

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 25-1301

RICKY KAMDEM-OUAFFO,
Appellant
v.

FEIN SUCH KAHN & SHEPPARD, P.C., “FSKS”;
BORELLI & ASSOCIATES P.L.L.C., “BA”; PHILIP A. KHAN, Esq.; MICHAEL J.
BORRELLI, Esq.; ANTHONY P. MALECKI, Esq.; DOLORES M. DEALMEIDA, Esq.;
BRIAN P.S. MCCABE, Esq.; ROBERT A. BRUNO, J.S.C.; SETTLEMENTS
SYSTEMS INC; ROBERT T. LOUGY, A.J.S.C.; MICHELLE M. SMITH; ARMANDO
B. FONTOURA; TD BANK N.A.; PEPSICO INC.; LUBOJA AND THAU LLP;
JONATHAN C. THAU, LLP; RICHARD M. HUNTER, Esq.; RICHARD M. HUNTER
PLLC; LONDON FISCHER LLP; DR. PETER GIVEN; DR. NAIJIE ZHANG; AIDA
COSTELLO; JOHN DOE; JANE DOE; ABC CORPORATION (1-10)

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of New Jersey
(D.N.J. Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-04174)
District Judge: Honorable Zahid N. Quraishi

Submitted on Appellant’s and Appellees’ Motions for Summary Action
June 12, 2025

Before: BIBAS, PORTER, and MONTGOMERY-REEVES, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed June 25, 2025)

OPINION*

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

PER CURIAM

Pro se appellant Ricky Kamdem-Ouaffo appeals from the District Court's order denying his post-judgment motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration. For the reasons that follow, we will summarily affirm the District Court's order.

In 2022, Kamdem-Ouaffo filed a federal lawsuit challenging the garnishment of funds from his bank accounts pursuant to state court orders. The District Court dismissed his claims and later imposed a limited filing injunction against him. We affirmed both decisions on appeal. See Kamdem-Ouaffo v. Fein Such Kahn & Sheppard, P.C., No. 23-2089, 2024 WL 5244699, at *3 (3d Cir. Dec. 30, 2024). Kamdem-Ouaffo then filed a motion in the District Court for leave to seek reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), alleging that the judgment was unconstitutional.

In a text order, the District Court denied his motion, noting that it lacked authority to disturb our ruling on appeal and that Kamdem-Ouaffo could have raised his arguments on appeal. In response, Kamdem-Ouaffo filed an additional motion requesting to seek reconsideration and to correct statements in his prior motions, which the District Court denied. Kamdem-Ouaffo has appealed. Several appellees and Kamdem-Ouaffo have moved for summary action.¹

¹ We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review orders enforcing a filing injunction for abuse of discretion. See Abdul-Akbar v. Watson, 901 F.2d 329, 331 (3d Cir. 1990). We may summarily affirm a district court's decision if the appeal fails to present a substantial question. See Murray v. Bledsoe, 650 F.3d 246, 247 (3d Cir. 2011) (per curiam).

The District Court did not abuse its discretion in denying Kamdem-Ouaffo leave to file his motions, pursuant to the filing injunction. We have already concluded that the injunction was appropriately entered here and, in any event, Kamdem-Ouaffo did not present any basis for reopening the final judgment issued in his case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) (setting forth grounds for relief from a final judgment); see also Budget Blinds, Inc. v. White, 536 F.3d 244, 255, 258 (3d Cir. 2008).

Accordingly, we grant the appellees' motions for summary action and will affirm the District Court's orders.²

² Kamden-Ouaffo's pending motions are denied.