

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

May 5, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

AKOSUA AAEBO-AKHAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SARAH CONNELL; SEAN C. STAPLES;
TERESA GRANT; MARITTA L. KING;
DC FORENSICS; U.S. MARSHALS
SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Nos. 26-3086, 26-3087, & 26-3088
(D.C. No. 2:25-CV-02502-JWB-ADM)
(D. Kan.)

ORDER

Before **TYMKOVICH**, **McHUGH**, and **EID**, Circuit Judges.

Pro se Plaintiff Akosua Aaebo-Akhan filed three notices of appeals [DC ECF 27, 28, and 35] seeking to appeal three orders (two entered by the assigned magistrate judge and one entered by the district judge) that denied Ms. Aaebo-Akhan's motion for subpoena duces tecum, denied consideration of a voluminous exhibit to that motion, and struck a notice. The orders are as follows.

ORDER denying as moot 24 Emergency Motion for Subpoena Duces Tecum. As discussed in both the court's order granting plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF 4) and the court's Pro Se IFP Case Management Order (ECF 23), this case will not proceed until the court screens the case for merit under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Unless

otherwise directed by the court, plaintiff should refrain from filing any evidence, arguments, motions, or documents until the case has been screened. Signed by Magistrate Judge Angel D. Mitchell on 4/28/2026. [DC ECF 25].

ORDER: Plaintiff seeks to file a voluminous exhibit of 14,453 pages to 24 Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Subpoena Duces Tecum. The court denies plaintiff's request for two reasons. First, the court has already denied plaintiff's motion. (See ECF 25.) Second, the court's local rules prohibit such a filing. D. Kan. Rule 5.1(e) states that "[b]ulky or voluminous materials should not be filed in their entirety" and the "court may strike any pleading or paper filed in violation of this rule." Signed by Magistrate Judge Angel D. Mitchell on 4/29/2026. [DC ECF 26].

ORDER striking Doc. 31 from the record. The case management order states that Plaintiff is not to file any "notices" on the record except for allowed notices such as one for a change of address or an appeal. (Doc. 23, p. 11.) Requests for relief must be in the form of a motion. This document violates the case management order and is struck. Entered by Chief District Judge John W. Broomes on 05/01/2026. [DC ECF 34].

We raise *sua sponte* the question of whether we have jurisdiction to consider these three appeals. *See Amazon, Inc. v. Dirt Camp, Inc.*, 273 F.3d 1271, 1274 (10th Cir. 2001) (stating that "we have an independent duty to examine our own jurisdiction"). Upon consideration, we dismiss these three interlocutory appeals for lack of jurisdiction.

This court has jurisdiction to review final decisions of the district courts, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and specific types of interlocutory and collateral orders not applicable here, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*,

337 U.S. 541 (1949). Piecemeal review of interlocutory orders is not allowed. *See Southern Ute Indian Tribe v. Leavitt*, 564 F.3d 1198, 1207 (10th Cir. 2009). Here, the district court litigation is in a preliminary stage of review. All three orders concern the conduct of litigation before the district court, and contemplate further proceedings in the district court to review Ms. Aaebo-Akhan's complaint. These orders are not immediately appealable. *See Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. v. Mayacamas Corp.*, 485 U.S. 271, 279 (1988) ("An order by a federal court that relates only to the conduct or progress of litigation before that court ordinarily is not considered an injunction and therefore is not appealable under § 1292(a)(1)."); *Hayes Fam. Tr. v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 845 F.3d 997, 1003 (10th Cir. 2017) ("An order that . . . sets the stage for further trial court proceedings is not final."). Further, case management orders entered by the magistrate judge are not final and appealable. *See Phillips v. Beierwaltes*, 466 F.3d 1217, 1222 (10th Cir. 2006) (pre-trial magistrate judge orders entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) are not final and appealable).

All requests for judicial notice or other relief in these appeals are denied as moot.

APPEALS DISMISSED.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam