

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Joshua Chronicles v. Loyola University New Orleans

Chronicles · No. No. 25-2211 · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana dismissed nine motions filed by pro se plaintiff Joshua Chronicles as premature because Loyola University New Orleans had not yet been served or appeared. The court also stated that any request to seal prior filings must identify the specific documents or portions at issue and directed the plaintiff to Local Civil Rule 5.6 for future sealed filings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	No. 25-2211
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff Joshua Chronicles filed nine motions in a civil action before defendant Loyola University New Orleans had been served or entered an appearance. The district court addressed the motions by order and reasons and dismissed them as premature.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- service of process
- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- sanctions
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's motions for accommodations, sealing, preservation, discovery, sanctions, service-related relief, and scheduling were premature because defendant had not yet been served or appeared.

2. Whether plaintiff's generalized request to seal prior and future medical or disability-related filings adequately identified the documents or portions subject to sealing.
3. What procedure plaintiff must follow for future requests to file documents under seal.

HOLDINGS

1. The plaintiff's motions were premature because Loyola University New Orleans had not yet been served and had not entered an appearance; the motions were therefore dismissed as premature.
2. The request to seal prior medical filings was insufficiently specific because plaintiff did not identify which filings or portions he sought to seal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"As other orders in this case have noted, and as plaintiff himself concedes, defendant has not yet been served in this matter and it has not yet entered an appearance. Consequently, plaintiff's motions are premature."

"For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiffs motions are DISMISSED AS PREMATURE."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought a civil action against Loyola University New Orleans involving alleged disability-related and civil-rights matters. At the time of the order, the United States Marshals Service had not completed service, no executed summons had been returned, and defendant had not entered an appearance. Plaintiff nevertheless sought accommodations, sealing of medical records, preservation and protection of electronic evidence, discovery, sanctions, service-related relief, and a scheduling conference.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint was filed and process was issued, but no executed proof of service had been filed and Loyola had not appeared. The court had previously denied a motion to compel initial disclosures and set a discovery schedule as premature. In this order, the court dismissed all nine pending motions as premature, while explaining that any request to seal identified filings could be renewed after service and with compliance with Local Civil Rule 5.6.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Arup US Inc. v. Akmansoy, No. 24-128, 2025 WL 1673837, at *1
- June Med. Servs., L.L.C. v. Phillips, 22 F.4th 512, 521 (5th Cir. 2022)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA JOSHUA
CHRONICLES CIVIL ACTION VERSUS No. 25-2211 LOYOLA UNIVERSITY NEW

ORLEANS SECTION I ORDER AND REASONS Before the Court are nine motions¹ filed by pro se plaintiff Joshua Chronicles (“plaintiff”). These include: (1) a motion² for ADA/Rehabilitation Act Accommodations and Request to File Medical Documentation Under Seal; (2) a motion³ to seal prior and future medical, disability, and VA-related filings; (3) an emergency omnibus motion⁴ for forensic imaging preservation of electronic evidence, protection against further unauthorized access, restoration of account access, and anti-spoilation, relief pending preliminary injunction; (4) a motion⁵ for clarification, production of governing policies, and entry of a limited preservation order; (5) a motion⁶ for clarification of procedural requirements and request for guidance regarding required filings; (6) a motion⁷ for limited, targeted discovery regarding records disclosed without FERPA-complaint consent; (7) a motion⁸ for evidence protection and 1 See R. Doc.

Nos. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31. 2 R. Doc. No. 17. 3 R. Doc. No. 20. 4 R. Doc. No. 21. 5 R. Doc. No. 22. 6 R. Doc. No. 23. 7 R. Doc. No. 24. 8 R. Doc. No. 25. sanctions against defendant Loyola University New Orleans (“defendant”); (8) a motion⁹ to enforce or confirm status of U.S. Marshal Service under Rule 4(c)(3) and request for notice of return of executed service; and (9) a motion¹⁰ for a Rule 16 scheduling conference and limited case management order contingent on completion of service of process.

As other orders in this case have noted,¹¹ and as plaintiff himself concedes,¹² defendant has not yet been served in this matter and it has not yet entered an appearance. Consequently, plaintiff’s motions are premature. Proof of service will appear on the docket once service is effectuated by the U.S. Marshals Service.¹³ Plaintiff may refile appropriate motions at that time.

With respect to his motions requesting that all prior medical filings be sealed, plaintiff has not identified which filings or portions thereof he wishes to be filed under seal.¹⁴ The Court cannot meaningfully “review each document to decide which contain sufficient personal information to outweigh any public interest in sealing what is 9 R. Doc. No. 30. 10 R. Doc.

No. 31. 11 See R. Doc. No. 28 (denying plaintiff’s motion to compel initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1) and to set a limited discovery schedule as premature because “Defendant has not yet been served, nor has it made an appearance”); see also R. Doc. No. 10, at 6 (noting that no proof of service had been filed into the record as of November 10, 2025). 12 See R. Doc.

No. 30, at 1 (“The docket reflects issuance of process but does not yet reflect a returned executed summons.”); R. Doc. No. 31, at 1 (same). 13 See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) (“If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.”).

14 See generally R. Doc. No. 17, 20. already on the public record.” Arup US Inc. v. Akmansoy, No. 24-128, 2025 WL 1673837, at *1; see also June Med. Servs., L.L.C. v. Phillips, 22 F. 4th 512, 521 (5th Cir. 2022) (“It is the solemn duty of the judge to scrupulously examine each document sought to be sealed.”). If plaintiff wishes to have any prior documents sealed he must identify those documents or portions thereof for the Court’s review.

As for his request that future medical or disability related filings be filed under seal, the Court directs plaintiff to the rules for filing documents under seal provided by this Court’s Local Civil Rule 5.6.15 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiffs motions!® are DISMISSED AS PREMATURE. New Orleans, Louisiana, December 5, 2025. Si efit UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 15 Eastern District of Louisiana Local Civil Rule 5.6, available at <https://www.laed.uscourts.gov/attorney-information/rules-and-orders/local-rules>, 16 R. Doc.

Nos. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31.