

# IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

**THEODORE HAUGLAND,**  
Plaintiff,

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-CV-01744-EDK

---

## PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff Theodore Haugland, proceeding *pro se*, respectfully moves this Honorable Court for immediate injunctive relief pursuant to **RCFC 65, RCFC 5.2**, and this Court's **inherent authority to protect the integrity of judicial proceedings and confidential litigant information**. In support of this Motion, Plaintiff states as follows:

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

This Motion arises from a **documented cybersecurity incident affecting the federal judiciary's Case Management/Electronic Case Filing ("CM/ECF") and PACER systems on August 7, 2025**. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts publicly acknowledged that the judiciary's electronic case management system was subject to cyberattacks, prompting enhanced cybersecurity measures to protect sensitive and sealed filings.

At the time of the August 7, 2025 cybersecurity incident, Plaintiff's prior case in this Court, **Haugland v. United States, Case No. 1:25-CV-00710-EDK**, contained **sealed filings** that included:

- **IRS Form 1040 (2021)**
- **IRS Form 1040-X (2021)**
- **A Claim for Refund Statement**

RECEIVED - USCF  
DEC 19 2025

These documents contained **extraordinarily sensitive personal information**, including:

- Plaintiff Theodore Haugland's Social Security number
- The Social Security numbers of Plaintiff's two minor children, **Amora Haugland and Karina Haugland**
- Plaintiff's bank routing and bank account numbers

Recognizing the sensitivity of this information, **Judge Kaplan ordered these documents filed under seal.**

Following dismissal of the original case for lack of jurisdiction in September 2025, Plaintiff lawfully refiled his tax refund complaint in this Court on **October 10, 2025**, under **Case No. 1:25-CV-01744-EDK**, again necessarily including the same confidential documents.

Because the judiciary's electronic filing system had already been compromised during the pendency of Plaintiff's sealed filings, Plaintiff now seeks **non-monetary injunctive relief** to prevent further dissemination, misuse, or exploitation of his and his children's identities during the continued litigation of this matter.

---

## II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. On April 26, 2025, Plaintiff filed a tax refund complaint in the United States Court of Federal Claims, Case No. 1:25-CV-00710-EDK.
2. Plaintiff's complaint included IRS Forms 1040 and 1040-X for tax year 2021 and a Claim for Refund Statement containing Social Security numbers and bank account information.
3. Due to the sensitivity of these materials, Judge Kaplan ordered the filings sealed.
4. On August 7, 2025, the federal judiciary publicly confirmed that its CM/ECF and PACER systems were subject to a cybersecurity incident affecting case management infrastructure.
5. In September 2025, Plaintiff's original case was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.
6. On October 10, 2025, Plaintiff refiled the same tax refund claim in this Court under Case No. 1:25-CV-01744-EDK, again including the same confidential materials.
7. Plaintiff and his two minor children now face an ongoing and heightened risk of identity theft, tax fraud, and financial exploitation stemming from the exposure of permanent

personal identifiers during a known cybersecurity breach.

---

### III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

A party seeking injunctive relief must demonstrate:

1. A likelihood of success on the merits;
2. Irreparable harm absent injunctive relief;
3. That the balance of equities favors the movant; and
4. That an injunction serves the public interest.

*Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

---

### IV. ARGUMENT

#### A. Plaintiff Demonstrates a Likelihood of Success on the Merits

Courts have consistently recognized that failure to protect sealed or confidential information implicates serious due process and privacy concerns. **RCFC 5.2** exists specifically to protect litigants from disclosure of Social Security numbers, financial account numbers, and information concerning minor children.

The judiciary's own acknowledgment of cybersecurity vulnerabilities establishes that Plaintiff's confidential filings were exposed through no fault of his own.

---

#### B. Disclosure of Social Security Numbers and Tax Records Constitutes Irreparable Harm

Federal courts uniformly recognize that **Social Security numbers are among the most sensitive categories of personal information**, and their disclosure causes harm that cannot be undone.

In **Greidinger v. Davis**, the Fourth Circuit held:

"The harm that can be inflicted from the disclosure of a Social Security number is alarming and potentially financially ruinous. Once disclosed, the damage is done."  
*988 F.2d 1344, 1353–54 (4th Cir. 1993).*

The Ninth Circuit similarly recognized:

"Improper public disclosure of Social Security numbers can lead to identity theft and other serious harm."  
*In re Crawford*, 194 F.3d 954, 958 (9th Cir. 1999).

Tax records are afforded heightened protection:

"Tax returns contain highly personal financial information and are entitled to the utmost protection from disclosure."  
*Payne v. Jones*, 711 F.3d 85, 95 (2d Cir. 2013).

---

### **C. Loss of Control Over Personal Identifiers Is Itself a Concrete Injury**

The Supreme Court has recognized that unauthorized dissemination of personal information constitutes concrete harm:

"A plaintiff suffers injury in fact when the defendant obtains and disseminates personal information in violation of privacy rights."  
*TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 594 U.S. 413, 425–26 (2021).

Once disclosed, Social Security numbers cannot be meaningfully reclaimed or re-secured.

---

### **D. Exposure of Minor Children's Social Security Numbers Heightens the Harm**

Courts apply heightened scrutiny when minors' identities are compromised:

"The risk of future harm from disclosure of sensitive personal information supports a finding of irreparable injury."  
*Doe v. Harris*, 772 F.3d 563, 583 (9th Cir. 2014).

Identity theft involving minors often remains undiscovered for years, compounding the harm.

---

### **E. Monetary Damages Are Inadequate**

Courts consistently hold that monetary damages cannot restore privacy once Social Security numbers are exposed:

"Once personal identifying information such as a Social Security number is disclosed, no monetary award can fully restore the status quo."

*Kallstrom v. City of Columbus*, 136 F.3d 1055, 1067 (6th Cir. 1998).

---

## F. The Balance of Equities and Public Interest Favor Injunctive Relief

The requested relief imposes minimal burden compared to the permanent and ongoing risk to Plaintiff and his children. The public interest strongly favors enforcement of sealing orders, protection of minors' identities, and maintaining confidence in the judiciary's electronic filing systems.

---

## G.. Authority for Court-Ordered Oversight and Protective Audits

Federal courts possess **inherent supervisory authority** to protect the integrity of their proceedings, enforce sealing orders, and safeguard confidential litigant information placed before the Court. This authority includes the power to issue **protective and remedial orders necessary to prevent ongoing or future harm** arising from the handling of court records.

The Supreme Court has long recognized that courts have inherent power to "manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962). This supervisory authority extends to ensuring compliance with court orders and protecting the confidentiality of sealed materials. See *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43–44 (1991) (recognizing courts' inherent power to fashion appropriate remedies to protect the judicial process).

Courts have also exercised this authority to order **audits, certifications, and reporting requirements** where necessary to assess compliance with confidentiality obligations and to prevent further harm from improper disclosure of sensitive information. See *In re Sealed Case*, 237 F.3d 657, 667 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (recognizing courts' authority to impose protective measures to preserve the confidentiality of sealed records); *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 147 F.3d 935, 944 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (acknowledging courts' authority to impose ongoing oversight measures to ensure compliance with court orders).

Here, the requested oversight audit and continued certification are **narrowly tailored**, non-punitive measures designed solely to determine whether Plaintiff's sealed filings were affected by a known cybersecurity incident and to ensure that those filings remain protected during the pendency of this litigation. Such relief falls squarely within the Court's inherent authority to protect litigants and preserve confidence in the judicial process.

---

## V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Theodore Haugland respectfully prays that this Honorable Court grant the following **limited, non-monetary injunctive relief**, narrowly tailored to protect Plaintiff and his minor children during the pendency of this action:

**Protection Against Further Disclosure**

An order prohibiting further disclosure, dissemination, or unauthorized access to Plaintiff's IRS Forms 1040, 1040-X, Claim for Refund Statement, and all personal identifying information contained therein, including Social Security numbers and bank account information.

