

**In the United States Court Of Appeals, 5th Circuit**

<p>Brian P. Carr, Rueangrong Carr, and Buakhao Von Kramer Appellants versus United States, US Department of Justice, USPS, USPS OIG, USPS BoG, US CIGIE, Department of State, Department of State OIG, USCIS, DHS OIG, and SSA Appellees</p>	<p>Case No. <b>26-10025</b></p> <p><b>Verified<sup>1</sup> Motion to Amend the ROA, Correct Garbled Records</b></p> <p>Certificate of Conference – OPPOSED<sup>2</sup></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Motion to Amend the ROA,  
Correct Garbled Records**

**Table of Contents**

Table of Contents..... 1

Introduction..... 2

    Delay in Other Motion to Amend the ROA..... 2

Garbled ROA10-9pg182..... 4

Garbled ROA16-1pg182..... 4

Conclusion..... 5

Verification of Motion..... 5

Other Signatories..... 7

Alphabetical Index..... 7

Required Certificates of Compliance..... 8

    Conference Compliance..... 8

    FRAP 32(g)(1) Length Compliance..... 8

    Certification Of Electronic Signatures..... 9

1 The Verification of Motion is listed in the Table Contents.

2 The Certificate of Conference Compliance is listed in the Table of Contents.

FRAP 25(b) Service..... 9

### **Introduction**

Two documents were garbled in the process of including them in the Record on Appeal (ROA) and this motion requests that the ROA be amended to include legible copies of [ECF10-9](#) and [ECF16-1](#).

### **Delay in Other Motion to Amend the ROA**

The prior motion in this matter, [5CC25](#), had suggested that there would be two motions to amend the ROA and this motion is one of those motions. Due to unforeseen circumstances are delays in the second motion to unseal [ECF20](#) and all its exhibits with the exception of ECF20-1 as well as [ECF67](#) and all its exhibits with the exception of ECF67-13. The two exceptions are each exhibits which were not properly redacted but were replaced with correctly redacted exhibits in [ROA24pg570](#) with properly redacted replacement [ROA24-1pg573](#) and [ROA69pg1567](#) with properly redacted replacement [ROA69-1pg1571](#). These motions were resolved with orders:

- [ROA26pg578](#) states:  
DENIES as moot Plaintiff's Motion to Amend their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (ECF No. 20) and their Motion to Correct Typographical Errors (ECF No. 24).
- [ROA26pg578](#) states:  
ELECTRONIC ORDER granting in part [69] Motion to Amend/Correct. (Unless the document has already been filed, clerk to enter the document as of the date of this order.) Although styled as "FRCP 60 Motion for Relief," Plaintiff's motion does not seek relief from the final judgment entered in this case. Rather, he seeks leave to file redacted documents in place of documents that contain personal identifying information. To the extent

Plaintiff seeks leave to file redacted documents for public access, his motion is granted. (Ordered by Magistrate Judge Rebecca Rutherford on 11/5/2025) (Magistrate Judge Rebecca Rutherford)

Neither order addressed the request to seal the specific exhibits of ECF20-1 or ECF67-1 nor did it address the unsealing of the numerous (23) documents (over 125 pages) which were sealed as ‘collateral damage’.

While it is a straightforward to request the unsealing of [ECF20](#) and the second exhibit [ECF20-2](#) as well as [ECF67](#) and the twenty other exhibits (and a total of 124 pages), the anticipated motion will also request that the ROA be amended to include the anticipated motion to amend as well as any response and reply and the decision of this court.

This additional relief is sought so that appellants’ brief can expand on the careless sealing of numerous documents as indicative of misconduct and potential collusion with DoJ efforts to conceal crimes by the federal agencies.

Further, the motion will seek requirements that the TXND court provide for the correction of such failures to redact as required by [FRCP Rule 49.1](#) Committee Notes on Rules – 2007 (h):

If a person files an unredacted identifier by mistake, that person may seek relief from the court.

Such support could include standard forms for ‘Motions to Strike’ and orders allowing clerks to immediately correct such motions upon verifying that the stricken document does indeed violate [FRCP Rule 49.1](#) and that the replacement document corrects the defect. The clerks would only strike the targeted

documents.

Because of the complexity of the additional relief it is expected that it could be up to four weeks before the final motion to amend the ROA is complete with the primary delay being the need to validate TXND rules and the current procedures for correcting improperly redacted documents.

**Garbled [ROA10-9pg182](#)**

ROA [vol-692973\\_Part4.pdf](#) pages 9-12 text is garbled (possible font assignment problems) and does not match [ECF10-9](#) which is pages 159-161 in ECF. This is most easily verified with the links in [ROA10-9pg182](#).

This exhibit is critical in demonstrating that the USCIS FOIA requests were improperly denied by USCIS as described in [ROA84-1pg2219 para238pg49](#) and ignored by the court.

**Garbled [ROA16-1pg182](#)**

Similarly, in [vol-692973\\_Part4.pdf](#) pages 144-148 text is garbled (possible font assignment problems) and does not match [ECF16-1](#) which is pages 294-298 in ECF. This is most easily verified with the links in [ROA16-1pg182](#).

