

# United States District Court Northern District of Florida


EQUALITY FLORIDA, ET AL,	)	Number: 4:22-cv-00134-AW-MJF
PLAINTIFFS,	)	
V.	)	
RONALD DESANTIS, ET AL,	)	
DEFENDANTS.	)	

## Notice of Appeal

NOW COMES, Scott Huminski (“Huminski”), and Notices of Appeal concerning the Court’s orders Denying Intervention, Reconsideration of Denial of Intervention, Motion for ADA Accommodations and Motion to Compel. Huminski also appeals from the District Court clerk’s decision not to file multiple papers that Huminski intended to rely upon in this appeal and the Court below.

Filed herewith is Huminski’s motion for an injunction pending appeal pursuant to F.R.C.P. 62 and F.R.App.P 8. A similar Rule 8 paper will be filed in the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit upon commencement of the appeal and docketing.

Dated at Palm Coast, Florida this 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022.




---


Scott Huminski, pro se  
P.O. Box 353820  
Palm Coast, FL 32135  
(239) 300-6656  
[S\\_Huminski@live.com](mailto:S_Huminski@live.com)

## Certificate of Service

Copies of this document and any attachment(s) was served upon the parties via the U.S. Mails and/or email and/or the e-filing system.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022.

-s/- Scott Huminski




---

Scott Huminski

KM

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

**EQUALITY FLORIDA, et al.,**

**Plaintiffs,**

v.

**Case No. 4:22-cv-134-AW-MJF**

**RONALD DESANTIS, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Scott Huminski has filed a pro se motion to intervene, ECF No. 17, which this order denies.

Huminski has not shown he is entitled to intervention as of right because he has shown no “direct, substantial, legally protectable interest in the proceeding.” *Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197, 1213 (11th Cir. 1989) (cleaned up). He does not seek to challenge the law Plaintiffs challenge; he seeks only to address unrelated complaints about what he views as the State’s unfair treatment of him, including through his criminal cases.

Huminski has not shown any basis for permissive intervention either. He has not shown that his claim “and the main action have a question of law or fact in common.” *Id.* And even if the court had discretion to allow his intervention, I would not do so. A pro se plaintiff’s assertion of unrelated claims would only complicate

and delay this proceeding. Huminski's motion for a temporary restraining order against the State of Florida (a nonparty) only illustrates this point.

The motion to intervene (ECF No. 17) is DENIED. The motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 17-1, and the "Clarification of a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order," ECF No. 21, are STRICKEN as improperly filed.

SO ORDERED on May 23, 2022.

*s/ Allen Winsor*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

**EQUALITY FLORIDA, et al.,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**Case No. 4:22-cv-134-AW-MJF**

**RONALD DESANTIS, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO INTERVENE**

I earlier denied Scott Huminski's motion to intervene. ECF No. 46. Huminski now moves for reconsideration, requesting for various forms of relief. ECF No. 53. Because Huminski shows no entitlement to relief, his motion (ECF No. 53) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED on July 12, 2022.

*s/ Allen Winsor*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge