

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Carr v. United States, et al., 3-23-cv-2875 - Conferences on various motions by both parties

From: "Parker, Tami (USATXN)" <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>

Date: 9/8/2025, 10:40 AM

To: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

CC: "London-Doucet, Stacy (USATXN)" <Stacy.London-Doucet@usdoj.gov>

Mr. Carr,

Defendants oppose any motions to expedite.

Thank you,

Tami

Tami C. Parker

Assistant United States Attorney

Deputy Civil Chief

Northern District of Texas

817-252-5230

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, September 5, 2025 6:02 PM

To: Parker, Tami (USATXN) <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>

Cc: London-Doucet, Stacy (USATXN) <Stacy.London-Doucet@usdoj.gov>; George M. Padis <George.Padis@sbaitilaw.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Carr v. United States, et al., 3-23-cv-2875 - Conferences on various motions by both parties

Ms. Parker,

Again, my apologies for the delay in response as well as the scattered responses. It was certainly not my intention, but I am doing the best that I can.

Of course I am opposed to any motion to strike the proposed motion for sanctions. I still have not decided when to file motion for sanctions. Right now I am considering 14 days after submitting my Reply to the last of the series of Rule 60 motions (ECF 76) envisioned in the first, ECF 67. That will have given the court sufficient time (in my estimation) to consider correcting any factual errors in the FCR and other decisions.

On that date I am also considering filing another motion to expedite as the factual errors are so pervasive and obvious and all five plaintiffs (and potential plaintiffs) are suffering due to the delay in resolution. As required by LR 7.1 it would be a rather lengthy and repetitious repeat of the expedite motion in ECF 76, but that is necessary because the court has not ruled on the majority of the outstanding motions which were unopposed and ready for decision several months ago (however you choose to count motions, the majority are unopposed at this time). The LR 7.1 relief we sought would have allowed us to avoid repeating the same arguments and case law over and over. Can you let me know your response to this second motion to expedite? How about a third and fourth until the court gives some response?

On 9/2/2025 10:34 AM, Parker, Tami (USATXN) wrote:

Last, Defendants intend to file a miscellaneous motion seeking to have you barred from filing any further pleadings in this case until the Court has ruled on the motions currently pending before the court. By my loose count, there are at least 10 pending motions filed by Plaintiff since judgment was entered in this case. Each motion is extremely lengthy and repetitive. This course of conduct clutters the docket, results in unnecessary and significant wastes of resources by the Court and Defendants. In Defendants' view, your conduct has risen to the level of vexatious and harassing. Please provide Defendants with your position on this motion.

I am especially intrigued by this miscellaneous motion. It sounds like an absurd violation of due process and requirements for a fair hearing, but can you provide me a preliminary

overview of the statutes and case law to support it. Once I know the supporting law for it I can let you know my response but it is likely to be that I oppose such a motion. For example, if USCIS entered another false record rescinding my wife's citizenship because a confidential informant had said that actually she was the real head of the Cartel de Los Soles (rather than the previously alleged Maduro) and deported her to a high security prison in El Salvador where the CIA was overtly torturing her (not psychological torture like 'water boarding') to learn the real organization of the Cartel de Los Soles (another case of conflicting information, she is a citizen, no she is a really bad guy) then the court would not hear / permit any motion until the backlog of other motions is resolved? Wow!

Would the court ignore all the other pending motions (including the majority which are several months old and unopposed) to decide only your miscellaneous motion? That sounds like another case of apparent collusion. Shouldn't the court just add your motion to the growing queue? Wouldn't it be easier for the court to just deny all motions which would make your motion moot. Of course that would clear the way for a proper appeal where the court was given an opportunity to consider all the new issues (such as flagrant and obvious factual errors) and so were open for consideration on appeal.

It would also make it appropriate to seek relief in other forums for clearly falsified records including the difficult to demonstrate intent.

In summary I am likely opposed to both your proposed motions but would like to see the case law (and even preliminary drafts of the motions) before I formally declare my opposition.

Thanks for your attention to this matter and, again, my apologies for the delayed and scattered response.

Wishing you the best,  
Brian

---

From: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, September 5, 2025 6:11:10 PM  
To: George M. Padis <george.padis@sbai law.com>  
Cc: Parker, Tami (USATXN) <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>  
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Accept Service of Preliminary FRCP Rule 11(c) Motions For Sanctions in 3:23-CV-02875-S

Hi George,

I presume you have seen the discussions of proper service and Ms. Parker retaining the mailed document.

You could end all this discussion by letting me and Ms. Parker know that you accept the electronic copy of the document as served on 29 Aug 2025 (the date of mailing the paper document which is substantially delayed because of your failure to keep current addresses up to date). You could also let her know that you approve of her retaining the paper copy so that we can put this confusion behind us.

Wishing you all the best,  
Brian

---

Subject: Carr v. United States, et al., 3-23-cv-2875 - Conferences on various motions by both parties  
From: "Parker, Tami (USATXN)" <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>

Date: 9/2/2025, 11:34 AM

To: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

CC: "London-Doucet, Stacy (USATXN)" <Stacy.London-Doucet@usdoj.gov>

Mr. Carr,

I see by your email dated September 1, 2025, that you have found an email address for former AUSA George Padis and forwarded a copy of your proposed motion for sanctions to him. I will take no further action with respect to attempting to forward your proposed motion to Mr. Padis at this time.

