

I am the pro se defendant in Case No. 25-C-003961, currently set for 9:02 AM on May 13, 2025, in Room 308.

This case was formally removed to federal court on May 12, 2025, and is now docketed as Case No. 3:25-CV-271-GNS in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky. I filed a Notice of Removal in both federal and state court. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), the state court no longer has jurisdiction and is prohibited from proceeding further.

In addition, I am currently hospitalized due to a stroke resulting from the plaintiff's refusal to provide access to life-sustaining medication, a right I had previously requested under the ADA and federal housing law. The state court failed to timely review multiple verified ADA filings requesting emergency access, remote accommodations, and intervention. As a result, I am physically incapable of attending or meaningfully participating in this hearing — even remotely — without extreme hardship and medical risk.

I respectfully request that this case be taken off the call sheet and that no hearing proceed until the federal court has ruled on jurisdiction and the pending TRO.

Thank you for your urgent attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Daniel J. Feldman
danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
(307) 699-3223
8809 Denington Dr., Louisville, KY 40222

On Mon, May 12, 2025, 07:54 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danielifeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Subject: Notice of Federal Removal and Emergency TRO Filing – Feldman v. Ivy, et al.

To all named Defendants and related counsel:

Please be advised that the undersigned has formally removed the above-referenced cases (Jefferson Circuit Court Case No. 25-Cl-002530 and Jefferson District Court Case No. 25-C-003961) to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, and has filed an Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Stay of State Court Proceedings.

This action is being removed under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441, and 1443 based on:

- Denial of Plaintiff's rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act
- Ongoing due process violations by the Jefferson courts
- Systemic 14th Amendment violations involving disparate treatment of unrepresented vs. represented litigants
- Procedural gatekeeping by court staff that excluded or blocked Plaintiff's verified filings and emergency pleadings
- The **court's failure to provide ADA accommodations**, contributing directly to Plaintiff's hospitalization

As of today, Plaintiff has been **hospitalized for over a week following a stroke**, which was caused by **denial of critical medication** — first by Defendants (Ivy, Highmark, their attorneys), and then by state courts that refused to act. This stroke occurred after repeated, documented requests for help were ignored or procedurally blocked.

Plaintiff/Defendant is **still hospitalized and will remain so beyond the current state court hearing date**, and cannot participate in person. The federal filing includes an ADA accommodation request and a motion for remote participation.

This notice is also to inform you that Plaintiff's damages claims have increased. In addition to the previously stated claims totaling \$1.2 million, Plaintiff now intends to pursue additional damages for permanent harm and medical consequences caused by Defendants' intentional negligence and the court's inaction.

Attached please find:

- · Notice of Removal
- · Emergency Motion for TRO
- · Proposed Order
- · Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- ADA and Remote Appearance Request
- Medical Records (Exhibit A)
- Certificate of Service
- · Exhibit Packet and Table of Contents

You are hereby formally notified of this removal and motion for federal relief. A stamped copy of the Notice of Removal will also be filed with the Jefferson Circuit and District Courts immediately following the federal court filing.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.

Pro Se Defendant 8809 Denington Dr. Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699–3223

On Fri, May 2, 2025 at 1:04 PM Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com wrote:

Dear Clerk, ADA Coordinator, and Counsel:

1	EXHIBIT O	Video Transcript and Link –	
2		Captures deputy saying, "We are not paying any attention to you, no,"	
3		followed by video feed being cut. Video Link: Watch here	
4	Daniel:		
5	Yes, can you hear	false 9-1-1 call of violence. What you're doing is illegal. r me, officer? Yes, this is an illegal eviction on the	
6	This is a self-help eviction that was initiated by the Ivy over a week ago It invalidates and disqualifies any help from the Sheriff's office This was a self-help eviction.		
7 8	SHERIFF: Sheriff's office!		
9	Daniel:		
10	this way and yes hi this is the only way i can supervise the move is because the uh because they call a false 911 call um and they they call a false 911 call um and they also this is a self-help eviction also this is a self-help eviction they they locked they took the rocks off of my doors last they took the locks off of my doors last week and so anything you do today is illegal and so anything you do today is is um i've referred for criminal um is um i've referred for criminal um a criminal referral and a criminal referral and the DC Court can you acknowledge if you've heard me		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	SHERIFF: We are not paying	ng any attention to you, no.	
17	Daniel:	m ma an mat?	
18	Well did you hea that's where they	just disconnected the camera	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1 2 [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND EMERGENCY PROTECTIVE RELIEF 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 5 6 DANIEL J. FELDMAN, **U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA** 7 Plaintiff. CASE: 1:25-CV-0657 8 v. SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE DATE FILED: IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, 10 RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, JUDGE: ASHLEY LEMONS. 11 ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, 12 JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE, 13 (proposed) ORDER GRANTING MARY BETH WOODARD, 14 JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESO.. JAYSON FREW, CRIMINAL REFERRAL LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3, 16 AND EMERGENCY 17 Defendants. PROTECTIVE RELIEF 18 19 20 21 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING CRIMINAL REFERRAL 22 AND EMERGENCY PROTECTIVE RELIEF 23

1	Upon review of Plaintiff's Emergency Affidavit and Motion for Criminal Referral, Hate	
2	Crime Designation, and Maximum Penalties, filed on May 30, 2025, and upon review of the	
3	exhibits and verified evidence in support thereof, it is hereby:	
4	ODDEDED.	
5	ORDERED:	
6	1. The Clerk of Court is directed to transmit this Motion and all supporting exhibits to:	
7	o The U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia; and	
8	o The Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice	
9		
10	for appropriate investigation and potential prosecution under:	
11	o 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights)	
12	o 18 U.S.C. § 249 (Hate Crimes)	
13	o 18 U.S.C. § 1509 (Obstruction of Court Orders)	
14	o 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (ADA Title II)	
15	o 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Deprivation)	
16		
17		
18	2. The following individuals and entities are identified for referral and potential	
19	prosecution:	
20	o Ashley Lemons, Property Manager	
21	o John Benz, Esq. , Counsel for Ivy	
22	 Christian Blake Heath, Ivy Staff 	
23	o Captain T. Clarke, Jefferson County Sheriff's Office	
24		

1	 Sgt. Perry, Jefferson County Sheriff's Office 	
2	o Judge Lisa Langford, Jefferson District Court	
3	o Judge Sarah Clay, Jefferson Circuit Court	
4	o Judge Greg Stivers, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky	
5	o Linda Steinhoff Holmes, Private Defendant	
6	o Mary Beth Woodard, Ivy Apartments, Highmark Residential Management	
7		
8		
9	3. These parties shall also show cause within 14 days why protective injunctive relief	
10	should not be entered to prevent further retaliation, seizure, or procedural exclusion	
11	targeting the Plaintiff.	
12		
13		
14	4. The Clerk shall note this referral on the docket and ensure immediate delivery by both	
15	electronic and certified mail to the U.S. Attorney's Office and DOJ Civil Rights Division.	
16		
17		
18	SO ORDERED.	
19		
20	DATED:, 2025	
21		
22	JUDGE	
23	US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
24		

1	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive	
3	Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223	
3	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	LINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6		CT OF COLUMBIA
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	,	U.S. District Court - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
9	Plaintiff, v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-0657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE
12	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	MOTION TO EXPEDITE RULING
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	ON IFP APPLICATION AND
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	EMERGENCY TRO,
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	NATIONAL STAY, AND
18	Defendants.	,
19		CRIMINAL REFERRAL FOR
20		HATE CRIMES
21		
22	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF TH	E UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

24

MOTION TO EXPEDITE RULING ON IFP APPLICATION AND 1 2 EMERGENCY TRO, NATIONAL STAY, AND CRIMINAL REFERRAL 3 FOR HATE CRIMES 4 5 Plaintiff, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D., respectfully moves this Court to expedite ruling on three 6 emergency matters now pending before the Court: 7 1. Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (IFP); 8 2. Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) and Motion for Nationwide Stay; 10 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Criminal Referral based on hate-motivated retaliation, ADA 11 exclusion, and civil rights obstruction. 12 13 1. Procedural Background 14 This case was filed May 23, 2025 and assigned Case No. 1:25-CV-00657. 15 Plaintiff filed a verified complaint, IFP application, Emergency TRO, Motion for 16 Nationwide Stay, and Motion for Criminal Referral. 17 The Court has not ruled on any of these filings to date. 18 All filings are supported by verified affidavits, statutory citations, and constitutional 19 claims. 20 21 22 23

2. Ongoing and Escalating Harm

- Since filing, Plaintiff has become homeless, disabled, and stranded abroad without
 access to medication, or due process.
- Plaintiff's home was seized and cleared of all personal property under a state court
 order entered after federal removal, in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).
 - All emergency motions were timely submitted, yet remain entirely unreviewed due to the unresolved IFP application.
 - Law enforcement and court officers cited the lack of a federal ruling as reason to proceed with the eviction, despite being on notice of removal and active filings.

3. Constitutional and Structural Urgency

- The continued delay in resolving the IFP application has **denied Plaintiff access to**justice, violating the **Fifth Amendment** and **ADA Title II**.
- The Emergency TRO seeks to preserve status quo and halt enforcement based on a voided state order.
- The Motion for Nationwide Stay challenges structural disparities in access between pro se and represented litigants.
 - The Criminal Referral Motion documents a sustained pattern of hate-based retaliation,
 false reports, and unlawful eviction tactics, supported by exhibits and sworn declarations.

22

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

4. Requested Relief Plaintiff respectfully asks that this Court: 1. Immediately rule on Plaintiff's IFP application; 2. Immediately review and rule on the Emergency TRO and Motion for Nationwide Stay; 3. Immediately review and docket action on the Motion for Criminal Referral; 4. Acknowledge that further delay constitutes a continuing constitutional injury, including irreparable harm, loss of access to judicial relief, and denial of fundamental rights. Executed on May 30, 2025 Respectfully submitted, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se

1	EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL CIVIL RULE	55.1
2	I, Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D., certify under penalty of perjury that:	
3	-, - masses of a constant, a constant, and a processing of processing and a constant of the co	
4	1. This motion is made in good faith and not for delay.	
5	2. I am currently homeless, disabled, and physically located outside the United	ed States due to
6	medical emergency.	
7	3. All of my belongings were taken during an unlawful eviction enforced und	ler a void state
8	order while my federal case has remained stalled.	
9	4. No court has reviewed any of my emergency filings because my IFP applied	cation has not
10	been decided.	
11	5. Every hour of delay increases the harm I suffer and risks mooting the relie	f I've
12	requested.	
13	6. Immediate judicial action is required to prevent further irreparable harm.	
14	Executed on May 30, 2025	
15	Respectfully submitted,	
16		
17	Daniel O Feldmenter	
18	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. Pro Se	
19	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222	
20	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com (307) 699-3223	
21		
22		
23		

EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL CIVIL RULE 65.1

1	David I Fallman Dl. D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
2	Louisville, KY 40222 (307) 699 - 3223	
3	danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	DI ADMENE DE CE DANIEL I EFI DAAN	,
5	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
		DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE DISTRI	CT OF COLUMBIA
7		
8	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – (1st Circuit) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
0	Plaintiff,	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
9	v.	CASE: 1.25 CV 00/57
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE	CASE: 1:25-CV-00657
	IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE OF FILING: May 30, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	
12	ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE:
	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE,	MEMORANDUM OF LAW
15	MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	CHALLENGING RULE 23(A)(4)
13	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16		AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS
17	LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES, and JOHN DOES 1–3,	APPLIED TO STRUCTURALLY
18	Defendants	EXCLUDED LITIGANTS
19		
20		
20		
21		
22	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
		3

23 COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

1	MEMORANDUM OF LAW	
2	Challenging Rule 23(a)(4) as Unconstitutional As Applied to Structurally Excluded	
3	Litigants	
4		
5	I. INTRODUCTION	
6 7	This memorandum challenges the categorical denial of class representation rights to pro se	
8	litigants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) as applied in cases where the structural	
9	harm is exclusion from legal representation. Plaintiff contends that when the subject of a civil	
10	rights class action is the systemic denial of court access to the unrepresented, barring such	
11	individuals from leading the class is both logically circular and constitutionally impermissible.	
12	This brief argues that such a rule, as applied here, violates:	
13	1. The First Amendment (right to petition the government for redress);	
14	2. The Fifth Amendment (procedural due process); and	
15	3. The Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection and due process).	
16		
17	II. LEGAL BACKGROUND	
18	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) requires that the class representative "fairly and	
19	adequately protect the interests of the class." Courts have uniformly interpreted this to prohibit	
20	pro se litigants from representing others in class actions. See Oxendine v. Williams, 509 F.2d	
21	1405 (4th Cir. 1975); Fymbo v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co., 213 F.3d 1320 (10th Cir. 2000).	
22	However, these rulings presume the availability of licensed representation and apply the rule	
23	without scrutiny when the exclusion from representation is itself the class injury.	

 $MEMO\ OF\ LAW\ CHALLENGING\ RULE\ 23(A)(4)\ UNCONSTITUTIONAL\ TO\ EXCLUDED\ LITIGANTS\ 1:25-CV-00657$

III. FIRST AMENDMENT VIOLATION

- 2 The First Amendment guarantees the right to petition the government for redress. See *California*
- 3 Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972). Where court rules
- 4 categorically bar individuals from filing collective claims solely because they lack a license to
- 5 practice law, and where no one else can assert that claim on their behalf, the rule operates as a
- 6 content-neutral but status-based suppression of petitioning rights.

7

8

1

IV. FIFTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION

- 9 Procedural due process demands a meaningful opportunity to be heard. See *Boddie v*.
- Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971). In this case, Rule 23(a)(4) becomes a **self-reinforcing**
- procedural wall: the class is defined by exclusion from representation, yet representation is
- required to assert the class's rights.

13

- 14 This forecloses any forum for relief, rendering the alleged injury unreviewable a violation of
- the Due Process Clause.

16

17

18

V. FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION

- The Equal Protection Clause bars the government from creating and enforcing laws that
- discriminate based on status. See *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509 (2004). When pro se litigants
- are categorically excluded from class representation even when the class is composed entirely
- of those excluded from representation the rule has a **disparate impact** based solely on status.
- This structural exclusion cannot survive scrutiny under the Fourteenth Amendment when it
- perpetuates inequality in access to justice.

24

MEMO OF LAW CHALLENGING RULE 23(A)(4) UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO EXCLUDED LITIGANTS 1:25-CV-00657

VI. RELIEF REQUESTED 1 2 Plaintiff requests that the Court: 3 1. Declare that Rule 23(a)(4), as applied to classes defined by exclusion from 4 representation, is unconstitutional; 5 2. Permit Plaintiff to serve as class representative for a Rule 23(b)(2) class composed of 6 unrepresented, indigent, or disabled litigants systemically denied equal procedural access; 7 3. Allow limited class leadership by verified pro se plaintiffs where no other representative 8 is reasonably available and the exclusion is the subject of the case. 9 10 Please see the Memorandum Appendix for further detail on precedent rulings. 11 12 Respectfully submitted, 13 15 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 16 Date: May 30, 2025 8809 Denington Drive (307) 699-3223 17 Louisville, KY 40222

danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Pro Se Plaintiff

1	MEMORANDUM APPENDIX
2	
3	To Accompany Memorandum Challenging Rule 23(a)(4)
4	A. FULL PARAGRAPH SUMMARIES OF PRECEDENT CASES
5	A. FULL FARAGRAFII SUMMARIES OF FRECEDENT CASES
6	Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975) Holding: A criminal defendant has a constitutional
7	right to represent himself. The Court emphasized the dignity and autonomy that self-
8	representation preserves.
9	
10	Application: Courts cannot impose blanket restrictions on pro se litigants when the right to self-
11	representation is fundamental. Denying class representation to litigants solely because they are
12	pro se contradicts this precedent when the class's very injury is exclusion from counsel.
13	Boddie v. Connecticut , 401 U.S. 371 (1971) <i>Holding</i> : Due process prohibits states from
14	denying access to court for fundamental matters (like divorce) solely based on inability to pay.
15	
16	Application: When court rules effectively prohibit excluded groups from initiating structural
17	challenges — as Rule 23(a)(4) does here — the denial is constitutionally impermissible under
18	Boddie.
19	M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (1996) <i>Holding</i> : Struck down court-imposed fees for transcript
20	access in appeals of parental termination cases.
21	
22	Application: Just as courts cannot impose financial barriers to appellate rights, they cannot
	impose procedural barriers (bar admission) that categorically block classes defined by access

 $MEMO\ OF\ LAW\ CHALLENGING\ RULE\ 23(A)(4)\ UNCONSTITUTIONAL\ TO\ EXCLUDED\ LITIGANTS\ 1:25-CV-00657$

23

24

exclusion.

1	Bounds v. Smith , 430 U.S. 817 (1977) <i>Holding</i> : Incarcerated individuals must have meaningful
2	access to the courts.
3 4 5	Application: Structural court access is a constitutional guarantee. Denying pro se class representation when representation is the injury violates the essence of <i>Bounds</i> .
6	Tennessee v. Lane, 541 U.S. 509 (2004) <i>Holding</i> : ADA Title II applies to court systems;
7	individuals with disabilities must have meaningful access to judicial processes.
8 9 10	Application: Procedural rules that bar the disabled and unrepresented from asserting claims of systemic exclusion conflict directly with the Court's mandate in Lane.
11	California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972) <i>Holding</i> : The
12	right to petition includes the right of access to courts.
131415	Application: Blocking access to class certification based solely on legal status violates the petitioning rights of those structurally denied legal access.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 2 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO **DECLARE RULE 23(a)(4) UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS** 3 APPLIED AND ALLOWING CLASS REPRESENTATION 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 6 DANIEL J. FELDMAN, **U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA** 8 Plaintiff, CASE: 1:25-CV-0657 v. 9 SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE DATE FILED: 10 IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, 11 RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, JUDGE: ASHLEY LEMONS. 12 ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH. 13 JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE. 14 (proposed) ORDER GRANTING MARY BETH WOODARD, JOHN R. BENZ, ESO., 15 MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., **MOTION TO DECLARE RULE 23(a)(4)** JAYSON FREW, 16 LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS APPLIED and JOHN DOES 1-3. 17 AND ALLOWING CLASS Defendants. 18 REPRESENTATION 19 20 21 22 [proposed] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DECLARE RULE 23(a)(4) 23 UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS APPLIED AND ALLOWING CLASS REPRESENTATION 24

1	Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law challenging the application of Federal
2	Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) to structurally excluded litigants, and good cause appearing:
3	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
4	1. Rule 23(a)(4), as applied to classes defined by exclusion from representation, is declared
5	unconstitutional under the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments.
6	2. Plaintiff Daniel J. Feldman is permitted to serve as class representative in this action
7	under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2), despite proceeding pro se.
8	3. The Court finds that no alternative class representative is reasonably available due to the
9	nature of the structural injury, and that Plaintiff has established standing and adequacy
10	based on verified filings and procedural record.
11	4. A hearing shall be set for formal certification of the class and to determine further
12	procedural safeguards.
13	
14 15	SO ORDERED.
16 17	DATED:, 2025
18 19	JUDGE
20	US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.	
2	8809 Denington Drive Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	ı
5		DISTRICT COURT
7	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-00657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11 12	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE:
13	ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
14	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	PROOF OF SERVICE –
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	SUPPLEMENTAL FILING FOR
16 17	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3,	HATE CRIME CRIMINAL
18	Defendants.	REFERRAL, EXPEDITED RULING,
19		AND CLASS REPRESENTATION
20		
21		
22		
23	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE U	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 2 I, **Daniel J. Feldman**, certify under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that on **May** 3 30, 2025, I served true and correct copies of the following filings on all named parties and 4 agencies via electronic mail with attached PDF documents: 5 6 7 **Documents Served:** 8 9 A. New Documents 10 Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of TRO and Nationwide Stay 11 (dated May 27, 2025) 12 **Notice of May 27 filing** 13 **Proof of Service for May 27 filing** 14 **Motion to Expedite IFP Application and Emergency Motions** (dated May 30, 2025) 15 Memorandum of Law Challenging Rule 23(a)(4) as Unconstitutional (dated May 30, 16 2025) 17 **Emergency Affidavit and Motion for Criminal Referral with Maximum Penalties** 18 (dated May 30, 2025) 19 20 21 22 23 24

