

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-14348
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 3:10-cv-00392-RV-EMT

BARBARA ANN KELLY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

ROBERT DAVIS,
SEASIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP,
SEASIDE COMMUNITY REALTY INC,
SEASIDE I HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION INC,
TOWN COUNCIL INC,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Florida

(July 12, 2021)

Before LAGOA, BRASHER, and ED CARNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Barbara Ann Kelly appeals the district court's judgment awarding attorney's fees to Seaside Community Development Corporation. She challenges the court's determination of her citizenship for diversity jurisdiction purposes and its award of sanctions to Seaside based on Kelly's lying about her state citizenship. We affirm in all respects for the reasons explained by the district court. See Doc. 362; Doc. 368; Doc. 406. Kelly's contentions and arguments, including any not addressed by the district court, are so lacking in merit that they do not warrant or deserve any discussion. See, e.g., United States v. Irielle, 977 F.3d 1155, 1165 n.6 (11th Cir. 2020). By all appearances Kelly has disrespected and abused the legal system at every stage of this decade-long litigation, and we decline to continue indulging her waste of judicial resources.

Kelly's appeal may well be frivolous and deserving of additional sanctions and an award to Seaside of "just damages" and "double costs," see Fed. R. App. P. 38, but to avoid spending even more judicial resources we will not order her to show cause why she should not be sanctioned. At least, we will not do that yet. Further efforts to challenge the district court's rulings, and this Court's judgment, may not be met with similar leniency. See generally, e.g., United States v. Morse, 532 F.3d 1130, 1133 (11th Cir. 2008) (sanctioning a pro se litigant and reasoning that "[b]ecause [his] arguments are frivolous and he had been warned about raising them, we conclude that [Rule 38] sanctions are appropriate"); see also Kelly v.

Davis, 679 F. App'x 978 (11th Cir. 2017) (unpublished) (noting in Kelly's last appeal that her "lawsuit in this case borders on frivolous, if it does not cross that border").

The district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**, and all pending motions are **DENIED**.