

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ERCOLE A. MIRACHI,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	No. 21-126
KATHY BOOCKVAR, <i>et al</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 20th day of January, 2022, upon consideration of Plaintiff’s numerous “Submissions to Court Under 18 U.S.C. § 2382” (Docket Nos. 137-156) filed after the Court’s December 30, 2021, opinion and order dismissing Plaintiff’s Final Amended Complaint with prejudice (Docket Nos. 135-136), it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff is placed on notice that if he continues to file pleadings as to this terminated case, the Court may restrict his filing privileges.¹

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jeffrey L. Schmehl
Jeffrey L. Schmehl, J.

¹ Prior to the Court ordering him to file a final amended complaint in this matter, Plaintiff had filed 21 Amended Complaints. Thereafter, Plaintiff began filing documents that he titled “Submissions to Court Under 18 U.S.C. § 2382.” As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has filed 84 such submissions, 18 of which were filed after this Court dismissed his Final Amended Complaint with prejudice and terminated his case. A review of these submissions shows that they all set forth additional information as to the allegations contained in Plaintiff’s Final Amended Complaint.

“When a district court is confronted with a pattern of conduct from which it can only conclude that a litigant is intentionally abusing the judicial process and will continue to do so unless restrained, . . . [the court] is entitled to resort to its power of injunction and contempt to protect its process.” *See Abdul-Akbar v. Watson*, 901 F.2d 329, 333 (3d Cir. 1990). The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), provides a district court with the ability enjoin “abusive, groundless, and vexatious litigation.” *Brow v. Farrelly*, 994 F.2d 1027, 1038 (3d Cir. 1993); *see also In re Oliver*, 682 F.2d 443, 445 (3d Cir. 1982).