NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

_____

No. 26-1123

_____

RICKY KAMDEM-OUAFFO,
Appellant

v.

FEIN, SUCH, KAHN & SHEPARD, P.C. (FSKC);
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 CORPORATIONS (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 Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)
on November 2, 2026

Before: KRAUSE, BIBAS, and NYGAARD, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: November 12, 2026)

_____

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se appellant Ricky Kamdem-Ouaffo appeals from the denial of his post-judgment motions for leave to seek reconsideration and for recusal of the District Judge. For the reasons that follow, we will affirm the District Court's orders.

In 2022, Kamdem-Ouaffo initiated a federal lawsuit challenging the garnishment of funds from his bank accounts pursuant to state court orders. The District Court dismissed his claims and ultimately imposed a limited filing injunction against him. We affirmed both decisions. *See Kamdem-Ouaffo v. Fein Such Kahn & Sheppard, P.C.*, No. 23-2089, 2024 WL 5244699, at *3 (3d Cir. Dec. 30, 2024) (per curiam). Kamdem-Ouaffo subsequently sought leave to file several motions for reconsideration under Rule 60(b), which the District Court denied, and we summarily affirmed those decisions on appeal. *See Kamdem-Ouaffo v. Fein Such Kahn & Sheppard, P.C.*, No. 25-1301, 2025 WL 1752490, at *1 (3d Cir. June 25, 2025) (per curiam).

Soon after, Kamdem-Ouaffo requested leave to file another motion for reconsideration in the District Court, which was denied by text order. Kamdem-Ouaffo filed a notice of appeal, as well as a motion for leave to seek reconsideration of the District Court's

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

decision, and a motion to disqualify the District Judge. The District Court denied both motions by text order and Kamdem-Ouaffo filed another notice of appeal.[1]

As we concluded in Kamdem-Ouaffo's prior appeal, we discern no abuse of discretion in the District Court's decisions denying Kamdem-Ouaffo leave to file additional motions for reconsideration, pursuant to the filing injunction previously entered against him. In his initial appeal, we concluded that the injunction was appropriately entered — and regardless, Kamdem-Ouaffo did not present any proper basis for reopening the final judgment issued in his case, as the District Court explained. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) (setting forth grounds for relief from a final judgment); *see also BLOM Bank SAL v. Honickman*, 605 U.S. 204, 216 (2025); *Budget Blinds, Inc. v. White*, 536 F.3d 244, 255, 258 (3d Cir. 2008).

Further, we see no error in the District Court's denial of Kamdem-Ouaffo's recusal motion. *See generally In re: Kensington Int'l Ltd.*, 353 F.3d 211, 220 (3d Cir. 2003) ("The test for recusal under [28 U.S.C.] § 455(a) is whether a reasonable person, with knowledge of all the facts, would conclude that the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned."). Recusal was not warranted based on Kamdem-Ouaffo's disagreement with the District Court's rulings or his subjective beliefs that the District Judge was biased. *See SecuraComm Consulting, Inc. v. Securacom Inc.*, 224 F.3d 273, 278 (3d

[1] Kamdem-Ouaffo filed his appeal in the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which transferred the appeal to this Court as the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit lacked jurisdiction over his appeal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review orders enforcing a filing injunction and denying a motion to recuse for abuse of discretion. *See Abdul-Akbar v. Watson*, 901 F.2d 329, 331 (3d Cir. 1990); *Jones v. Pittsburgh Nat'l Corp.*, 899 F.2d 1350, 1356 (3d Cir. 1990).

Cir. 2000) ("We have repeatedly stated that a party's displeasure with legal rulings does not form an adequate basis for recusal[.]").

Accordingly, we will affirm the District Court's orders.