Should you ultimately file the sanctions motion, please take note for purposes of a certificate of service that the Defendants are opposed to the motion. The motion lacks merit for the reasons already explained to you by the Court in response to your previous motions for sanctions. Briefly, as Defendants and the Court have explained, your disagreement with a position taken by an opposing side does not render that side's position sanctionable. Or false. Or criminal. Similarly, a party's good faith representation, even should the same turn out to be incorrect, is not sanctionable or criminal.

Given the previous motions for sanctions and the court's subsequent explanation for why the arguments lacks merit, please also take note that the Defendants will likely, in addition to filing a brief in opposition, file a motion to strike under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) or a Rule 11 motion for filing a legally frivolous pleading. Please provide Defendants with your position on any such motions.

Last, Defendants intend to file a miscellaneous motion seeking to have you barred from filing any further pleadings in this case until the Court has ruled on the motions currently pending before the court. By my loose count, there are at least 10 pending motions filed by Plaintiff since judgment was entered in this case. Each motion is extremely lengthy and repetitive. This course of conduct clutters the docket, results in unnecessary and significant wastes of resources by the Court and Defendants. In Defendants' view, your conduct has risen to the level of vexatious and harassing. Please provide Defendants with your position on this motion.

Thank you,

Tami

Tami C. Parker  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Deputy Civil Chief  
Northern District of Texas  
Burnett Plaza, Suite 1700  
801 Cherry Street, Unit #4  
Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882  
T: 817-252-5230  
F: 817-252-5458

---

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Accept Service of Preliminary FRCP Rule 11(c) Motions For Sanctions in 3:23-CV-02875-S

From: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>

Date: 9/1/2025, 2:48 PM

To: George.Padis@sbaitilaw.com

CC: "Parker, Tami (USATXN)" <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>

Dear Mr. Padis,

Attached is an electronic copy of a FRCP Rule 11(c) Motions For Sanctions. In accordance with FRCP Rule 5, I have mailed a copy to your last known address in the matter (as AUSA)

but it probably won't arrive for a few days as you seem to have moved to a new job and address. However, my reading of Rule 5 is that the date of service is the date of mailing of 29 Aug 2025. While this email does not provide legal service, it is a courtesy so that you can proceed as necessary. You might also consider updating your Texas Bar contact information as it appears to be out of date. Isn't google great?

Wishing you all the best,  
Brian

P.S. You might let AUSA Parker know what to do with the paper copy when she gets it.

On 8/29/2025 6:16 PM, Brian Carr wrote:

Ms. Parker,  
There is no rush. I went ahead and printed a copy and sent it in accordance with Rule 5 (last address on file). It will probably come to you in a few days and then you can forward it on. Rule 11(c) is a little ambiguous on what the government's responsibility is. As an employee of a law firm it would be clear, but not so much in this case. Thanks for your attention to this matter and for keeping me informed.  
Brian

On 8/29/2025 5:56 PM, Parker, Tami (USATXN) wrote:

Mr. Carr,  
This office does not represent AUSA Padis and he is no longer an employee. I will have to explore what, if anything, I can do with your request. I will let you know what I learn.

Tami

Tami C. Parker  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Deputy Civil Chief  
Northern District of Texas  
817-252-5230

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Carr <carrbp@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 8:35 PM  
To: Parker, Tami (USATXN) <Tami.Parker@usdoj.gov>  
Cc: London-Doucet, Stacy (USATXN) <Stacy.London-Doucet@usdoj.gov>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Accept Service of Preliminary FRCP Rule 11(c) Motions For Sanctions  
Dear AUSA Parker,  
Re: [EXTERNAL] Accept Service of Preliminary FRCP Rule 11(c) Motions For Sanctions in 3:23-CV-02875-S

Attached is a preliminary copy of a FRCP Rule 11(c) motion for sanctions directed against AUSA Padis. It has not been filed with the court as required by FRCP Rule 11(c). However, service is required in accordance with FRCP Rule 5. Normally FRCP Rule 5 service is almost automatic via ECF, but it is not permitted in this case (at this stage). The alternative is to print the document and mail it to AUSA Padis at his USATXN address from the files. It will probably go to you for routing in any case. I am wondering if you can accept service of this electronic version and route it to AUSA Padis? If that is a problem, I will go ahead and print and mail it, but at least he will have an electronic copy to work (I am much more comfortable with electronic versions).

I have decided that AUSA Owen did not warrant sanctions as all her filings fell within my perception of strong advocacy (her duty) and not excessively false or misleading so there won't be any motions for sanctions for her. On consideration, your Response also fits within strong advocacy so this motion could well be the last of this effort to get a court to investigate and consider what is appropriate in AUSA Padis' early efforts.

Thanks for a prompt response.

Brian

P.S. A side benefit of mailing the motion paper to AUSA Padis is that it will give some meaning to 'costs' which really only apply to law firms as pro se and government parties generally don't have costs to be sanctionable.

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

Attachments:

RI601stMtn4Sanctions.pdf 518 KB