

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

John T. Hessert v. The Street Dog Coalition, Katrina Weschler, Stacey Evans, Andrea Romano, Tom Hudson, Rachael Brown, Lisa Cummins Dulchinos, Doug McInnis, Sandrine Chaumette, Kylie Clark, Warren Jackson, Wendy Yan Hoppe, and Shoshana Mostoller

Hessert · No. 25-cv-03807-NYW-NRN · Decided May 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado orders Plaintiff John T. Hessert to show cause why filing restrictions should not be imposed based on his numerous, repetitive, and duplicative filings. The proposed restrictions would require him to obtain leave of court before filing additional motions or documents and would require mailed submissions, proposed filings, legal-basis declarations, and certifications. The court also denies his Consolidated Third Motion to Correct Clerical Errors in Docket Entries.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nina Y. Wang
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	May 6, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-03807-NYW-NRN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court considered whether to impose filing restrictions on a pro se plaintiff after extensive repetitive and duplicative filings. The court denied the plaintiff's Consolidated Third Motion to Correct Clerical Errors and issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why proposed filing restrictions should not be imposed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court's decision to impose filing restrictions is reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated

PARTIES

John T. Hessert v. The Street Dog Coalition, Katrina Weschler, Stacey Evans, Andrea Romano, Tom Hudson, Rachael Brown, Lisa Cummins Dulchinos, Doug McInnis, Sandrine Chaumette, Kylie Clark, Warren Jackson, Wendy Yan Hoppe, Shoshana Mostoller

TOPICS

sanctions

civil procedure

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

judicial administration

sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's repetitive, duplicative, and excessive filings justified proposed filing restrictions.
2. Whether the court could impose filing restrictions without first providing notice and an opportunity to respond.
3. Whether the plaintiff's Consolidated Third Motion to Correct Clerical Errors in Docket Entries should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court may impose carefully tailored filing restrictions on an abusive litigant when the court describes the litigant's abusive filing history, establishes procedures for seeking permission to file, and provides notice and an opportunity to respond before the restrictions take effect.
2. The plaintiff's excessive, repetitive, and duplicative filings, continued after multiple warnings and adverse rulings, constituted abusive and vexatious litigation conduct sufficient to warrant an order to show cause concerning proposed filing restrictions.
3. The Consolidated Third Motion to Correct Clerical Errors in Docket Entries was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A filing restriction is appropriate where the Court has (1) described a litigant's history of abusive filings, (2) provided guidelines for what the litigant must do to obtain permission to submit additional filings, and (3) given the litigant notice and an opportunity to respond before the restrictions are implemented." (Order Regarding Filing Restrictions)

"The Court does not impose these restrictions through this Order. Before these restrictions will be imposed, Plaintiff must be provided notice and an opportunity to oppose these restrictions." (Order Regarding Filing Restrictions)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

John Hessert filed approximately 49 motions or other documents seeking affirmative relief and at least 17 additional filings during the first five months of the action. Many filings were repetitive or duplicative, including

multiple requests for temporary restraining orders, recusal, alternative service, docket corrections, and fee waivers, even after the court ruled on or explained the relevant issues. The court concluded that the filing pattern, continued after repeated warnings and admonishments, was abusive and vexatious and was consuming substantial judicial resources.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated the action on November 24, 2025. During the ensuing five months, he filed approximately 49 motions or other requests for affirmative relief and at least 17 additional filings, including repetitive motions for injunctive relief, recusal, alternative service, docket corrections, and fee waivers. The court had previously warned that continued excessive and duplicative filings could result in filing restrictions. The court referred two temporary-restraining-order motions to Magistrate Judge N. Reid Neureiter, whose recommendation to deny them remained subject to plaintiff's objections. This order denied plaintiff's third motion to correct clerical errors and required him to show cause before proposed filing restrictions could take effect.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Tripati v. Beaman*, 878 F.2d 351, 353-54 (10th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)
- *In re Sindram*, 498 U.S. 177, 179-80 (1991)
- *Andrews v. Heaton*, 483 F.3d 1070, 1077 (10th Cir. 2007)
- *Calvin v. Lyons*, 770 F. App'x 433, 434 (10th Cir. 2019)
- *Lonsdale v. United States*, 919 F.2d 1440, 1448 (10th Cir. 1990)
- *Morrison v. Beemer*, No. 21-cv-00077-STV, 2022 WL 612393, at *1, *3-4 (D. Colo. Mar. 2, 2022)
- *Garcia v. Waken*, No. 16-cv-01977-PAB-NYW, 2021 WL 4947236, at *3 (D. Colo. Aug. 3, 2021), recommendation adopted, 2022 WL 970003 (D. Colo. Mar. 31, 2022)