

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Barry Harris v. Alessia Moore, et al.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01801-CDS-EJY (D. Nev. Jan. 8, 2026) · No. 2:23-cv-01801-CDS-EJY · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada denied Barry Harris’s motion for sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. The court found no sanctionable conduct concerning an erroneous conviction entry, declarations regarding mental health coursework, or disclosure of medical information, and also found no basis for sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 or the court’s inherent authority. Defendants were ordered to correct the incorrect conviction reference in the plaintiff’s Information Summary.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Elayna J. Youchah
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:23-cv-01801-CDS-EJY
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 based on declarations and information submitted by defendants in opposition to plaintiff's motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. The district court denied the motion and ordered defendants to correct an erroneous conviction reference in plaintiff's Information Summary.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court evaluated whether the challenged filings violated Rule 11's certification requirements and whether the record supported sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 or the court's inherent authority.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Barry Harris v. Alessia Moore, et al.

TOPICS

sanctions

civil procedure

civil rights

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

sanctions

civil rights

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants or their counsel violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 by submitting an erroneous conviction reference, allegedly false statements concerning plaintiff's mental-health coursework, or medical information.
2. Whether sanctions were warranted under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 based on the challenged filings.
3. Whether sanctions were warranted under the court's inherent authority.

HOLDINGS

1. Rule 11 sanctions were not warranted because the erroneous conviction entry was a historical error made years earlier, was not shown to result from unreasonable conduct or an improper purpose by defendants or counsel, and was not relied upon for any purpose before the court.
2. Rule 11 sanctions were not warranted because the challenged declaration addressed plaintiff's failure to complete anger-and-aggression step-down coursework, not a claim that plaintiff had never completed any phase of mental-health treatment, and plaintiff did not refute the declaration's actual statements.
3. Rule 11 sanctions were not warranted because plaintiff did not show that the medical information referenced by defendants was false or factually unsupported, and plaintiff had already placed the medical issues before the court.
4. Sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 were not appropriate because the record did not show subjective bad faith, such as knowingly or recklessly advancing a frivolous argument or pursuing a meritorious claim to harass an opponent.
5. Sanctions under the court's inherent authority were not warranted because plaintiff offered no evidence of willful disobedience, bad faith, vexatiousness, wantonness, or oppressive conduct.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 11 is an extraordinary remedy, one to be exercised with extreme caution.” (Order at 4)

“The Court finds no violation of Rule 11 or any other reason to impose sanctions against Defendants or their counsel based on the error in the Information Summary, the content of Ms. Corder’s Declaration, or information referenced and statements made in Mr. Vandebusch’s Declaration.” (Order at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants submitted declarations and an Information Summary in response to plaintiff's motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. The Information Summary, first entered in 2019, incorrectly described plaintiff's conviction as kidnapping of a minor rather than first-degree kidnapping with substantial bodily harm, but defendants did not create, cite, or rely on the error for purposes of the litigation.

Plaintiff also alleged that a declaration falsely stated he had not completed any phase of mental-health treatment and that another declaration improperly disclosed medical information; the court found those allegations unsupported because the declaration concerned failure to complete anger-and-aggression coursework and the medical issues had already been placed before the court by plaintiff.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Defendants responded with declarations and exhibits, including an Information Summary containing an erroneous description of plaintiff's conviction. Plaintiff then moved for sanctions, defendants opposed, and plaintiff replied. The court denied sanctions but directed defendants to correct the erroneous reference to prevent future errors.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Huettig & Schromm, Inc. v. Landscape Contractors, 790 F.2d 1421, 1427
- Rachel v. Banana Republic, Inc., 831 F.2d 1503, 1508
- Hudson v. Moore Business Forms, Inc., 836 F.2d 1156, 1159
- Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp., 496 U.S. 384, 393
- Operating Engineers Pension Trust v. A-C Company, 859 F.2d 1336, 1345
- Coltrade Int'l, Inc. v. United States, 973 F.2d 128, 131-132
- B.K.B. v. Maui Police Department, 276 F.3d 1091, 1107
- In re Keegan Management Co., 78 F.3d 431, 436
- Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper, 447 U.S. 752, 766