

MANDATE

E.D.N.Y. – C. Islip
20-cv-3361
24-cv-7247
Bulsara, J.

United States Court of Appeals FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 25th day of February, two thousand twenty-six.

Present:

Gerard E. Lynch,
Steven J. Menashi,
Circuit Judges,
Jed S. Rakoff,
*District Judge.**

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

25-2225 (L)(Tandem)
25-2434 (Con),
25-3217 (Con)

Kevin Knipfing, Employer, AKA Kevin James, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

25-2239 (L)(Tandem)
25-2437 (Con),
25-3208 (Con)

* Judge Jed S. Rakoff, of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, sitting by designation.

MANDATE ISSUED ON 05/06/2026

Steve Savitsky, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.


Appellant, pro se, moves for in forma pauperis status, to stay the filing injunctions and district court proceedings, to expedite the appeals, to recuse the district court, and other relief in the consolidated appeals at 25-2225, 25-2434, and 25-3217. Appellant also moves for in forma pauperis status, to lift and reverse the filing injunctions and restore access to the pro se electronic submission portal, to stay the district court proceedings, to expedite the appeals, to recuse the district court and other relief in the consolidated appeals at 25-2239, 25-2437, and 25-3208.

In September 2025, the Clerk's Office directed that the appeals in 25-2225 and 25-2239 would be considered in tandem with the appeal docketed at 25-2234. *See* 2d Cir. 25-2225, doc. 7. However, the appeal docketed at 25-2234 will not be considered in tandem with the appeals here; instead, the appeal at 25-2234 will be considered by a different future panel.

This Court has determined sua sponte that it lacks jurisdiction over these appeals (consolidated and in tandem) because a final order has not been issued by the district court as contemplated by 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *See Petrello v. White*, 533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the appeals are DISMISSED in 25-2225 (L), 25-2434 (Con), 25-3217 (Con), 25-2239 (L), 25-2437 (Con), and 25-3208 (Con). It is further ORDERED that Appellant's motions in both consolidated appeals are DENIED as moot.

To the extent we construe the Appellant's motion as a petition for mandamus, it is DENIED. *See Hong Mai Sa v. Doe*, 406 F.3d 155, 158 (2d Cir. 2005).

FOR THE COURT:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit