

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

IN RE: KEITH MORDASKY

No. 3:20-cv-00077 (JAM)

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE

On January 10, 2020, the Court received a “motion for leave” filed by Keith Mordasky. The motion states in its entirety “To Janet C. Hall: You will notice that Troop K is not invol[v]ed in these cases. Forward these drafts to my substa[t]ion address 25 Vermont Drive, Apt 14, Willimantic, CT, 06226.” Doc. #1. Attached to this “motion for leave” are four proposed complaints asserting wildly frivolous allegations of impropriety against various national politicians. Doc. #1; *see also* Docs. #1-2; #1-3; #1-5; #1-7. Attached in turn to each proposed complaint is a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Docs. #1-2 at 6; #1-3 at 6; #1-5 at 6; #1-7 at 6.

Mordasky has an extensive litigation history in this District. A PACER search shows “Keith Mordasky” or “Keith S. Mordasky” is listed as plaintiff in 112 cases in the District of Connecticut.

After issuing an order to show cause and allowing Mordasky an opportunity to respond, Judge Hall has previously entered a leave-to-file sanction: an order requiring Mordasky to request leave to file any new *in forma pauperis* actions or other documents in the District of Connecticut. *See* Doc. #1-1 (*Mordasky v. Troop K et al*, 3:16-cv-1219 (JCH), Doc. #21, (D.

Conn. July 20, 2016)); *In re Martin-Trigona*, 9 F.3d 226, 228-30 (2d Cir. 1993) (discussing authority of federal court to issue leave-to-file sanction against vexatious litigants).

Because Mordasky's proposed complaints are plainly delusional and frivolous, I will deny his motion for leave to file the proposed complaints. *See Roy v. USA Govt Washington*, 2009 WL 580442 at *1 (E.D.N.Y. 2009); *see also Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989) (noting authority of court to dismiss frivolous claims); *Abascal v. Jarkos*, 357 F. App'x 388, 390 (2d Cir. 2009) (noting authority of court to dismiss claims with "fantastic" or "delusional scenarios").

Judge Hall's order barring Mordasky from filing future *in forma pauperis* complaints or other documents with the Court without leave to do so remains in effect. The Clerk of Court is directed to return, without filing, any future *in forma pauperis* complaints submitted by Mordasky without a clear request for leave to file. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962); *Malley v. Corp. Counsel of City of New York*, 9 F. App'x 58, 59-60 (2d Cir. 2001).

Accordingly, the Court DENIES the request for leave to file (Doc. #1) with prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall close this case. It is so ordered.

Dated at New Haven this 30th day of April 2020.

/s/ Jeffrey Alker Meyer
Jeffrey Alker Meyer
United States District Judge