

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-12154
Non-Argument Calendar

TAQUAN RAHSHE GULLETT-EL,
General Executor-Caveator, Taquan Rashie Gullett Estate,
SYTERIA HEPHZIBAH-EL,
General Executrix-Caveatrix, Syteria Lawrence Estate,
Plaintiffs- Appellants,

AAMARU ALIEN RELIGIOUS CONSUL ASSOCIATION,
Plaintiff,

versus

TIMOTHY J. CORRIGAN,
a private person,
SEAN PATRICK FLYNN,
a private person,
W. STEPHEN MULDROW,
a private person,
JON S. WHEELER,
a private person,

RONNIE FUSSELL,
a private person, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 3:17-cv-00881-TJC-MCR

Before JILL PRYOR, BRANCH, and LUCK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Taquan Gullett-El and Syteria Hephzibah-El, proceeding pro se, appeal the district court's order denying their motion to dissolve an anti-filing injunction. The government moved for summary affirmance, contending the appeal is frivolous. We agree, grant the summary-affirmance motion, and affirm the district court's order.

I.

The plaintiffs, mother and son, were separately charged with federal offenses. Before the trials began, they each filed federal lawsuits against the judges and attorneys involved in the prosecutions. The lawsuits were dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and were deemed "patently frivolous." After mother and son were convicted, they continued filing similar lawsuits in state court and the Court of Federal Claims and continued to name the judges and attorneys involved in their previous cases as defendants.

25-12154

Opinion of the Court

3

In 2017, for example, the plaintiffs filed what they called a “Universal and International Humanitarian Declaration for Common Law Prejudgment Writ of Personal Replevin” in Florida’s Fourth Judicial Circuit. The United States—one of 182 defendants—removed the case to the District Court for the Middle District of Florida. The district court dismissed with prejudice and permanently enjoined the plaintiffs from “initiating any action or other matter” in that court (or in Florida’s Fourth Circuit) “without obtaining [its] prior approval.” The plaintiffs appealed that order, but the appeal was dismissed for want of prosecution.

About seven years later, the plaintiffs moved the district court to dissolve the anti-filing injunction. The district court denied the motion because it “present[ed] no factual or legal basis to support the requested relief.”

The plaintiffs appeal the district court’s denial of their motion to dissolve the injunction. In response, the government moved for summary affirmance.

II.

Summary disposition is appropriate: (1) where time is of the essence—“situations where important public policy issues are involved or those where rights delayed are rights denied”; (2) where a party’s position “is clearly right as a matter of law”; or where (3) “the appeal is frivolous.” *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969). We construe pro se pleadings liberally, but “this leniency does not give a court license to serve as de facto counsel for a party, or to rewrite an otherwise deficient

pleading in order to sustain an action.” *Campbell v. Air Jamaica Ltd.*, 760 F.3d 1165, 1168–69 (11th Cir. 2014) (citation modified).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(5) allows a party to move for relief from an order where “applying it prospectively is no longer equitable.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(5). We review for abuse of discretion the propriety of an anti-filing injunction. *Miller v. Donald*, 541 F.3d 1091, 1096 (11th Cir. 2008). But if the time to appeal the issuance of an injunction has come and gone, a party “may not file a successive motion requesting the same relief ‘simply to revisit the initial injunction decision or resurrect an expired time for appeal.’” *Birmingham Fire Fighters Ass’n 117 v. Jefferson Cnty.*, 290 F.3d 1250, 1253 (11th Cir. 2002) (16 *Wright & Miller’s Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3924.2 (2d ed. 1996)). Instead, the party must allege “changed circumstances, new evidence, or a change in the law.” *Id.* at 1254 (citing 16 *Wright & Miller* § 3924.2).

An appellant’s brief must include arguments containing “appellant’s contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies.” Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A). “Issues not raised in an initial brief are deemed forfeited and will not be addressed absent extraordinary circumstances.” *Raper v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 89 F.4th 1261, 1274 (11th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Anthony v. Georgia*, 69 F.4th 796, 807 (11th Cir. 2023)).

III.

Summary affirmance is warranted here for two reasons. First, the plaintiffs’ appeal is frivolous as they have not pointed to

any “changed circumstances, new evidence, or a change in the law.” *See Birmingham Fire*, 290 F.3d at 1254. Their brief is largely indiscernible but broadly seeks to argue that our government is illegitimate, and that they are beneficiaries of trusts that are owed billions of dollars in gold. Their legal authorities are from long ago. For example, it is not obvious what relevance the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917 might have here, but whatever its application might be, plaintiffs could have brought an argument based on that law before the district court issued its injunction. The plaintiffs did not explain any change in the law concerning the Trading with the Enemy Act between when the district court initially enjoined them, and when they moved to dissolve the injunction years later. They are instead trying to relitigate the anti-filing injunction using the same sovereign citizen arguments that they sought to use in their initial complaint.¹ That is no longer permitted once the injunction is final. *See id.* at 1253.

Second, the appeal is frivolous because the plaintiffs have forfeited any arguments they might have had by not raising them in their initial brief. *See Groendyke*, 406 F.2d at 1161–62. Even under the most liberal construction, the brief contains no references to the law governing dissolving the anti-filing injunction. While it makes a passing reference to the injunction itself, the brief does not

¹ We have summarily rejected the arguments of “so-called ‘sovereign citizens,’ who believe they are not subject to the jurisdiction of the courts,” as frivolous. *United States v. Sterling*, 738 F.3d 228, 233 n.1 (11th Cir. 2013).

explain why maintaining the injunction is unlawful, cite any relevant authority on the topic, or explain what changed that makes the injunction no longer appropriate. As a result, the issue is “deemed forfeited,” and we need not address it. *See Raper*, 89 F.4th at 1274.

★ ★ ★

Because the plaintiffs’ appeal is frivolous, we **GRANT** the government’s motion for summary affirmance and affirm.

AFFIRMED.