1		B. Filings and Exhibits Previously Served in this Matter
2		
3	•	Verified Civil Rights Complaint
4	•	Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)
5	•	Motion for Criminal Referral and Order to Show Cause
6	•	Motion for Nationwide Stay of Judicial Proceedings Where Filing Disparity Exists
7	•	Proposed Order: TRO and Emergency Relief
8	•	Proposed Order: Nationwide Structural Stay
9	•	Proposed Order: Criminal Referral and Protective Injunction
10	•	JS-44 Civil Cover Sheet (D.C. District Court)
11	•	Summonses (submitted for Clerk's processing)
12	•	Notice of Filing
13	•	This Certificate of Service
14	•	Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Criminal Referral and Mandatory
15		Incarceration
16	•	Declaration of Jo Anne Feldman (Sworn Statement, May 21, 2025)
17	•	Plaintiff's Email Disproving Firearm Threat (May 21, 2025)
18	•	Letter to HUD Investigator Grace Walsh
	•	Photographs of Lock Tampering and Removed Federal Signage
19	•	Press Releases and National Legal Advocacy Notice
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

SERVED TO: 1 2 All recipients have been previously served in related litigation and have active contact with this 3 case EXCEPT the newly named Defendant Linda Steinhoff-Holmes. No emails were returned 4 undeliverable. 5 **Correction to Prior Service Record:** 6 To correct the record, I acknowledge that the attorney for Defendant Linda Steinhoff-Holmes 7 was inadvertently omitted from the prior service on May 27, 2025. As of today, May 30, 2025, 8 she has been properly served with all materials listed above. 9 10 **Service Recipients (By Email):** 11 John Benz – john@rawnlawfirm.com 12 Michelle Rawn – michelle@rawnlawfirm.com 13 Ivy Management (Mary Beth Woodard) – mwoodard@highmarkres.com 14 Alyssa Duncan (Counsel for Linda Steinhoff-Holmes) – aduncan@clappmoroney.com 15 Jayson Frew – jayson.frew@gmail.com 16 Jefferson County Sheriff's Office (Legal Division) – mberghaus@jcsoky.org 17 U.S. Marshals (WDKY) – wdky-info@usmarshals.gov 18 HUD ADA Coordinator – grace.walsh@hud.gov 19 Jefferson County Court Clerks – brionayoung@kycourts.net, lesliedavis@kycourts.net 20 21 22 23 24

1	Dated: May 30, 2025
2	Daniel of Feldmenton
3	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
4	
5	8809 Denington Dr Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
6	
7	+1 (307) 699-3223 Plaintiff, Pro Se
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

N
S DISTRICT COURT
ICT OF COLUMBIA
U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CASE: 1:25-CV-0657
DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
HIDGE.
JUDGE:
NOTICE OF
MOTION TO VACATE TRANSFER
ORDER, ISSUE EMERGENCY
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER,
AND REASSIGN CASE

NOTICE OF EMERGENCY MOTION TO VACATE TRANSFER ORDER, 1 2 ISSUE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, AND REASSIGN CASE 3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, Daniel J. Feldman, pro se, respectfully moves this Court 4 for emergency relief pursuant to: 5 • Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4) (relief from void order), 6 • Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 (temporary restraining order), and 7 • 28 U.S.C. § 455 (recusal and reassignment). 8 The emergency motion seeks the following relief: 9 1. Vacatur of the May 28, 2025 Transfer Order (ECF No. 7); 10 2. Issuance of an Emergency Temporary Restraining Order; 11 3. Judicial reassignment due to conflict of interest and denial of access. 12 This Motion is based on the attached Memorandum of Law, supporting exhibits, the Verified 13 Complaint, and all matters of record in this action. 14 Filed: May 30, 2025 15 16 17 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 18 Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive 19 Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com 20 (307) 699-3223 21 22 23

1	Doniel I Foldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4	damentedmanphd@gman.com	
-	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
5	HAITED CTATEC	DISTRICT COURT
6		CT OF COLUMBIA
O		
7	DANIEL LEELDMAN	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
O	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CASE: 1:25-CV-0657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC,	
10	RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, ASHLEY LEMONS,	JUDGE
12	ASTILL T LLMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH,	
	JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	MOTION TO VACATE
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ.,	TRANSFER ORDER,
	MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	ISSUE EMERGENCY TRO,
17	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	AND DE AGGION GAGE
	- ·	AND REASSIGN CASE
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21		
22	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF TH	E UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

23

- Plaintiff, Dr. Daniel J. Feldman, appearing pro se, respectfully moves this Court to:
- 2 1. **Vacate** the Transfer Order dated May 28, 2025 (ECF No. 7);
- 2. **Issue an Emergency Temporary Restraining Order** pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65; and
- 3. **Reassign** this matter to a neutral judge under 28 U.S.C. § 455 due to conflict of interest,
- 5 pending misconduct referrals, and prior failures to adjudicate Plaintiff's verified motions.

7

I. INTRODUCTION

- 8 This case was transferred without adjudication of emergency filings, despite active
- 9 constitutional, ADA, and evidentiary harm. The transferee court has executed eviction orders
- while the federal removal was active, denied service of all orders, ignored 19 emergency
- motions, and is the subject of a DOJ referral by Plaintiff.

12

13

The emergency is not resolved — it is worsening.

14

15

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

- Mar 31, 2025 Initial Emergency TRO + ADA filings denied by Judge Clay (KY)
- May 12, 2025 Case removed to W.D. Ky.
- May 13, 2025 KY court issued eviction order post-removal (void under 28 U.S.C. §
- 19 1446(d))
- May 16–22, 2025 Emergency TROs, jurisdiction enforcement motions, and criminal
- 21 referrals filed
- May 23, 2025 Verified Civil Rights Complaint filed in D.D.C. with TRO
- May 28, 2025 D.D.C. transferred case without adjudicating any pending motions

1 III. LEGAL STANDARDS (See Appendix for detail)

- Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) Void orders must be vacated
- Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 TROs may be issued to prevent irreparable harm
- 28 U.S.C. § 455 Recusal required for conflict or appearance of bias
- 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) Removal divests state court of jurisdiction

6

7

IV. ARGUMENT

8 A. The Transfer Was Void and Constitutionally Defective

- 9 Judge Moss transferred this case without ruling on:
- Verified Civil Rights Complaint
- Emergency TRO
- IFP Application
- Motion for Nationwide Stay
- 14 This violated Plaintiff's rights under **Christopher v. Harbury**, **Caperton v. A.T. Massey**, and
- 15 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4).

16

17

B. TRO Relief Is Required to Prevent Ongoing Constitutional Harm

- Plaintiff satisfies the **Winter v. NRDC** standard:
- Likelihood of success on ADA, Due Process, and § 1983 claims
- Irreparable harm from eviction, seizure of legal records, and medical deprivation
- Balance of equities favors pause not continued harm
- Public interest lies in protecting due process and disabled access

23

C. Re	assignment Is Mandatory Under 28 U.S.C. § 455
Judge	Moss transferred the case to W.D. Ky., a court:
•	Where harm occurred
•	Under referral for judicial misconduct
•	That enforced eviction while motions were pending
This r	equires reassignment under Liljeberg v. Health Services.
D. IF	P Denial and Non-Service Are Due Process Violations
D.D.C	C. refused to rule on Plaintiff's IFP.
W.D.	Ky. denied it without findings or service — in direct violation of Neitzke v. Williams and
Mulla	ne v. Central Hanover.
E. En	nergency Motions Were Never Reviewed or Heard
To da	te, none of Plaintiff's verified motions have received:
•	Hearings
•	Findings
•	Service of denial
•	Entry on the docket in good faith

1 F. Chronology of 19 Ignored Emergency Filings (March 31 – May 30)

2	Date	Court	Filing	Status
3	Mar 31	KY Circuit	Emergency TRO + ADA Remote Request	Denied Apr 9 without evidence reviewed
4	Apr 7	KY Circuit	Supplemental TRO	Denied without cause
5	Apr 9	KY Circuit	Judge Clay barred future filings	Filed & docketed without findings
3	Apr 11	KY Circuit	Notice of Reconsideration	Misinterpreted and denied
6	Apr 21	KY Circuit	Motion to Clarify TRO & ADA Reconsideration	Blocked, barred from filing
7	May 2	KY Circuit	Motion for Zoom Access and ADA Relief	Ignored
8	May 12	W.D. Ky	Emergency TRO + IFP	Denied without ruling or service
9	May 16 '	W.D. Ky	Motion to Enforce Federal Removal	Ignored
10	May 19 '	W.D. Ky	Notice of Obstruction & Retaliation	Not entered on docket
	May 20 '	W.D. Ky	Supplemental Emergency Motion	Not ruled
11	May 21 '	W.D. Ky	Second Supp. Emergency Motion + Exhibits	No hearing
12	May 22 '	W.D. Ky	Criminal Referral (Hate Crime)	No docket entry
13	May 23 l	D.D.C.	Verified Civil Rights Complaint + TRO	Transferred before review
14	May 27 1	D.D.C.	Memo in Support of Structural TRO	Never adjudicated
15	May 30 l	D.D.C.	Final Emergency Filing (Criminal Referral + IFP)	Transferred same day
16		Additional	ADA Remote Filings + Exhibit Re- Submissions	All ignored
17		Additional	Affidavit of Harm and Asset Loss	Never entered
18		Additional	Jurisdictional Clarification / Stay Filing	Not ruled
19		Additional	Emergency Notices to Sheriff + Marshals	Never enforced
20				

21

22

23

1 V. RELIEF REQUESTED

- 2 Plaintiff respectfully requests:
- 3 1. **Vacate** the Transfer Order dated May 28, 2025
- 4 2. **Reinstate** jurisdiction in D.D.C.
- 5 3. **Issue Emergency TRO** halting all enforcement and retaliation
- 4. **Reassign case** to a non-conflicted D.D.C. judge
- 7 5. **Adjudicate all pending emergency filings** immediately

8

9

EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL CIVIL RULE 65.1

- I, Daniel J. Feldman, certify under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that this
- 11 Motion qualifies as an emergency. Immediate relief is necessary to prevent continuing
- irreparable harm from:
- Enforcement of void eviction orders
- Loss of evidence and ADA accommodations
- Denial of IFP and court access across three jurisdictions
- At least 19 emergency motions since March 31, 2025, declarations, or filings have
- been submitted none ruled upon the merits
- The emergency is escalating, not abating. This motion seeks the minimum relief necessary to
- 19 preserve constitutional rights, evidence, and judicial integrity.
- 20 1. This motion is made in good faith and not for delay.
- 2. I am currently homeless, disabled, and physically located outside the United States due to
- 22 medical emergency.