This exhibit is critical in refuting the later denial by USCIS in [ROA10-10pg185](#) which improperly denies my wife's N-400 application for citizenship (even though it was previously approved in [ROA10-5pg177](#) and the denial had the effect of leaving my wife as an apparent illegal and terrified of being deported without cause or notice at any time) for 'failure to appear' without any discussion of notice. [ROA16-1pg182](#) demonstrates that there was not timely notice of the

hearing as the notice was not mailed until almost a week after the listed date on the notice [ROA10-7pg179](#). This discrepancy was the basis for the ancillary prospective relief in [ROA84-1pg2219 para210pg41](#) and [relief34-38pg75](#).

### **Conclusion**

As such I request that the ROA be amended so that the ROA has legible copies of these documents.

The court is also asked to provide such other and further relief as the court deems appropriate.

Respectfully Submitted,

### **Verification of Motion**

I, the undersigned appellant, hereby affirm under penalty of perjury in both the United States and Thailand that:

1. I have reviewed the above motion and certifications below and believe all of the statements to be true to the best of my knowledge.
2. I have reviewed the associated documents and exhibits and believe them to be true and accurate copies with the exception of the documents identified as being redacted. The redacted documents have only been altered to remove sensitive personal information according to normal redaction procedures.

I hereby reaffirm that the above is true to the best of my knowledge under penalty of perjury in both the United States and Thailand.

*/s Brian P. Carr*

---

Brian P. Carr  
1201 Brady Dr  
Irving, TX 75061

Date: 13. May 2026

Location: Irving, TX

**Other Signatories**

*/s Air Carr*

---

Rueangrong Carr  
1201 Brady Dr  
Irving, TX 75061

Date: 19 Aug 2025

Location: Irving, TX

*/s Buakhao Von Kramer*

---

Buakhao Von Kramer  
105 - 3 M 5 T YANGNERNG  
SARAPEE, CHIANG MAI 50140  
THAILAND

Date: 20 Aug 2025

Location: Bangkok, Thailand

*/s Rujipas Lawichai*

---

Rujipas Lawichai  
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7  
Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,  
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand

Date: 20 Apr 2026

Location: Phuket, Thailand

*/s Tanapon Lawichai*

---

Tanapon Lawichai  
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7  
Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,  
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand

Date: 21 Apr 2026

Location: Lopburi, Thailand

**Alphabetical Index**

5CC25..... 2  
ECF10-9..... 2, 4  
ECF16-1..... 2, 4

ECF20..... 2 f.  
 ECF20-2..... 3  
 ECF67..... 2 f.  
 Fifth Circuit Rules and Internal Operating Procedures.....8  
 FRAP 25(b)..... 8  
 FRAP 27(d)(2)(A).....7  
 FRAP 32(a)(5)..... 8  
 FRAP 32(a)(6)..... 8  
 FRAP 32(f)..... 8  
 FRAP 32(g)(1)..... 7  
 ROA10-10pg185.....4  
 ROA10-5pg177.....4  
 ROA10-7pg179..... 5  
 ROA10-9pg182.....4  
 ROA16-1pg182.....4  
 ROA24-1pg573..... 2  
 ROA24pg570..... 2  
 ROA69-1pg1571.....2  
 ROA69pg1567..... 2  
 ROA84-1pg2219.....4 f.  
 vol-692973\_Part4.....4

**Required Certificates of Compliance**

The undersigned hereby certifies under penalty of perjury:

**Conference Compliance<sup>3</sup>**

This Motion to Amend the ROA, Correct Garbled Records is OPPOSED.

The conference was held via an email sent to AUSA Parker on 6 May 2026. I have not received any response to the email to date. As such, defendants are considered to be OPPOSED to this motion.

**FRAP 32(g)(1) Length Compliance**

This document complies with the type-volume limitation of [FRAP 27\(d\)\(2\)\(A\)](#)

<sup>3</sup> According to the Fifth Circuit Court's [Electronic Noticing and Filing Options Available to Pro Se Parties](#): All parties filing motions must also conduct a conference with all parties regarding the motion, the filer must contact all parties, advise what the motion will seek and ask each if they are opposed or unopposed to the motion

because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by [FRAP 32\(f\)](#), this document contains 705 words (which is less than the nominal 5,200 words for a single motion), as determined by LibreOffice Writer word processing software<sup>4</sup>.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirement of [FRAP 32\(a\)\(5\)](#) and the type-style requirements of [FRAP 32\(a\)\(6\)](#) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using LibreOffice Writer using Times New Roman (14-point).

### **Certification Of Electronic Signatures**

In accordance with [Fifth Circuit Rules and Internal Operating Procedures \(FCRIOP\)](#) which states:

25.2.10 Signatures... Documents which require more than one party's signature must be filed electronically by... showing the consent of the other parties on the document; or any other manner approved by the court.

I hereby certify that I did indeed receive the consent of the other parties to include their signatures on this document.

### **FRAP 25(b) Service**

On the recorded date of this document, I electronically submitted the foregoing document with the clerk of 5th Circuit United States Court Of Appeals using the electronic case filing system (ECF) of the court. I also hereby certify that on this same date no copies were served via U.S. mail as all parties in this matter are enrolled in the court's electronic case filing (and service) system.

---

<sup>4</sup> LibreOffice Writer does not have an ability to count words in a document excluding sections but instead can count words in the entire document (not useful or correct for this purpose) or in the selected section. By selecting everything below the Table of Contents but above the first signature block I can get the word count and then manually enter the count in the certification. The certified word count was accurate on 13 May 2026 at 4PM.

*/s Brian P. Carr*

---

Brian P. Carr  
1201 Brady Dr  
Irving, TX 75061

Date: 13. May 2026

Location: Irving, TX