

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished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)