23

1	3.	All of my belongings were taken during an unlawful eviction enforced on May 27, 2025,
2		under a void state order while my federal case has remained stalled.
3	4.	No court has reviewed any of my emergency filings because my IFP application has not
4		been decided.
5	5.	Every hour of delay increases the harm I suffer and risks mooting the relief I have
6		requested.
7	6.	Immediate judicial action is required to prevent further irreparable harm.
8		
9		Executed on May 30, 2025
10		Respectfully submitted,
11		Daniel O Feldmenter
12		Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D.
13		Pro Se 8809 Denington Drive
14		Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com
15		(307) 699-3223
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

APPENDIX OF AUTHORITIES 1 2 3 I. STATUTES AND RULES 4 5 1. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) – Effect of Removal 6 "Promptly after the filing of such notice of removal of a civil action the defendant or defendants 7 shall give written notice thereof to all adverse parties and shall file a copy of the notice with the 8 clerk of such State court, which shall effect the removal and the State court shall proceed no 9 further unless and until the case is remanded." 10 **Key Clause:** The state court's jurisdiction ends automatically upon proper removal. Any action 11 taken after that date, including an eviction order, is void. 12 13 2. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) – Relief from a Judgment or Order 14 "On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final 15 judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: 16 17 (4) the judgment is void." 18 **Key Clause:** An order entered without jurisdiction or due process must be vacated as a matter of 19 law. 20 21 22 23

1	3. Fed	. R.	Civ.	P. 6	55(b)(1) – Tem	porary H	Restraining	Orders
---	--------	------	------	------	---------	---------	----------	-------------	---------------

- 2 "The court may issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse
- 3 party or its attorney only if:
- 4 (A) specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and
- 5 irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse party can be heard in opposition;
- 6 and
- 7 (B) the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why
- 8 it should not be required."
- 9 **Key Clause:** A TRO may be issued ex parte if irreparable harm is documented through verified
- 10 affidavits.

12 4. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) – In Forma Pauperis Standard

- 13 "Any court of the United States may authorize the commencement, prosecution or defense of any
- suit, action or proceeding... without prepayment of fees or security therefor, by a person who
- submits an affidavit... that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor."
- 16 **Key Clause:** Denial of IFP without review is a denial of court access. The court must assess the
- application before transferring or denying.

19 5. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), (b)(1), (b)(5) – Disqualification of Judges

- 20 (a) "Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any
- 21 proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned."
- 22 **(b)(1)** "Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party..."

23

18

1	(b)(5) "Where he is a party to the proceeding, or is known to have an interest that could be
2	substantially affected by the outcome."
3	Key Clause: Recusal is mandatory where the judge has a personal stake or the appearance of
4	partiality exists.
567	II. CASE SUMMARIES
8	1. Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403 (2002)
9	The Supreme Court held that the denial of meaningful access to courts is a standalone
10	constitutional violation under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The case emphasized that
11	such denial need not be explicit—gatekeeping, docket suppression, or unjustified silence may
12	also constitute a violation. This applies where courts refuse to rule on verified filings or obstruct
13 14	legal access for pro se or disabled litigants.
15	2. Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (2009)
16	This case clarified that a judge must recuse not only when actual bias is proven, but when a
17	reasonable person might question impartiality. The appearance of bias is enough to warrant
18	disqualification. Transferring a case into the jurisdiction of a judge under misconduct referral is a
19 20	textbook example of such an appearance.
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	3. Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847 (1988)
2	The Court ruled that even unintentional violations of recusal obligations can void judicial
3	actions. If a judge fails to step aside when bias or its appearance exists, all related orders may be
4	vacated retroactively. This supports both reassignment and vacatur of the transfer order in this
5	case.
6	
7	4. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)
8	The Court ruled that a pro se litigant's IFP application may not be denied without assessing
9	whether the underlying complaint states an arguable legal claim. Dismissal or denial of fee
10	waivers without reasoning or findings violates both statutory and constitutional rights.
11	
12	5. Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950)
13	This case established that due process requires actual or constructive notice to a party before
14	action is taken against them. Judgments entered without notice are legally void. In this matter, no
15	service of orders was ever made to Plaintiff in W.D. Ky., invalidating all enforcement.
16	
17	6. Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7 (2008)
18	The Supreme Court laid out the modern standard for TROs: the movant must show (1) a
19	likelihood of success, (2) imminent and irreparable harm, (3) the balance of equities favors relief,
20	and (4) the public interest supports action. This case has become the controlling precedent for
21	emergency injunctive relief in all federal courts.
22	
23	
24	

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING 2 MOTION TO VACATE TRANSFER ORDER, ISSUE EMERGENCY TRO, AND REASSIGN CASE 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 5 DANIEL J. FELDMAN, U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 7 Plaintiff, CASE: 1:25-CV-0657 v. 8 SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE DATE FILED: May 30, 2025 IVY APARTMENT HOMES, HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, 10 RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC, JUDGE: ASHLEY LEMONS. 11 ALFREDO CARBALLO, CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, 12 JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON, (proposed) ORDER GRANTING JASON WHITEHOUSE, 13 MARY BETH WOODARD, MOTION TO VACATE JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., 14 MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ., JAYSON FREW, TRANSFER ORDER, 15 LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES and JOHN DOES 1–3. ISSUE EMERGENCY TRO, 16 Defendants. 17 AND REASSIGN CASE 18 19 20 21 22 23

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO VACATE TRANSFER ORDER,
2	ISSUE EMERGENCY TRO, AND REASSIGN CASE
3	Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Vacate Transfer Order, Issue Temporary
4	Restraining Order, and Reassign Case, and for good cause shown, it is hereby:
5	ORDERED that the Motion is GRANTED;
6	FURTHER ORDERED that the Transfer Order dated May 28, 2025 (ECF No. 7) is VACATED
7	and jurisdiction is restored to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;
8	FURTHER ORDERED that the Court shall retain jurisdiction over all filings to date and
9	adjudicate Plaintiff's pending motions, including for in forma pauperis, temporary restraining
10	order, and class certification;
11	FURTHER ORDERED that a Temporary Restraining Order is entered preventing any
12	enforcement actions, seizures, evictions, or retaliatory conduct against Plaintiff pending further
13	order of this Court;
14	FURTHER ORDERED that this matter is reassigned to a neutral judge under 28 U.S.C. §
15	455(a) due to appearance of bias and conflict with judicial referrals and prior non-rulings;
16	FURTHER ORDERED that an expedited status conference shall be scheduled within 7 days of
17	entry of this Order.
18	
19	SO ORDERED.
2021	DATED:, 2025
222324	JUDGE, US DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1	Daniel I Foldman Dh D	
2	Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 8809 Denington Drive	
_	Louisville, KY 40222	
3	(307) 699 - 3223 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com	
4		,
5	PLAINTIFF, PRO SE DANIEL J. FELDMAN	
6		DISTRICT COURT ICT OF COLUMBIA
7		
	DANIEL J. FELDMAN,	U.S. District Court – DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
8	Plaintiff,	
9	V.	CASE: 1:25-CV-00657
10	SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC, d/b/a THE IVY APARTMENT HOMES,	DATE FILED: May 30, 2025
11	HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC, RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC,	JUDGE:
12	ASHLEY LEMONS, ALFREDO CARBALLO,	
13	CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH, JARMEL "MEL" HOPSON,	
14	JASON WHITEHOUSE, MARY BETH WOODARD,	PROOF OF SERVICE –
15	JOHN R. BENZ, ESQ., MICHELLE RAWN, ESQ.,	MOTION TO VACATE TRANSFER
16	JAYSON FREW, LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES	ORDER, ISSUE EMERGENCY
	and JOHN DOES 1–3,	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER,
18	Defendants.	AND DEACCION CACE
19		AND REASSIGN CASE
20		
21	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THE U	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:	
23		
24		

CE	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE					
I, D	aniel J. Feldman, certify under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that on May					
30,	2025, I served true and correct copies of the following filings on all named parties and					
age	ncies via electronic mail with attached PDF documents:					
Do	cuments Served:					
A. I	New Documents					
	Notice of Emergency Motion					
	• Emergency Motion to Vacate Transfer Order, Issue TRO, and Reassign Case (dated May					
	30, 2025)					
	Certificate of Emergency (included in motion)					
	Appendix of Authorities (attached or embedded)					
	Proposed Order Granting Emergency Relief					
	This Certificate of Service					
B. I	Filings and Exhibits Previously Served in this Matter					
	Verified Civil Rights Complaint					
	Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)					
	Motion for Criminal Referral and Order to Show Cause					
	Emergency Affidavit of Harm and Evidence Loss					

•	Memorandum in Support of Structural TRO and Stay
•	Motion for Nationwide Stay of Judicial Proceedings
•	Proposed Order: Structural TRO and Emergency Relief
•	JS-44 Civil Cover Sheet (D.D.C.)
	All exhibits and supporting materials referenced in original D.C. filings and prior W.D.
	Ky. removal packets
,	Press Releases and Congressional Notice of Judicial Misconduct
Son	vod To.
Ser	ved To:

Service Recipients (By Email): 1 2 John Benz – john@rawnlawfirm.com 3 Michelle Rawn – michelle@rawnlawfirm.com 4 Ivy Management (Mary Beth Woodard) – mwoodard@highmarkres.com 5 Alyssa Duncan (Counsel for Linda Steinhoff-Holmes) – aduncan@clappmoroney.com 6 Jayson Frew – jayson.frew@gmail.com 7 Jefferson County Sheriff's Office (Legal Division) – mberghaus@jcsoky.org 8 U.S. Marshals (WDKY) – wdky-info@usmarshals.gov 9 HUD ADA Coordinator – grace.walsh@hud.gov 10 Jefferson County Court Clerks – brionayoung@kycourts.net, lesliedavis@kycourts.net 11 12 Dated: May 30, 2025 13 14 Daniel J. Feldman, Ph.D. 15 8809 Denington Dr 16 Louisville, KY 40222 danieljfeldmanphd@gmail.com 17 +1 (307) 699-3223 18 Plaintiff, Pro Se 19 20 21 22 23

U.S. District Court

District of Columbia

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 6/2/2025 at 2:47 PM and filed on 6/2/2025

Case Name: FELDMAN v. SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC et al

Case Number: 1:25-cv-00657-UNA

Filer:

WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 05/28/2025

Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

MINUTE ORDER re [9] Request for Leave to File Review, [10] Request for Leave to File Review. Leave to file DENIED. The "physical transfer of the original papers" to the Western District of Kentucky, see Dkt. 8, deprives this court of jurisdiction. Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 924 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Signed by Judge Amit P. Mehta on 6/2/2025. (psu1)

U.S. District Court

District of Columbia (Washington, DC) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:25-cv-00657-UNA

FELDMAN v. SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC et al

Assigned to: Unassigned Demand: \$1,200,000

Cause: 28:1443(1) Rent, Lease & Ejectment

Date Filed: 05/23/2025

Date Terminated: 05/28/2025

Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

DANIEL J. FELDMAN

represented by DANIEL J. FELDMAN

8809 Dennington Drive Louisville, KY 40222 307-699-3223 PRO SE

V.

Defendant

SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC

doing business as

IVY APARTMENT HOMES

Defendant

HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC

Defendant

RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC

Defendant

ASHLEY LEMONS

Defendant

ALFREDO CARBALLO

Defendant

CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH

Defendant

JARMEL HOPSON

MEL

Defendant

JASON WHITEHOUSE

Defendant

MARY BETH WOODARD

Defendant

MICHELLE RAWN

ESQ.

Defendant

JAYSON FREW

Defendant

LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES

Defendant

JOHN DOES 1-3

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
05/23/2025	1	COMPLAINT against All Defendants filed by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: 1 Li Civil Cover Sheet, # 2 Summons), # 3 Certificate of Service) (zmtm). (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	2	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025		Initiating Pleading & IFP Application Received. A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	3	MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	4	MOTION for Protective Order by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	5	Emergency MOTION to Stay by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/27/2025	6	SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM to re 5 MOTION to Stay, 3 MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order filed by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Certificate of Service)(znmw) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/28/2025	7	ORDER TRANSFERRING PRO SE CASE to the USDC for the Western District of Kentucky. Pro Se party has been notified by first class mail. Transfer due FORTHWITH. Signed by Judge Randolph D. Moss on 5/28/2025. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/28/2025	8	Case transferred to the USDC for the Western District of Kentucky pursuant to 7 Order Transferring Pro Se Case; Sent to Court via extraction. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/28/2025		Receipt on 5/28/2025 of Electronic Transfer. Other Court Number 3:25-cv-00314 sent by USDC for the Western District of Kentucky. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/30/2025	2	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE REVIEW. The attached document requires leave to file: Supplemental Filing - DANIEL J. FELDMAN. Reason(s): Case has been transferred/remanded. (zjd) (Entered: 05/30/2025)

5/30/2025	10	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE REVIEW. The attached document requires leave to file: Motion to Vacate 7 Transfer Order, Issue Emergency TRO, and Reassign Case - DANIEL J. FELDMAN. Reason(s): Case has been transferred/remanded. (zjd) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
06/02/2025		MINUTE ORDER re 2 Request for Leave to File Review, 10 Request for Leave to File Review. Leave to file DENIED. The "physical transfer of the original papers" to the Western District of Kentucky, see Dkt. 8, deprives this court of jurisdiction. Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 924 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Signed by Judge Amit P. Mehta on 6/2/2025. (psul) (Entered: 06/02/2025)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DANIEL J. FELDMAN,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Civil Action No. 25-00657 (UNA)
SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC et al.,)
Defendants.)

TRANSFER ORDER

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, brings this action for "immediate injunctive relief, damages, and a nationwide stay on court proceedings[.]" Compl., ECF No. 1 at $2 \, \P$ 3. A resident of Louisville, Kentucky, Plaintiff alleges that his lawsuit filed "in Kentucky federal court after removal from state court . . . was dismissed without any ruling on the merits," and "[a]t least seven emergency motions, including [for] ADA accommodations, were submitted but ignored." *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff seeks similar emergency relief here. *See* Mots., ECF Nos. 3, 4, 5.

Plaintiff alleges that "Defendants proceeded with eviction during hospitalization, blocked access to representative, and physically removed property before any lawful writ," and that the courts "failed to serve orders, grant hearings, or cite any filed evidence." *Id.* at 4. In Count III of the Complaint, the most telling, Plaintiff states: "By executing an unlawful eviction, failing to respect a federal stay, and using false statements in court, Defendants committed actionable deprivations under" 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff asserts that his "claims involve systemic and structural constitutional violations that span multiple states" and "implicate both local actors and national private defendants" in Kentucky, California, Texas and North Carolina. *Id.* at 3. Plaintiff's summonses place all but one defendant in Louisville, Kentucky, ECF No. 1-2, and the

Civil Cover Sheet has Jefferson County, Kentucky, as the lead defendant's "County of Residence," ECF No. 1-1.

A civil action such as this "may be brought in a judicial district . . . in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated[.]" 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2). Because Plaintiff's allegations do not establish a plausible connection to Washington, D.C., venue is improper in this District. When "venue [is laid] in the wrong [judicial] district," a district court "shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case" to a district "in which it could have been brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Transfers are favored to "preserv[e] a petitioner's ability to obtain review," *Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. Browner*, 237 F.3d 670, 674 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (citation omitted), especially in *pro se* actions. *See James v. Verizon Servs. Corp.*, 639 F. Supp. 2d 9, 15 (D.D.C. 2009). Transfer is particularly appropriate here, moreover, because it appears that Plaintiff, in effect, is seeking reconsideration of a decision rendered "in Kentucky federal court," dismissing Plaintiff's earlier-filed case "without any ruling on the merits." ECF No. 1 at 4 ¶ 10. This Court lacks authority to review the decision of another federal district court.

Before transferring a case, "the court must ensure as a preliminary matter that venue is proper and that the defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in the transferee forum." *Mathis v. Geo Group, Inc.*, 535 F. Supp. 2d 83, 86 (D.D.C. 2008). The complaint is brought principally against defendants in Kentucky, which is also the location of the property from which Plaintiff alleges he was unlawfully evicted. Thus, the requirements of venue and personal jurisdiction are presumptively satisfied, at least with respect to the necessary parties to the litigation.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), this case is **TRANSFERRED**

FORTHWITH to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, 28 U.S.C. § 97(b).

Whether Plaintiff should proceed further and without prepayment of fees, ECF No. 2, are

determinations left for the receiving court.

_____/s/____

Date: May 28, 2025

RANDOLPH D. MOSS United States District Judge

U.S. District Court District of Columbia (Washington, DC) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:25-cv-00657-UNA Internal Use Only

FELDMAN v. SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC et al

Assigned to: Unassigned Demand: \$1,200,000

Cause: 28:1443(1) Rent, Lease & Ejectment

Date Filed: 05/23/2025

Date Terminated: 05/28/2025

Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

DANIEL J. FELDMAN

represented by **DANIEL J. FELDMAN**

8809 Dennington Drive Louisville, KY 40222

307-699-3223 PRO SE

V.

Defendant

SREIT IVY LOUISVILLE, LLC

doing business as

IVY APARTMENT HOMES

Defendant

HIGHMARK RESIDENTIAL, LLC

Defendant

RAWN LAW FIRM, PLLC

Defendant

ASHLEY LEMONS

Defendant

ALFREDO CARBALLO

Defendant

CHRISTIAN BLAKE HEATH

Defendant

JARMEL HOPSON

MEL

Defendant

JASON WHITEHOUSE

Defendant

MARY BETH WOODARD

Defendant

JOHN R. BENZ

ESQ.

Defendant

MICHELLE RAWN

ESQ.

Defendant

JAYSON FREW

Defendant

LINDA STEINHOFF-HOLMES

Defendant

JOHN DOES 1-3

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
05/23/2025	1	COMPLAINT against All Defendants filed by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Civil Cover Sheet, # 2 Summons), # 3 Certificate of Service) (zmtm). (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	2	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025		Initiating Pleading & IFP Application Received. A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	3	MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	4	MOTION for Protective Order by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/23/2025	<u>5</u>	Emergency MOTION to Stay by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Text of Proposed Order)(zmtm) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/27/2025	<u>6</u>	SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM to re 5 MOTION to Stay, 3 MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order filed by DANIEL J. FELDMAN. (Attachments: # 1 Certificate of Service)(znmw) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
05/28/2025	7	ORDER TRANSFERRING PRO SE CASE to the USDC for the Western District of Kentucky. Pro Se party has been notified by first class mail. Transfer due FORTHWITH. Signed by Judge Randolph D. Moss on 5/28/2025. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/28/2025	8	Case transferred to the USDC for the Western District of Kentucky pursuant to 7 Order Transferring Pro Se Case; Sent to Court via extraction. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/28/2025		(Court only) ***Civil Case Terminated. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)
05/28/2025		Receipt on 5/28/2025 of Electronic Transfer. Other Court Number 3:25-cv-00314 sent by USDC for the Western District of Kentucky. (znmw) (Entered: 05/28/2025)

may 27 2025 cALL to DC confirming 14th violation

00:57 General Clerk

Wait while I transfer your call.

01:07 Daniel

Yes. Hi, my name is Daniel Feldman. I spoke with you, I believe, last week, and you were helping me with an emergency filing that I have for TRO.

01:17 Daniel

And I've been targeted in Kentucky for three years with fake eviction claims from my landlord.

01:27 Daniel

And today, despite having an avoided order, eviction order, the sheriff says that they're going to execute on it anyway.

01:34 Daniel

And even though it's been removed, it was removed to federal court and was not within the state court's jurisdiction,

01:42 Daniel

the sheriff says that they're not going to, they're not going to, they don't, they don't care.

01:46 Daniel

They're going to execute an eviction on me while I was suffering from a stroke.

01:50 Daniel

I've been, I'm out of the country, I've been in a hospital bed, and they took this opportunity to falsely evict me.

01:59 Daniel

I have a restraining order I put in last week challenging the,

02:04 Daniel

that my civil rights were violated, I was not allowed due process.

02:07 Daniel

And, you know, so I filed that last week, and right now, they're executing on the order at 10 o'clock this morning, in one hour.

02:16 Daniel

And they, the marshal's office told me when I called them, they will not do anything until the court, until DC court has ruled, they won't intervene.

02:25 Daniel

And I really need to get an emergency motion, emergency hearing, I'm not sure how to do that.

02:32 Daniel

All my things are being taken right now.

02:34 Daniel

My whole life.

02:37 General Clerk

I got you. So let me get you over to the case administrators.

02:42 General Clerk

I'm not sure how that process will go for like an emergency here.

02:46 General Clerk

But they should be able to direct you at the right area for that.

02:50 Daniel

You guys have been awesome. I really appreciate it. Thank you for doing that.

02:54 Filing Clerk

It's a little bad, but one moment

03:13 Finance

Good morning, you have to score, how can I help you?

03:15 Daniel

Yes, hi, my name is Daniel Feldman. I filed in D.C. court last week a restraining order, emergent restraining order request. My case number is 1 colon 2 5.

03:29 Finance

Hold on one second, hold on one second.

03:31 Daniel

short

03:32 Finance

Okay, so you said one semicolon two five.

03:38 Daniel

And then it's 0657.

03:42 Daniel

zero six five seven and

03:46 Daniel

Feldman versus the IV at all.

03:50 Finance

Was this, was this, is this a pro se case?

03:53 Daniel

Yes, it is.

03:55 Finance

Okay, let me transfer you over to the new K-Test, okay?

04:09 General Clerk

Yes, Mr. Corkin, my name.

04:11 Daniel

Hey, good morning. How are you?

04:14 Daniel

My name is Daniel Feldman. I filed, so my case is CV 0657.

04:20 General Clerk Hold it, hold it, man.

04:21 Daniel

Oh, sure, sure. Sorry about that.

04:24 General Clerk

Hold on, sir. No, no problem.

04:26 General Clerk

Okay, so what is it?

04:28 Daniel

0657

04:31 General Clerk

25.

04:32 Daniel

This is 25 CV 065.

04:35 General Clerk

406-5.

04:42 General Clerk

What type of case is it?

04:44 Daniel

So this is, well, it's a federal question, but I've also put in...

04:49 Daniel

Hold on, sir.

04:51 Daniel

Is it a civil case or a...

04:54 Daniel

It's a civil case, but I've asked for criminal referral.

05:00 General Clerk

Can you give me the case number again?

05:02 Daniel

It's 1 colon 25.

05:05 General Clerk

Mm-hmm.

05:06 Daniel

CV 0657.

05:12 General Clerk

What's the last name?

05:18 Daniel

Feldman versus the Ivy.

05:21 General Clerk

No, I just need the last name of the plaintiff.

05:24 Daniel

philip

05:27 Daniel

feldman f like frank e l d like dog m-a-n

05:35 General Clerk

Is it a, did you file it in, are you a prostate filer?

05:52 General Clerk

When did you file it?

05:54 Daniel

So these are filed last week.

05:58 Daniel

no they were filed electronically

06:02 Daniel

and i was given the case electronically and i spoke with the clerks last week

06:07 General Clerk

What do you mean electronically?

06:08 General Clerk

By email?

06:10 General Clerk

Okay, it's not, so when you say email, when you say electronically, we always take it through ECF, yeah, but if you email it, that's a different thing.

06:19 Daniel

Yeah.

06:22 Daniel

I see.

06:23 General Clerk

So, yeah, we receive it.

06:25 General Clerk

Is it from Daniel?

06:26 Daniel

yes uh-huh and there are two more documents this morning that were added

06:32 Daniel

and the reason i'm calling is because there were three emergent orders in there

06:37 Daniel

and one of them is a restraining order um and that's that need i mean right now i'm being

06:44 Daniel

um i'm having all of my belongings seized unlawfully right now it's happening right now

06:51 Daniel

and um the the marshal's office says that they will not proceed without a

06:57 Daniel

an order from the court to stop and so the marshal's office will not intervene and the

07:04 Daniel

um and the sheriff's office there it's been three years of hell it's a hate crime they've

07:11 Daniel

been trying to evict me under false grounds and while i was in a hospital as a stroke

07:17 Daniel

they they held an eviction hearing i was not allowed to speak they

07:21 Daniel

silenced me they silenced my my my video i was not allowed to get given any due process

07:26 General Clerk

Okay, what are you trying to do, sir?

07:29 General Clerk

Are you a sir or a ma'am?

07:31 Daniel

I'm a serf.

07:32 Daniel

Thank you for asking.

07:32 General Clerk

Thank you for asking.

07:34 Daniel

No, that's okay. I'm glad you asked. Thank you.

07:37 Daniel

So, because, you know, you never know.

07:41 Daniel

And so I'm looking, you know, so I was asking the court to step in and provide a restraining order emergently.

07:47 Finance

We're good.

07:49 General Clerk

So as of today, the case hasn't been opened yet.

07:53 General Clerk

She just filed it on Friday.

07:55 General Clerk

We have four to six business days to process it.

07:58 Daniel

well i know but so the clerk i spoke with last week told me put emergent on the front of it

08:03 Daniel

because which i did there's three emergency requests in there um yeah and so that's why

08:11 Daniel

she and she they were very helpful last week and they said they were going to get this before

08:15 Daniel

you know a judge to look at immediately and to get all of my documents over there which i which

08:21 Daniel

i've done and and right now is the time that i need the restraining order because all of my

08:28 Daniel

things are being taken out of my house right now

08:32 General Clerk

Okay, so this is my digit, meaning I'm the one who processes case numbers from 4, 5, 6, 7.

08:41 General Clerk

So I'll try my best to be able to process this today.

08:45 General Clerk

She just filed a trial date.

08:47 Daniel

Right. And there were two more documents that were sent this morning.

08:48 General Clerk

And there's...

08:51 General Clerk

Yeah, we receive it.

08:52 General Clerk

Okay, that's great.

08:54 Daniel

TRO and then the memorandum?

08:57 Daniel

The memorandum and then the proof of service, yes.

09:02 Daniel

Oh, proof of service, okay.

09:03 Daniel

Yeah, those go with the other documents.

09:07 Daniel

okay and and that's why i mean i i just i i don't know what to do because the

09:13 Daniel

marshall's office is telling me they can't do anything until

09:17 Daniel

there's a court order and by then all of my things will be taken and removed unlawfully

09:22 General Clerk

Well, first, I'm sorry to hear that, but all I can.

09:26 Daniel

I understand.

09:27 General Clerk

...to be able to process this.

09:28 Daniel

They grabbed my mother, who's 81 years old, on a walker.

09:32 General Clerk

I think I'm going to the police.

09:36 Daniel

This is the police.

09:39 Daniel

They say they have an order from the court, but the order is not valid, and they won't.

09:44 Daniel

And they said, we don't care that they're going to execute it anyway.

09:47 Filing Clerk

it anyway.

09:48 Daniel

It's a hate crime.

09:49 Daniel

It's in Louisville, Kentucky.

09:51 Daniel

And they grabbed my mother, and it was a false 911 call.

09:57 Daniel

They took off the locks on my door for a week before the eviction order even,

10:01 Daniel

and then I hired off-duty police officers to guard it.

10:04 Daniel

From off-duty police officers and the apartment complex called 911

10:09 Daniel

and claimed it was a false violence request and called officers on officers.

10:14 Daniel

And then they said that my mother was armed, 81 years old, on a walker with COPD,

10:18 Daniel

can't even breathe, and another senior citizen there.

10:20 Daniel

And then they trespassed them.

10:23 Daniel

My mother's never even picked up a gun or fired a gun in her life.

10:27 Daniel

They put officers at risk, and my mother, and they grabbed her,

10:31 Daniel

and they forcibly removed her, and now they're taking all of my belongings right now.

10:36 Daniel

And it's all unlawful, the whole thing.

10:49 General Clerk

You can just file a motion.

10:51 Daniel

Well, that's what I did.

10:53 Daniel

Those are three emergent motions.

10:55 Daniel

They say there's three different ones.

10:57 Daniel

One is for a restraining order for today at 10 o'clock,

11:01 Daniel

which is going to be in 50 minutes.

11:06 Daniel

And then the other ones are for, you know, immediate.

11:09 Daniel

They're also emergent, but they're for criminal referral for this hate crime.

11:19 Daniel

11:21 Daniel I can't even drive anymore.
11:23 Daniel And then I'm in the hospital.
11:25 Daniel They take my home.
11:28 Daniel I can't believe it.
11:30 Daniel I can't believe it.
11:33 Daniel It's happening right now.
11:37 Daniel Anyway, the clerk told me last week, she said,
11:40 Daniel that she was going to try to get this immediately before a judge or something.
11:44 Daniel And I'm not sure what I have to do.
11:46 Daniel I mean, everyone's been so super nice there.
11:48 Daniel It's very different than the courts in Kentucky.
11:50 Daniel I'll tell you that.
11:54 Daniel And everyone's been respectful, you especially, and the other people I've spoken with.
12:01 General Clerk Okay. Well, since you already submitted that.
12:17 Daniel thank you for doing that and um you know i don't i there was there was a way that
12:22 Daniel they said i could get notified of the hearing but i think that the form i
12:26 Daniel filled out it said that it takes like two weeks or something for it to set up

They blinded my eye.

12:30 General Clerk

So because she filed a motion for waiver of filing fee.

12:34 General Clerk

That would have to be ruled on first before everything else.

12:38 Daniel

Oh no!

12:40 General Clerk

Yes, so that's why I said I'm going to brush this out.

12:51 Daniel

Well, can I pay? Can I pay for it?

12:55 Daniel

So let me just do that right now.

12:58 General Clerk

So if you're paying for the filing fee, you can just overnight the check and email us.

13:03 Daniel

Oh no, I can't do that. I'm in another country. All I have is my debit card.

13:08 General Clerk

Yeah, but you cannot do that over the phone.

13:10 General Clerk

We don't have that yet.

13:11 Daniel

oh no oh no there's no way to pay oh my god yes sir no no

13:28 General Clerk

You can pay for the filing fee.

13:30 General Clerk

It's just that we cannot accept it over the phone yet.

13:33 General Clerk

We don't have that.

13:34 Daniel

How am I going to get it to you? I'm in the hospital in Uruguay.

13:34 General Clerk

How am I going to get it to you?

13:38 General Clerk

It's \$405.

13:43 Daniel

Yes, how do I get that to you?