**1. Continued Sealing and Restricted Access**

An order requiring that all confidential filings in this case remain sealed and subject to restricted access consistent with RCFC 5.2 and this Court's prior sealing orders.

**2. Reasonable Safeguards During Litigation**

An order requiring reasonable safeguards to prevent unauthorized access to Plaintiff's confidential information while this matter is pending before the Court.

**3. Credit Monitoring and Identity Protection**

An order requiring Defendant to provide no less than **five (5) years of credit monitoring and identity theft protection services** for:

- **Theodore Haugland**
- **Amora Haugland** (minor child)
- **Karina Haugland** (minor child)

**4. Independent Oversight Audit of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts**

An order directing that an **independent oversight audit** be conducted, under appropriate confidentiality protections, to determine the scope and extent to which sealed filings and personal identifying information associated with Plaintiff's cases may have been accessed or exposed during the August 7, 2025 cybersecurity incident affecting the CM/ECF and PACER systems.

Plaintiff requests that such audit be limited to:

- Assessing whether Plaintiff's sealed filings were accessed, copied, or compromised;
- Identifying the categories of information potentially exposed; and
- Evaluating whether additional protective measures are necessary to safeguard Plaintiff's information during this litigation.

**5. Continued Oversight and Certification**

An order requiring the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, or an appropriate designated authority, to provide **periodic written certification to the Court** confirming:

- o That Plaintiff's sealed filings remain protected from unauthorized access; and
- o That no additional known compromises of Plaintiff's confidential information have occurred during the pendency of this case.

**6. Further Relief**

Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper to protect the integrity of these proceedings and the safety of Plaintiff's and his minor children's personal information.

---

**VI. CONCLUSION**

The August 7, 2025 cybersecurity incident affecting the federal judiciary's electronic filing system exposed Plaintiff's most sensitive personal and financial information while under seal. Because the resulting harm is ongoing, irreversible, and cannot be remedied through monetary damages, **injunctive relief is necessary to protect Plaintiff and his minor children during the pendency of this litigation.**

***Respectfully Submitted,***

December 12, 2025

Date

/s/   
THEODORE HAUGLAND

Plaintiff, *Pro Se*

99-009 Kalaloa St

Unit D2016

Aiea, HI 96701

United States

(202)933-3332

theodorehaugland@outlook.com

**Case 1:25-cv-01744-EDK**

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

\_\_\_\_\_  
THEODORE HAUGLAND  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Plaintiff(s),

v.

\_\_\_\_\_  
THE UNITED STATES,  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-CV-01744-EDK

Judge Elaine D. Kaplan

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 15, 2025, \_\_\_\_\_, a copy of plaintiffs  
motion for injunctive relief  
was mailed via USPS Certified Mail, to Eric J. Smith  
at PO Box 26, Washington, DC 20044.

  
(Signature of Applicant)

Theodore Haugland  
(Printed Name)

99-009 Kalaloa St # D2016  
(Street Address)

Aiea, HI 96701  
(City, State, ZIP Code)

(202)933-3332  
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED - USCFC

DEC 19 2025

**F**

US POSTAGE IMI 059251214041644 2000394174

\$8.02

SSK

FCM



12/14/25 Mailed from 96820 028W2311555

**USPS FIRST-CLASS MAIL®**

THEODORE HAUGLAND  
APT D2016  
99-009 KALALOA ST  
AIEA HI 96701-3498

4.90 oz

RDC 99



SHIP TO:



COURT CLERK  
USCFC  
WASHINGTON DC 20439

**USPS CERTIFIED MAIL®**



9507 1067 1411 5348 3403 84



THEODORE HAUGLAND  
99-009 KALALOA ST  
STE D2016  
AIEA, HI 96701

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT  
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

**CERTIFIED MAIL**



9589 0710 5270 3569 9818 86

UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS  
ATTENTION: COURT CLERK  
717 MADISON PL, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20439-0001