

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Stefanie D. Mason v. State of Delaware (J.P. Court), et al.

Mason · No. Civil Action No. 15-1191-GBW · Decided April 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware denied Stefanie D. Mason's motion to reopen a previously dismissed action, motion for reimbursement of PACER fees, and motion for e-filing rights and to amend the complaint. The court held that the alleged misrepresentations did not warrant relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3), that PACER fees were not subject to reimbursement on the facts presented, and that the motion to amend was moot because the case was not reopened. The order was entered on April 2, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gregory B. Williams
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
DECIDED	April 2, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 15-1191-GBW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3) to reopen a previously dismissed action, sought reimbursement of PACER fees, and sought e-filing rights and leave to amend. The district court denied the motion to reopen and fee reimbursement and denied the motion for e-filing rights and amendment as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	To obtain relief under Rule 60(b)(3), the movant must establish fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct by an adverse party and show that the conduct prevented the movant from fully and fairly presenting the case. Relief may be warranted when the evidence would have made a difference in advancing the case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished memorandum order
PARTIES	Stefanie D. Mason v. State of Delaware (J.P. Court), et al.

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

motion to amend

civil procedure

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

employment law

disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to reopen the case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3) based on alleged misrepresentations by Allen Guizzetti.
2. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to reimbursement of fees incurred accessing case documents through PACER.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motion for e-filing rights and leave to amend should be granted after the motion to reopen was denied.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to reopen was properly denied because Plaintiff failed to show that the alleged misrepresentations were attributable to an adverse party in the case or that they would have made a difference in advancing her claims.
2. The motion for reimbursement of PACER fees was denied because Plaintiff's lack of familiarity with PACER did not establish entitlement to an exemption or reimbursement.
3. The motion for e-filing rights and leave to amend was denied as moot because the motion to reopen was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To prevail, the movant must establish that the adverse party engaged in fraud or other misconduct, and that this conduct prevented the moving party from fully and fairly presenting h[er] case.”

“Relief may be warranted so long as the evidence ‘would have made a difference’ in advancing”

“As a general rule, once a judgment has been entered, a plaintiff is not allowed to amend his complaint unless that judgment has been ‘set aside or vacated’ under Rules 59 or 60.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's federal claims in her second amended complaint had previously been dismissed because she failed to plead membership in a protected class under Title VII and because her ADA and USERRA theories were legally barred or unavailable against the named defendants. Plaintiff later alleged that Allen Guizzetti had misrepresented his relationship with her in proceedings before another tribunal, including statements made years after this action had closed. She also sought reimbursement of PACER fees and permission to obtain e-filing rights and amend her complaint.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated the action on December 22, 2015. The original complaint was dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee, the case was reopened, and an amended complaint was later dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies and failure to state a claim. After Plaintiff filed a second amended complaint asserting Title VII, ADA, USERRA, and Delaware Merit Rules claims, the court dismissed the federal claims and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claim. Plaintiff then filed the motions addressed in this memorandum order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Stridiron v. Stridiron, 698 F.2d 204, 207 (3d Cir. 1983)
- Pierce v. City of Philadelphia, 811 F. App'x 142, 150 (3d Cir. 2020)
- Averbach v. Rival Mfg. Co., 879 F.2d 1196, 1202 (3d Cir. 1989)
- Iqbal v. BPOA, No. 24-1077, 2024 WL 3565307, at *3 (3d Cir. July 29, 2024)
- Iqbal v. Bd. of Pro. & Occupational Affs., No. 2:23-cv-832, 2024 WL 149840, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Jan. 12, 2024)
- Katumbusi v. Gary, No. 2:14-cv-1534 JAM AC PS, 2014 WL 5698816, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2014)
- Button v. New York Times Co., No. 1:24-cv-05888-MKV, 2025 WL 328002, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 29, 2025)
- Pina v. New York State Gaming Comm'n, No. 24-CV-5383 (LTS), 2024 WL 3565780, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. July 29, 2024)
- Rhines v. United States, 677 F. App'x 34, 36 (3d Cir. 2017)