13:46 General Clerk

I mean, if you can have somebody, like, pay for it in person, or if you can have somebody sign a check.

13:53 Daniel

The person that you see.

13:57 General Clerk

No, I mean, if you can have somebody pay for you.

14:02 Daniel

But where, where would they go?

14:05 General Clerk

If that person can come over in person and pay for it, we are in.

14:10 Daniel

In Washington, D.C., where my family is in Kentucky, I don't know anyone.

14:15 General Clerk

You can have them send a check if you want.

14:21 General Clerk

Overnight. I mean, it's up to you. I'm just giving you the option.

14:26 Daniel

I don't even, it won't accept electronic payments.

14:31 Daniel

I can't believe it.

14:32 General Clerk

We don't have that yet for prostate filers.

14:36 Daniel

This is this is the complaint.

14:37 General Clerk

This is the complaint.

14:38 Daniel

This is why my complaint says that pro se filers are not given due process because they're treated differently than lawyers and that it against the law, that is against the 14th Amendment and that is why I have this case as a 14th Amendment.

14:57 General Clerk

If this was filed with a check, with a filing fee, this could have been assigned to a judge already.

15:04 Daniel

I know, I know. That's why I've claimed, this whole claim is a 14th Amendment claim.

15:09 Daniel

It says that I'm not given due process.

15:11 Daniel

The same thing happened in the other court.

15:13 Daniel

I couldn't defend myself because I couldn't pay for my hospital bed in Uruguay.

15:19 Daniel

And therefore, the other side got to go ahead and submit everything, and I couldn't submit anything.

15:25 Daniel

And that's not due process.

15:27 Daniel

That is a violation of the 14th Amendment, and that's the entire crux of this argument.

15:32 Daniel

I'm losing my entire home today because there's no due process, because it's unfair.

15:38 Daniel

If you do not have represented, if you're not represented, you can't file the same way as a litigated party.

15:44 Daniel

And that is my whole point of my case.

15:49 Daniel

I need to get this thing.

15:50 Daniel

And why can't...

15:51 General Clerk

All I can promise you right now is that I...

15:54 Daniel

Can I speak to someone in the billing office, maybe, about this?

15:54 General Clerk

Can I...

16:00 Daniel

In the billing office.

16:00 General Clerk

the billing office.

16:01 Daniel

In the billing office.

16:03 Daniel

about granting an exception to take an electronic payment because my

16:07 General Clerk

of my

16:07 General Clerk

I can transfer you to the finance, okay?

16:10 General Clerk

You can ask them.

16:12 Daniel

You have been so super helpful.

16:13 Daniel

What is your name?

16:14 Daniel

I thank you so much.

16:16 General Clerk

No problem. My name is Chai, C-H-A-Y.

16:19 Daniel

C-H-A-Y. Chai, thank you again. I appreciate your help so much.

16:23 General Clerk

Thank you for your help.

16:25 Daniel

No problem, sir.

16:25 General Clerk

So I'll transfer you to finance, and you can ask them, okay?

16:29 Daniel

Okay, that'd be great. Thank you so much.

16:42 Daniel

Hi, my name is Daniel Feldman. I have a case that was sent to you guys on last week. It's

16:50 Daniel

an emergency TRO asking for emergency intervention from the judge. I filed IFP, but that's kind

16:58 Daniel

of because it's the only option available to me. I am trying to, all of my belongings

17:02 Daniel

are being seized unlawfully this morning at 10 a.m. and next 45 minutes. And they say

17:09 Daniel

that I can't, because I can't pay. The whole crux of my argument is I've asked, I've actually

17:14 Daniel

called for the judges to make a national shutdown because of the 14th Amendment. It's a constitutional

17:19 Filing Clerk

Okay, let me transfer you to INPEC because this is the finance office.

17:24 Filing Clerk

Let me transfer you.

17:24 Daniel

No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. I'm in the right spot. I'm in the right spot. Hold on, hold on.

17:25 Filing Clerk

No, no, no, no.

17:29 Daniel

Okay, because what they told me was, so this is Chai.

17:33 Daniel

She told me that there was, that there's no way I can pay unless I'm a lawyer.

17:38 Daniel

This is how I locked my home, because, and this is the reason for my complaint.

17:42 Daniel

My complaint is the 14th Amendment violation.

17:45 Daniel

If you're a lawyer, you can pay electronically, and if you're not a lawyer, you cannot.

17:50 Daniel

And that violates the 14th Amendment.

17:53 Daniel

It allows me not, I can't get due process.

17:56 Daniel

I can't defend myself in court.

17:59 Daniel

I've lost all my belongings because I can't pay electronically, and the other side can.

18:04 Daniel

And I need to make an exception.

18:06 Daniel

I need someone to grant me an exception to pay electronically with my debit card while I am in a hospital in another country.

18:16 Filing Clerk

Um, so you want to pay your restitution?

18:20 Daniel

Yeah, I want to pay for the filing fee.

18:24 Filing Clerk

Oh, for filing fee?

18:27 Daniel

Yes. And they say I cannot do that because I'm pro se. I have to do that in person.

18:34 Daniel

But if I was a lawyer, I could do it electronic. They would accept my card.

18:39 Filing Clerk

Yeah, that's the way it works.

18:41 Daniel

I know, so that's the whole crux of my argument.

18:43 Daniel

That's why I'm losing everything in my home right now.

18:46 Daniel

It's because the rules are different, and that violates the 14th Amendment.

18:51 Daniel

You have to provide access to the courts and justice the same,

18:55 Daniel

whether you're represented by a lawyer or you're not.

18:58 Daniel

And this court is in violation of the 14th Amendment by not accepting my payment.

19:04 Filing Clerk

I mean, the finance office is not in charge of, like,

19:07 Filing Clerk

we can't control how the system works, you know?

19:10 Daniel

But can you get me in touch with somebody who is, because what I'm saying is right now, that your court is in violation of the 14th Amendment, the exact reason why I filed this emergency complaint.

19:22 Filing Clerk

Okay, let me try and tell you just a second, please.

19:24 Daniel

Thank you. Thank you so much. I appreciate your help.

19:26 Filing Clerk

Yep, yep, no problem.

19:34 General Clerk

Good morning, Clark's office. How may I help you?

19:37 Daniel

Hi, my name is Daniel Feldman. I have a case number 1-25-CV-0657.

19:48 General Clerk

Okay, one second. 25 BB 0657.

19:52 Daniel

yes and i need to speak to someone because my entire crux of my case i'm losing right now

19:57 Daniel

i'm having all my belongings taken from my home unlawfully and they actually grabbed my mother

20:04 Daniel

with 81 years old on a walker and they trespassed her with this has been three years of a campaign

20:10 Daniel

of hate is in kentucky and i moved this case to d.c court because 14th amendment violation i've

20:18 Daniel

been in the hospital with a stroke in uruguay i'm down in south america right now recovering

20:23 Daniel

from eight days in the hospital with a stroke and they chose this time to evict me knowing

20:29 Daniel

that i can't you know so i can't get access to justice for example the other side can file

20:36 Daniel

immediately and i cannot and the reason i cannot is because i have to file for ifp

20:42 Daniel

because they will not accept so they will not accept my payment over the phone

20:46 Daniel

if i was a lawyer they would

20:48 Daniel

would is the crux of my argument is the constitutional crisis is a violation of the

20:53 Daniel

14th amendment and that i can't get um i cannot get um a the same access to justice

21:03 Daniel

that i would if i had a lawyer and that means the 14th amendment has never existed

21:09 Daniel

and because of this difference and i'm asking the court because the court is in violation of

21:14 Daniel

the 14th amendment the exact claim i'm making is the reason all my belongings are being taken

21:18 Daniel

right now i ask for an emergency temporary restraining order that they say could not be

21:23 Daniel

heard until the payment is made but there's no way for me to make a payment unless i am there

21:29 General Clerk

This is Michelle. I spoke with you on Friday. Right. I understand you mentioned that you were with Byron. Right. Yes. So in terms of the payment, that's a different department that handles that.

21:44 Daniel

Oh, well, they transferred me to you. So I was in finance. I talked to Chai, okay? Chai originally. Then Chai transferred

me to finance to see if there was a way that we could make an exception to accept my payment by credit card, just like a lawyer could do. Because...

21:44 General Clerk

Oh, were they?

22:01 General Clerk

Unfortunately, for individuals who are pro se, they would have to.

22:06 General Clerk

If they pay by credit card, if you come in person, but I'm just saying you're out of the country.

22:11 General Clerk

That could be done, but we don't have the resources to do it over the phone.

22:15 Daniel

That's right.

22:15 General Clerk

That's right.

22:17 General Clerk

Attorneys use their credit card through the PACER account because they're able to file electronically.

22:22 Daniel

I see.

22:23 General Clerk

We don't accept any payment by phone, not even for attorneys.

22:27 Daniel

So what I'm saying is right now,

22:27 General Clerk

So what I'm saying is right now.

22:29 Daniel

so then you know so what i'm saying right now is even the dc court

22:33 Daniel

has rules that are different for pro se versus not pro se it's a violation of the 14th amendment

22:39 Daniel

it's the entire crux of my argument of why all of my belongings are being taken

22:43 Daniel

out of my home right now as we speak i remember everything i have is being removed and taken

22:49 Daniel

And the only reason that they can't assign it to a judge is because they have to rule on the IFP first.

22:55 Daniel

And the only reason they have to do that is because I cannot even pay the filing fee.

22:59 Daniel

I have to have equal...

23:00 General Clerk

you have

23:02 General Clerk

who could bring the payment

23:04 General Clerk

or we also talked about

23:06 General Clerk

on Friday how it could be mailed

23:08 General Clerk

like certified mail

23:09 General Clerk

I have no way

23:10 Daniel

I have no access to my, all my stuff is in my apartment being taken and seized right now as we speak.

23:17 Daniel

And I have no access to my checking account book, my checkbooks, nothing, nothing.

23:21 Daniel

Everything I have is going to be gone in a matter of an hour or two.

23:24 Daniel

My entire life has been dismantled.

23:26 Daniel

And I can't get a judge because there's no payment.

23:29 Daniel

If I was a lawyer, I could.

23:32 Daniel

That's the whole crux of my argument.

23:34 Daniel

It's a 14th Amendment.

23:35 Daniel

I, I does not do process when some people can get access to the court and other people cannot.

23:42 Daniel

I cannot get access to a judge because of a difference in whether I'm represented or not.

23:51 Daniel

Regardless of the mechanism, there's a difference in access to justice.

23:57 Daniel

And that is the entire crux of my argument that I'm trying to get before a judge this morning.

24:03 Daniel

And there's no way I can do that.

24:05 Daniel

I have a credit card in my hand.

24:07 Daniel

I can get anybody to accept a payment.

24:10 Daniel

Maybe someone could write a check for me.

24:12 Daniel

I can sell them the money.

24:13 Daniel

I could send you a, I could, I could sell you the money and you could pay it for me.

24:17 Daniel

But somehow, some way, the court there, which has been super nice to me, everyone has been super nice.

24:23 Daniel

But some way, you've got to get around this 14th Amendment contradiction because you've got to provide access to the judges whether I'm represented or not.

24:35 Daniel

There's got to be a way, we can find out today, we've got to be a way I can get before a judge this morning.

24:41 Daniel

And that's why I'm asking you for help.

24:43 Daniel

I mean, I don't know what else to do.

24:44 Daniel

I mean, I could sell someone the money.

24:46 Daniel

It'll be in their account immediately.

24:47 Daniel

Or cash app it to them or something.

24:50 Daniel

They could write me a check.

24:51 Daniel

There's got to be some way that the court can make sure that I have the same access to judges that lawyers do.

25:00 Daniel

Part of my, part of my complaint is the Supreme Court, I cannot file there.

25:04 Daniel

I can't file anything in the Supreme Court because I have to be barred and that is a violation of the 14th Amendment.

25:11 Daniel

It's in every single court, every court in the United States of America.

25:15 General Clerk

I understand your argument, Mr. Felden.

25:18 General Clerk

But unfortunately, the only way we can receive payment is if there's some type of check.

25:24 General Clerk

Or if you have someone who can make the payment in person, and I know you said that's not possible.

25:30 Daniel

That's not possible.

25:31 Daniel

Can somebody...

25:32 General Clerk

With the IEP, you would still have to wait for the judge to make a ruling as to whether or not...

25:37 Daniel

So all of my stuff is going to be taken by then because there's no due process.

25:41 Daniel

Because I don't have the same access.

25:41 General Clerk

I don't have the same access I can offer at this time, Mr. Feldman.

25:45 Daniel

Well, can I speak to, I mean, you've been so nice and so super great.

25:49 Daniel

I see somebody at the executive level of the courts, one of the executive council at the court, because they have to remove this due process obstacle.

26:02 Daniel

Because it is an obstacle.

26:03 Finance

as it is an option.

26:04 Daniel

and it's not fair and i'm losing all my belongings right now because of it

26:08 Daniel

i'm losing everything in my house everything i've ever owned i can't believe it i just can't

26:15 Daniel

believe it and because i can't pay because i'm not a lawyer that's the only reason the only reason

26:25 General Clerk

Um, well, Mr. Feldman, I understand you're going through a lot at this time.

26:30 Daniel

and i need your help i need your help can you please refer me to over to whoever is the executive

26:36 Daniel

officer of the court somebody who can who can talk to me about like trying to get around this issue

26:41 General Clerk

around this issue.

26:43 General Clerk

I can see if my supervisor is available.

26:46 Daniel

Thank you, that's great, thank you.

27:34 General Clerk

He's in a meeting, but I'm going to transfer you to his voicemail so he can follow up with you, okay?

27:39 Daniel

By then I'll be too late, but that's okay.

27:43 Daniel

I mean, there's nothing I can do.

27:43 General Clerk

There's nothing I can do.

27:45 General Clerk

There's nothing I can do.

27:47 General Clerk

There's nothing I can do.

27:52 General Clerk

I just can't believe it, I just can't believe it.

28:13 Finance

Hi, this is Jean-Claude Dion, Operation Supervisor for the United District and Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia.

28:19 Finance

Today is Friday, May 23rd, and I'm in the office today.

28:23 Finance

Please leave your name, number, and a brief message, and I'll shortly return your call.

28:28 General Clerk

Record your message at the tone.

28:29 General Clerk

When you are finished, hang up or press pound for more.

28:32 Daniel

uh hello my name is daniel feldman and i was just transferred by one of the clerks and you

28:40 Daniel

guys have been super great i have a problem all my things are being taken right now

28:44 Daniel

um because of lack of access of due process and lack of the 14th amendment

28:49 Daniel

being available for unrepresented parties i've been told that i cannot get my case my emergency

28:58 Daniel

hearing for all my things being taken out of my home illegally this morning because the judge has

29:03 Daniel

not ruled on ifp and i even i want to pay i can't pay because i'm not a lawyer if i was a lawyer i

29:09 Daniel

could pay and that is in violation of the 14th amendment and it's exactly the reason why i

29:16 Daniel

removed my case to the dc circuit was because i couldn't get due process in any of the lower courts

29:23 Daniel

in fact every court in america has this 14th amendment violate

29:28 Daniel

obstacle where if you are not represented you can have your home taken like mine's being taken

29:32 Daniel

right now they're removing my things at the moment in this moment my case number is 125 cv 0657

29:42 Daniel

and this is a constitutional crisis that has cost me my entire life all of my belongings

29:50 Daniel

are being seized right now i'm in a hospital in another country and the only reason is because

29:58 Daniel

i can't pay with a credit card or a debit card the filing fee and the court is telling me there's

30:05 Daniel

no way around it there's no way around this obstacle to due process if i was a lawyer i

30:12 Daniel

could stop them from taking all of my things but i'm not and therefore this is how america is

30:20 Daniel

the 14th amendment has never existed as the crux of my argument before the court

30:26 Daniel

and i need you to understand that i'm not a lawyer i'm not a lawyer i'm not a lawyer

30:28 Daniel

help i needed if i could sell someone the money and they could write a check for me

30:32 Daniel

some way the court to get around the due process violation because that's what it is this court is

30:40 Daniel

like all the other courts in violation of the u.s constitution due process to provide equal access

30:47 Daniel

to justice to all and if i can't get my case before a judge like an attorney can then the

30:54 Daniel

14th amendment doesn't exist

30:58 Daniel

and i need your help please i need your emergent help because my entire life

31:02 Daniel

is being put on the street right now as i'm talking to you and i'm watching it happen

31:08 Daniel

and the only reason is because i don't have due process i'm not a lawyer

31:13 Daniel

please call me back immediately i am at i'm at 435-612-0242 it's 435-612-0242

31:28 Daniel

and i appreciate it thank you

31:29 Daniel

oh my god

00:01 Speaker 2

Hi, this is your call. I'm Leon. I'll break the superglasses in the United States District and bankruptcy courts in the District of Columbia today, Wednesday, June 4th, and I'm in the office today. Please leave your name, number, and address in the conversation. I'll start the call. Thank you. Record your message at the tone. When you're finished, play out or press pound for more options.

00:23 Daniel

Hello, Jean-Claude. Hi, this is Dr. Daniel Feldman. I hope you remember me. I'm calling as the pro se plaintiff case number 125-CV-0657. And that's Feldman v. Ivey et al., which is filed on your court in May and includes pending emergency motion and request to vacate the transfer to Kentucky. So last week when we spoke, I know that you said that you were going to send the filings over. They will be reviewed due to the emergency designation. So I've also filed this in Supreme Court. So I made filings in Supreme Court including verified TR motions, criminal referrals, declarations of exclusion under Title II of ADA. I've not seen any orders come back from

01:05 Daniel

D.C., any rulings or docket activity reflecting those filings. You know, the thing is, it now, um, so I want to make sure, so the case has been administrated, has the case been administratively closed or transferred without judicial review. So that's what I need to know, that piece. And then have the most recent filings been entered into the docket, so including the May 27th and 28th emergency motions and proof of service. So, um, May 30th, I want to think it is. Um, if the court has taken action, I was probably served or notified because I've not received anything by mail or phone call or anything like that. But it's urgent because I need to know whether your court is taking jurisdiction or whether or not to escalate the case. So, um, I'm going to make sure that you know what I'm talking about. I'm going to make sure that you know what I'm talking about. I'm going to make sure that you know what I'm talking about. Um, because the, the, the problem is that the Western District of Kentucky has actually sent me a notice now that they are no longer

02:00 Daniel

accepting my electronic e-filings. I have to file everything in person, knowing that I'm out of the country, that I'm homeless now. And so instead of, instead of allowing me access at all, they have completely blocked me from speaking. Now, they've never served me anything either. And I have, uh, documented as exhibits into the Spring Court and in the May 30th filings to D.C. Court, the transcript from Kentucky Western District where the clerk tells me point blank, they don't have to serve me. They don't, they don't, I mean, I, I don't get to know whether or not, um, it had been remanded back to the state court. And now they're telling me I can't make any electronic filings. I have to do them all in person, which is going backwards. And once again, proves my point of the fact that this, that the appropriate removal to us to D.C. Circuit Court. I've also asked, I've written a writ of mandamus to Supreme Court demanding that D.C. Court take a look at this. I can send you a copy. I think I did send you a copy. I know I did,

03:05 Daniel

um, as a, as proof of service, um, because you are an interested party and you're a very nice, reasonable person. So, um, you hopefully you got that from me. And if you can, let me know. I'm sorry for the long message. I just want to make sure that I know where I stand in D.C. Court. And I wanted to update you that the Kentucky Western District has completely shut me out now. I have no First Amendment there, no Fifth Amendment there at all. Zero. None. I have no ability to communicate with that court. And that is exactly the reason why Judge Moss was so incorrect in his ruling to transfer this case. I also, in my complaint, I call for a national class action and to be the class representative, even though I'm not barred, because in my case, you cannot be, you can't, I can't have representation for this class. It defeats the entire purpose. And so once again,

04:04 Daniel

that can't be transferred back to Kentucky Western District. That is a D.C. Court thing. So you guys have got to take a look at this. If you can let me know what the status of it is. And Judge Moss has got to be removed. I really, I'm going to refer him for participation in the hate crime, as I have with all the other, the judges and now the clerks that have now blocked my electronic access in Kentucky Western District. Can you give me a call back? I am at 435-612-0242. 435-612-0242. And I look so forward to talking to you again, probably tomorrow, because I realize now it's the end of the

ay. And hopefully you're home or on your way. Bye-bye. Thank you.	