

Exhibit

54

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

MAID OF THE MIST	:	
CORPORATION et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.	:	1:09-CV-1543-WSD
	:	
ALCATRAZ MEDIA, LLC, et al.,	:	
Defendants.	:	

SHOW CAUSE ORDER

William Windsor and Barbara Windsor are **ORDERED** to appear in Courtroom 1705, United States Courthouse, 75 Spring Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia on **FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2011 at 11:00 a.m.** A hearing shall be held for the limited purpose of receiving evidence and hearing argument regarding the issues identified in this Order.¹

The history of this case is detailed in this Court's prior Orders [*see, e.g.*, 32-1, 99, 125 & 152]. The Plaintiffs are now attempting to collect \$37,333.67, plus interest, in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 38 sanctions that the United States

¹ The other parties and their attorneys may, but are not required, to be present.

Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit imposed on Mr. Windsor for filing a frivolous appeal [54 at 2].

Mr. Windsor, who is representing himself, has refused to pay the amount ordered.

Mrs. Windsor is now involved in the case because the Plaintiffs have sought post-judgment discovery from both of the Windsors to aid in the collection of the judgment against Mr. Windsor. *See* Fed R. Civ. P. 69(a)(2). Mr. Windsor and, apparently, Mrs. Windsor, have not provided the information requested in discovery.

On April 21, 2011, this Court granted the Plaintiffs' motions to compel and ordered Mr. and Mrs. Windsor "to provide complete responses to the Plaintiffs' discovery requests no later than May 13, 2011" [152 at 6]. This Court also returned to Mrs. Windsor a Notice of Appeal, Certificate of Compliance, and Certificate of Service that had purportedly been filed by her on April 11, 2011 (the "April 11, 2011 Documents") because the documents were rubber-stamped with a purported signature, rather than signed by Mrs. Windsor [151]. The Court stated that "[i]n light of [Mr.] Windsor's continuing improper attempts to represent his wife in

these proceedings, her original signature on each of those documents is required [151 at 4].²

On April 28, 2011, the Clerk received (1) a “Request for Specific Approval to File Motion for Stay” – purportedly signed by Mrs. Windsor – stating that “Barbara has filed appeals on all orders in this matter” and asserting that “[n]on-party witnesses are entitled to appeal orders and [sic] without waiting for final judgment to be entered” [Undocketed Filing at 1-2] and (2) the April 11, 2011 Documents with “original” signatures written above the rubber-stamped signatures. The “original” signatures on all the documents submitted or resubmitted on April 28 appear distinctly different from the rubber-stamped signatures on the April 11, 2011 Documents. They are similar in character and stroke as Mr. Windsor’s signature.


In light of the history of this case, the Court’s direction to Mr. Windsor that he may not serve as counsel for his wife and because it is possible that signature submissions to this Court by the Windsors are not authentic, the Court determines

² Mr. Windsor, who is not a lawyer, is again cautioned that he may not represent Mrs. Windsor in these proceedings [*see, e.g.*, 105 at 1, 125 at 4 n.2 & 135 at 1-2].

it is necessary to **ORDER** Mr. and Mrs. Windsor to appear before the Court to provide evidence about how each of the documents submitted on April 28 were prepared and by whom they were signed and submitted.

Mr. Windsor's Request for Specific Approval to File Motion for Stay [157] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 4th day of May, 2011.



WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE