

**APPEAL NO. 22-12038 and 22-12411**

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

---

**WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,**  
Plaintiff – Appellant,

versus

**JAMES N. HATTEN, et al,**  
Defendants

---

**Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division  
D.C. Docket No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT  
Judge Thomas Woodrow Thrash**

---

**APPELLANT’S PETITION FOR REHEARING  
AND EN BANC DETERMINATION**

**APPENDIX 140**

---

William M. Windsor  
5013 S Louise Avenue PMB 1134, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108  
Phone: 352-661-8472, Email: windsorinsouthdakota@yahoo.com

**PRO SE FOR PLAINTIFF/ APPELLANT, WILLIAM M. WINDSOR**

APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

---

**In re: WILLIAM M. WINDSOR, Plaintiff and Appellant**

---

James N. Hatten, Anniva Sanders, J. White, B. Gutting, Margaret Callier, B. Grutby, Douglas J. Mincher, Jessica Birnbaum, Judge William S. Duffey, Judge Orinda D. Evans, Judge Julie E. Carnes, John Ley, Judge Joel F. Dubina, Judge Ed Carnes, Judge Rosemary Barkett, Judge Frank M. Hull,  
**Defendants and Appellees,**

**Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division  
Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT  
Judge Thomas Woodrow Thrash**

---

**STATEMENT REGARDING APPEAL**

---

William M. Windsor  
5013 S Louise Ave #1134  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108  
352-661-8472  
Email: bill@billwindsor.com

**PRO SE FOR PLAINTIFF/ APPELLANT,  
WILLIAM M. WINDSOR**

---

1. William M. Windsor (“Windsor” or “Plaintiff”) in Civil Action No. 1-11-CV-01923-TWT hereby files this Frivolity and Jurisdictional Screening Statement required by an order of this Court.

2. This STATEMENT REGARDING APPEAL complies with this Court’s December 21, 2011 order.

**THE DATE AND THE DISTRICT COURT DOCKET NUMBER OF EACH ORDER THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THE APPEAL**

3. The order appealed is the ORDER issued by JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH on 6/30/2022 in Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT (“ORDER”).  
[EXHIBIT 2293.]

**CONCISE SUMMARY OF ISSUES WINDSOR INTENDS TO RAISE**

**4. JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH’S ORDER IS VOID AND INVALID.**

5. The issues are unlawful sua sponte modification of an injunction, violation of hundreds of court precedents, violation of Constitutional rights, denial of due process, jurisdiction, failure to have the ORDER signed and/or sealed by the clerk, extreme bias, and more.

**6. FEDERAL COURTS HAVE NO JURISDICTION OVER STATE**

## **COURT MATTERS.**

7. Federal courts have no jurisdiction over state court matters. *Baum v. Blue Moon Ventures, LLC*, 513 F.3d 181, 191-92 (5th Cir. 2008); *Sieverding v. Colo. Bar Ass'n*, 469 F.3d 1340, 1344 (10th Cir. 2006); and *Martin-Trigona v. Lavien*, 737 F.2d 1254, 1263 (2d Cir. 1984).

### **8. WINDSOR WAS DENIED PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS.**

9. The only facts before the district court were from WINDSOR. There wasn't a single affidavit or word of testimony from the Defendants. The ORDER fails to set forth any valid reasons for it (as there are none).

10. JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH foreclosed WINDSOR's access to federal courts and Texas state courts. JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH issued an injunction without giving WINDSOR the opportunity to be heard at a hearing. There was no Show Cause order issued to WINDSOR. He did not have proper notice.

### **11. THERE WAS NO FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE ORDER.**

12. The basis for the ORDER was alleged "abuse of the federal judicial system" by "repeatedly filing frivolous, malicious and vexatious lawsuits the judges assigned to his many cases ..." But there was no evidence presented in the matter to support such a statement in the ORDER.

**13. THIS COURT MUST MAKE IT CLEAR THAT JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ORDERS OR INJUNCTIONS THAT RESTRICT STATE COURT MATTERS.**

14. Meaningful access to the courts is the issue. Federal courts have no authority to limit state court filings. There are three key federal precedents that are routinely cited on this issue by every federal circuit court -- *Baum v. Blue Moon Ventures, LLC*, 513 F.3d 181, 191-92 (5th Cir. 2008); *Sieverding v. Colo. Bar Ass'n*, 469 F.3d 1340, 1344 (10th Cir. 2006); and *Martin-Trigona v. Lavien*, 737 F.2d 1254, 1263 (2d Cir. 1984). WINDSOR has researched "filing restrictions" referencing the three key federal precedents in every federal circuit court. There has never been one single appellate decision that disagrees with the three cases. WINDSOR has reviewed and reported on over 150 federal appellate decision regarding filing restrictions.

**15. JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH HAD NO RIGHT TO DENY ACQUAINTANCES OF WINDSOR FROM PURSUING THEIR LEGAL MATTERS.**

16. The courthouse doors have been closed to WINDSOR and his acquaintances in violation of extensive case law. WINDSOR and his

acquaintances have been denied rights pursuant to the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

**17. JUDGE THOMAS W. THRASH HAS EXTREME BIAS AGAINST WINDSOR. HE WILL DO ANYTHING TO DAMAGE WINDSOR.**

**CONCISE SUMMARY OF THE BASIS OF  
THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION**

18. The Court of Appeals has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) because one of the district court's rulings (1) imposed an injunction; or (2) had the practical effect of an injunction; or (3) worked a modification of an injunction.

19. Injunctions are appealable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a).

**LIST OF ALL PENDING APPEALS, PETITIONS, AND ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS IN THIS COURT AND THE STATUS OF EACH**


20. There is one appeal pending in this Court – 22-12038. Status = new.

**LIST OF ALL OUTSTANDING INJUNCTIONS OR ORDERS, WHETHER ISSUED BY THIS COURT OR BY ANY FEDERAL COURT THAT RESTRICT WINDSOR'S FEDERAL COURT FILINGS**

21. Order dated December 21, 2011 in Case Numbers 11-12176-E, 11-13996-E, 11-14073-A, 11-14501-E, 11-14021-B, 11-14023-A, 11-14124-B, 11-

14125-B, 11-14126-B, and 11-14127-B.

Submitted, this 14th day of July, 2022.



**William M. Windsor**

5013 S Louise Ave #1134

Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108

352-661-8472

Bill@BillWindsor.com

# **EXHIBIT**

# **2293**



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

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

B. GRUTBY, et al.,


Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE  
NO. 1:11-CV-1923-TWT

ORDER

This is a pro se civil action. It is before the Court on the Motion for Leave to File Motions [Doc. 269], Motion for Leave to File [Doc. 270] and Motion for Leave to File Civil Rights Complaint [Doc. 271] which are DENIED based upon the well-documented history of frivolous filings by William Windsor and his abuse of the federal judicial system.

SO ORDERED, this 30th day of June, 2022.

  
THOMAS W. THRASH, JR.  
United States District Judge