

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA

Jaffan International, LLC v. Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC, and
Sheriff Chad Chronister, in his official capacity as Sheriff of
Hillsborough County

Case No. 8:25-cv-02623-JLB-AAS (M.D. Fla. Dec. 1, 2025) · No. 8:25-cv-02623-JLB-AAS · Decided
December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida denied Jaffan International, LLC's emergency motion for an injunction pending appeal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d). The court held that Jaffan had not shown a strong likelihood of success because the Rooker-Feldman doctrine barred its challenge to a state-court eviction judgment and writ of possession. The court denied Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC's Rule 11 sanctions motion without prejudice, allowing it to be refiled later.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John L. Badalamenti
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-02623-JLB-AAS
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) and Defendant's Motion for Sanctions
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Jaffan International, LLC v. Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC; Sheriff Chad Chronister, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Hillsborough County

TOPICS

injunctions

subject matter jurisdiction

sanctions

civil procedure

real estate

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

appellate procedure

real estate

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should grant an injunction pending appeal under Rule 62(d)
2. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprives the district court of subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's challenge to the state court judgment
3. Whether Defendant's motion for sanctions under Rule 11 should be granted

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's motion is denied because Plaintiff failed to make a strong showing of likelihood of success on the merits, as the Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprives the district court of subject matter jurisdiction over challenges to state court judgments.
2. The motion is denied without prejudice because the Court declines to make a determination on sanctions while the case is on appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"[A] federal district court and a federal court of appeals should not attempt to assert jurisdiction over a case simultaneously."

"filing a notice of appeal is 'an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal.'"

"[a]lthough narrow in its application, a state court loser cannot avoid Rooker-Feldman's bar by cleverly cloaking [its] pleadings in the cloth of a different claim. Pretext is not tolerated."

"Plaintiff's injury is caused by the state court's judgment of eviction and its subsequent writ of possession. Therefore, this Court has no subject matter jurisdiction to consider the merits of Plaintiff's challenge to those proceedings."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Jaffan International, LLC sought to enjoin the execution of a writ of possession issued by a state court following an eviction judgment. The state court's final judgment was affirmed by Florida's Second District Court of Appeal, and the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari. Plaintiff argued that a denied lift-stay motion from a dismissed federal bankruptcy proceeding should have preclusive effect against the state court judgment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff sought a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, which was denied based on the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. Plaintiff appealed to the Eleventh Circuit and moved for an injunction pending appeal

in both courts. The Eleventh Circuit denied the emergency motion. This Court then ruled on Plaintiff's pending motion for an injunction pending appeal and Defendant's motion for sanctions.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co., 459 U.S. 56 (1982)
- Claiborne v. JP Morgan Chase Bank Nat'l Ass'n, 2025 WL 1262350 (11th Cir. May 1, 2025)
- Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009)
- Hilton v. Braunskill, 481 U.S. 770 (1987)
- Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280 (2005)
- Behr v. Campbell, 8 F.4th 1206 (11th Cir. 2021)
- May v. Morgan Cnty., Ga., 878 F.3d 1001 (11th Cir. 2017)
- Johnson v. 3M Co., 55 F.4th 1304 (11th Cir. 2022)
- Anderson v. Smithfield Foods, Inc., 353 F.3d 912 (11th Cir. 2003)
- Baker v. Alderman, 158 F.3d 516 (11th Cir. 1998)
- Donaldson v. Clark, 819 F.2d 1551 (11th Cir. 1987)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION
JAFFAN INTERNATIONAL, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Case No: 8:25-cv-02623-JLB-AAS RADHE
KRISHNA PROPERTIES, LLC, and SHERIFF CHAD CHRONISTER, in his official capacity as
Sheriff of Hillsborough County, Defendants. / ORDER Before the Court is Plaintiff Jaffan
International, LLC's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) and
Defendant Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC's Motion for Sanctions against Plaintiff.

(Docs. 28, 31). Plaintiff's motion arose out of this Court's denial of its Emergency Renewed
Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction based on the Rooker-
Feldman doctrine (Doc. 25). Plaintiff subsequently appealed the Court's Order to the Eleventh
Circuit Court of Appeals (Doc. 27), and Plaintiff moved for an injunction pending appeal in both
this Court and the Eleventh Circuit (Doc.

28; Emergency Motion for Administrative Injunction and Injunction Pending Appeal at 3–4, Jaffan
Int'l, LLC v. Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC, No. 25-13943 (11th Cir. Nov. 10, 2025)). The
Eleventh Circuit denied Plaintiff's emergency motion for an injunction due to Plaintiff's failure to
make the requisite showing. Order of the Court, Jaffan Int'l, LLC v. Radhe Krishna Properties,
LLC, No. 25-13943 (11th Cir.

Nov. 10, 2025). This Court then directed Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 30), and Defendants responded and sought sanctions against Plaintiff in that response. (Docs. 31, 32). Upon careful review, Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) is DENIED, and Defendant Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC's motion for Sanctions is DENIED without prejudice.

I. Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) "[A] federal district court and a federal court of appeals should not attempt to assert jurisdiction over a case simultaneously." *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982).

Thus, filing a notice of appeal is "an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal." *Id.* "[I]f a case 'rests before the Court of Appeals,' the district court has no power to alter the status of the case." *Claiborne v. JP Morgan Chase Bank Nat'l Ass'n*, 2025 WL 1262350, at *1 (11th Cir.

May 1, 2025) (citation omitted). Nevertheless, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure authorize both district courts and circuit courts to issue injunctions pending appeal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(d); Fed. R. App. P. 8(a)(2).

In evaluating whether an injunction pending appeal should be granted, courts consider four factors. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 426 (2009) (citing *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 776 (1987)). First, "whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits." *Id.* Second, "whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay." *Id.* Third, "whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding." *Id.* And, fourth, "where the public interest lies." *Id.* Here, the Court need not venture beyond the first factor because Plaintiff has not made a strong showing that it is likely to succeed on the merits.

The Rooker- Feldman doctrine applies to cases involving "state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments." *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005).

In such cases, the district court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction because a district court's jurisdiction is original, not appellate. *Id.* at 283. The only proper federal venue for an appeal of the merits of a state court judgment is the United States Supreme Court. *Behr v. Campbell*, 8 F.4th 1206, 1210 (11th Cir. 2021) (citing *Exxon Mobil Corp.*, 544 U.S. at 283).

Plaintiff is correct that Rooker- Feldman is a narrow doctrine. See *id.* at 1208. However, as the Eleventh Circuit has explained, "[a]lthough narrow in its application, a state court loser cannot

avoid Rooker-Feldman's bar by cleverly cloaking [its] pleadings in the cloth of a different claim. Pretext is not tolerated." *May v. Morgan Cnty., Ga.*, 878 F.3d 1001, 1005 (11th Cir.

2017) (emphasis altered). Here, Plaintiff attempts to cloak its state-court merits challenge. The writ of possession that Plaintiff asked this Court to enjoin was the result of a state-court final judgment. (Doc. 24 at 10–11). That final judgment was affirmed by Florida's Second District Court of Appeal, and the United States Supreme Court denied certiorari.

(*Id.* at 11). Now, in this action, Plaintiff's argument was that the execution of the writ should be enjoined because, according to Plaintiff, a denied lift- stay motion from a dismissed federal bankruptcy proceeding is entitled to preclusive effect. (*Id.* at 13–18). Setting aside the merits of that argument, it is not an argument that can be properly made to this Court.

Rooker-Feldman bars plaintiffs from seeking relief for "injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced." *Exxon Mobil Corp.*, 544 U.S. at 284. Here, Plaintiff's injury is caused by the state court's judgment of eviction and its subsequent writ of possession.

Therefore, this Court has no subject matter jurisdiction to consider the merits of Plaintiff's challenge to those proceedings. Plaintiff could have sought relief by other means with the state court case or the appropriate state appellate court, but it has apparently failed to take advantage of those opportunities.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) is denied, as Plaintiff failed to demonstrate strong likelihood of success on the merits. II. Defendant Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC's Motion for Sanctions Nevertheless, "[t]he district court has authority to proceed forward with portions of the case not related to the claims on appeal." *Johnson v. 3M Co.*, 55 F.4th 1304, 1309 (11th Cir.

2022) (citation omitted). Defendant Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC moves for sanctions against Plaintiff Jaffan International, LLC under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. (Doc. 31). A district court may award Rule 11 sanctions: (1) when a party files a pleading that has no reasonable factual basis; (2) when the party files a pleading that is based on a legal theory that has no reasonable chance of success and that cannot be advanced as a reasonable argument to change existing law; or (3) when the party files a pleading in bad faith for an improper purpose.

Anderson v. Smithfield Foods, Inc., 353 F.3d 912, 915 (11th Cir. 2003) (citation omitted). The inquiry under Rule 11 is "whether the party's claims are objectively frivolous" and "whether the person who signed the pleadings should have been aware that they were frivolous." *Baker v. Alderman*, 158 F.3d 516, 524 (11th Cir. 1998) (citation omitted). "Although the timing of sanctions rests in the district judge's discretion, Rule 11 sanctions 'normally will be determined at the end of litigation.'" *Id.* at 523 (quoting *Donaldson v. Clark*, 819 F.2d 1551, 1555 (11th Cir.

1987). As Plaintiff's case is currently on appeal, the Court declines to make a determination on the motion for sanctions at this time. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff Jaffan International, LLC's Emergency Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal under Rule 62(d) (Doc. 28) is DENIED. 2. Defendant Radhe Krishna Properties, LLC's Motion for Sanctions against Plaintiff (Doc.

31) is DENIED without prejudice, and Defendant may refile the motion at a later date. ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on December 1, 2025. JOHN L. BADALAMENTI UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE