IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND Southern Division

MARVIN TUTT, Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 8:25-cv-02006-TDC

V.

REGINA ROBINSON
CHARLES COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION
CHARLES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND
STATE OF MARYLAND
SHARA GABRIELLE HENDLER, ESQ.
ANDREA KHOURY
MISTEY L. METZGAR
1-30 Jane/John Does And/Or Entities
THEODORE D. CHUANG

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - ADDING JUDGE CHUANG IN INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** **FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND** **MARVIN TUTT** *Plaintiff,*

V.

STATE OF MARYLAND, et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:25-cv-02006-TDC

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Marvin Tutt files this Second Amended Complaint adding Theodore D. Chuang in his INDIVIDUAL capacity as a defendant for conspiracy and deprivation of civil rights under color of law.

NEW DEFENDANT

31. THEODORE D. CHUANG, in his individual capacity

- United States District Judge who conspired with state defendants
- Acted outside judicial capacity to protect co-defendants
- Issued retroactive orders designed to dismiss valid claims
- Coordinated with Maryland officials to deprive civil rights

ADDITIONAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- **247.** On June 23, 2025, Plaintiff filed this action exposing \$3.2 billion in fraud by Maryland officials.
- **248.** On June 24, 2025, the Department of Justice filed suit against ALL Maryland federal judges, including Defendant Chuang, creating personal stakes in protecting Maryland officials.
- **249.** On July 8, 2025, Defendant Chuang, acting outside his judicial capacity and in conspiracy with state defendants, issued a retroactive Case Management Order designed to prevent Plaintiff from prosecuting valid claims.
- **250.** The Order was not a legitimate exercise of judicial discretion but a coordinated effort to protect co-defendants in the DOJ litigation.
- **251.** Defendant Chuang knew Plaintiff had already filed his case on June 23, yet retroactively imposed requirements that would be impossible to meet.
- **252.** The Order requires fraud victims to create "joint records" with alleged fraudsters a requirement so absurd it reveals non-judicial motives.
- **253.** Defendant Chuang acted in concert with state defendants as evidenced by:
- Timing immediately after DOJ lawsuit
- Protecting state defendants' interests
- Creating procedural impossibilities

- Ignoring federal rules **254.** This conspiracy deprived Plaintiff of: - Due process rights - Access to courts - Equal protection - Fair adjudication ## NEW CAUSES OF ACTION **COUNT 18: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 - CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE CIVIL RIGHTS** (Against Theodore D. Chuang in Individual Capacity) **255.** Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs. **256.** Defendant Chuang, acting under color of law but outside judicial capacity, conspired with state defendants to deprive Plaintiff of constitutional rights. **257.** The conspiracy included: - Issuing retroactive procedural barriers - Creating impossible requirements - Protecting co-defendants in DOJ litigation

- Preventing prosecution of valid claims

- **258.** As a direct result, Plaintiff suffered:
- Continued garnishments of \$130/week
- Inability to prosecute claims
- Denial of due process
- Ongoing financial harm
- **259.** Defendant Chuang's actions were willful, malicious, and in bad faith.
- **260.** Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory and punitive damages.
- **COUNT 19: 42 U.S.C. § 1985 CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE**

 (Against Theodore D. Chuang in Individual Capacity)
- **261.** Defendant Chuang conspired with state defendants to obstruct justice by preventing Plaintiff from prosecuting valid federal claims.
- **262.** The conspiracy involved using judicial power for non-judicial purposes protecting conspirators from liability.
- **263.** This obstruction was motivated by Defendant Chuang's personal interest as a co-defendant in DOJ litigation with Maryland officials.

264. Plaintiff suffered actual damages from this obstruction including continued theft of benefits and inability to obtain relief.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

As to Defendant Chuang in his INDIVIDUAL capacity, Plaintiff seeks:

- 1. **Nominal damages of ONE DOLLAR (\$1.00)** Plaintiff seeks only \$1 to establish the violation while demonstrating this case is about accountability, not money
- 2. **Declaratory judgment** that Defendant Chuang violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights through discriminatory treatment and failure to recuse
- 3. **Permanent injunctive relief**:
 - a. Prohibiting Chuang from presiding over any civil rights cases
 - b. Prohibiting Chuang from presiding over any pro se litigant cases
 - c. Prohibiting Chuang from issuing case management orders targeting specific litigants
 - d. Prohibiting Chuang from creating procedural requirements not found in the Federal Rules
- 4. **Mandatory relief requiring Chuang to**:
 - a. Complete 40 hours of judicial bias training
- b. Submit written acknowledgment of discriminatory conduct to the Fourth Circuit Judicial Council

- c. Report this matter to the Circuit Judicial Council
- d. Provide written apology to Plaintiff acknowledging the violations
- 5. **Systemic relief**:
 - a. Order independent audit of Chuang's treatment of pro se litigants for the past 5 years
 - b. Require disclosure of this case in any future matters involving pro se parties
 - c. Public filing of audit results to ensure transparency
- 6. **Attorney's fees** under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 (if counsel obtained)
- 7. **Costs of this action**
- 8. **All other relief** deemed just and proper
- ## WHY ONLY ONE DOLLAR

Plaintiff seeks only \$1.00 in damages from Judge Chuang to establish:

- 1. **This case is about principle, not profit** Plaintiff wants accountability, not enrichment
- 2. **The violation itself matters more than compensation** Constitutional rights are priceless
- 3. **Credibility through restraint** No one can claim this is a money grab
- 4. **Focus on systemic change** The injunctive relief matters more than damages
- 5. **Pure motive** A judge who violates rights should be stopped, not just fined

THE UNPRECEDENTED NATURE OF THIS CLAIM **This may be the first case in American jurisprudence where:** - A litigant sues their presiding judge - In the same case the judge is managing - While the judge continues presiding - For conspiracy with opposing parties - Creating an impossible logical loop **The absurdity proves the point**: No judge can fairly preside over a case where he is a defendant accused of conspiring with the other defendants. **Respectfully submitted,** /s/ Marvin Tutt Marvin Tutt Pro Se Plaintiff Email: owner@caiatech.com

The single dollar makes clear: This is about justice, not jackpots.

Date: July 15, 2025 ## VERIFICATION I, Marvin Tutt, verify under penalty of perjury that: 1. I have read this Second Amended Complaint 2. The factual allegations are true to the best of my knowledge 3. The claims are brought in good faith 4. I understand the serious nature of suing a federal judge /s/ Marvin Tutt **Date: July 15, 2025** ## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on July 15, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Second Amended Complaint upon the following parties via certified mail and first-class mail:

Charles County Child Support Administration

200 Kent Avenue

La Plata, MD 20646

Charles County Department of Social Services

200 Kent Avenue

La Plata, MD 20646

State of Maryland

c/o Office of the Attorney General

200 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202

Charles County, Maryland

200 Charles Street

La Plata, MD 20646

Shara Gabrielle Hendler, Esq.

c/o Charles County Child Support Administration

200 Kent Avenue

La Plata, MD 20646

Andrea Khoury

c/o Charles County Circuit Court

200 Charles Street

La Plata, MD 20646

Mistey L. Metzgar

c/o Charles County Circuit Court

200 Charles Street

La Plata, MD 20646

The Honorable Theodore D. Chuang

IN HIS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY

c/o U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland

6500 Cherrywood Lane

Greenbelt, MD 20770

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ Marvin Tutt

Marvin Tutt

Pro Se Plaintiff

Date: July 15, 2025