Related case No. 18-569

No. 18-344

==========

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

—o0o—

YI TAI SHAO, AKA Linda Shao

Petitioner - Appellant,

vs.

McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy

Respondents - Appellees.

REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CLERENCE THOMAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE STEPHEN BEYER, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SAMUEL ALITO, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN, ASSOCIATE SONIA SOTOMAYER, and ASSOCIATE JUSTICE GORSUCH

YI TAI SHAO, ESQ.
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588-7101
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
FAX: (408) 418-4070

Email: attorneyshao@aol.com

In pro per

REQUEST FOR RECUSAL

Petitioner Yi-Tai Shao declares that any reasonable person learns of all the facts will believe that SHAO cannot have a fair decision in front of the named 8 Justices presently at the US Supreme Court. SHAO moves to disqualify 7 of the above named Justices who were named in the Renewed Request for Recusal that were filed with the Court on or about February 2, 2018[1] (not involving Justice Gorsuch); except for Justice Kennedy who have been retired weeks after being served with the Summons in 1:18-cv-01233 RC, the remaining 7 Justices are in direct conflicts of interest in ruling all the Petitions filed or to be filed by Petitioner SHAO for the reason that they are in default for that case and Judge Rudolph Contreras has deterred the Clerk's Office of USDC for the District of Columbia not to enter default.

This type of conflicts of interest goes beyond all case laws about suing the justices as there are pending affidavits for default entry that should have been entered on October 16, 2018. See the last page of the docket, ECF No. 123 through 130 are the affidavits for entry of default against the present 7 Justices. Based on the direct conflicts of interest, where default should have been entered (The US Attorney as well as his office were both properly served with the Summons and complaint and were appraised with existence of this lawsuit as early as in June of 2018), SHAO respectfully requests recusal of the 7 Justices, who are: Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Associate Justice Thomas Clerence, Associate Justice Stephen Beyer, Associate Justice Samuel Alito, Associate Justice Elena Kagan, Associate Justice Sonia Sotomayer.

The result of the default judgment against the 7 Justices will be all declarative reliefs including impeachment for their refusing to rule on SHAO's 3 requests for recusal in abandoning their Constitutionally imposed duty to decide. SHAO believed Chief Justice John G. Roberts' appointed judge for the US Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, Judge Rudolph

[1] The Clerk's Office, for unknown reason, docketed the date of filing to be February 6, 2018 even though the Renewed Request for Recusal was submitted for filing simultaneously with the Petition for Rehearing. It was the third request for recusal.

Contreras, who, without disclosing his conflicts of interest, has deterred the default from being entered. It has been delayed for almost a month.

SHAO respectfully requests this Court to take judicial notice of the Renewed Request for Recusal in 17-613 and its 218 pages of Appendix. Jeff Atkins refused to post the Appendix but stated that the Appendix is under the Clerk's Office's custody.

SHAO telephoned and conversed with Mr. Ethan V. Torrey on the morning of November 14, 2018, informing him of this lawsuit, default entry requests pending with the case of Shao v. Roberts, et al. with case number of 1:18-cv-01233-RC that is pending with the U.S.D.C. for the District of Columbia. SHAO informed Mr. Torrey of the present direct conflicts of interest and asked to postpone the conference date for the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in No. 18-344. SHAO told Mr. Torrey that "Stay Requested" was already stated on the cover of the Petition with this case of 1:18-cv-01233-RC referenced inside the Petition. Mr. Torrey commented that he thought SHAO had done all she could and quickly hung up on SHAO and refused to respond to SHAO's inquiry of whether he would take an action to stay the proceeding as the Court's Counsel.

Despite the history of 3 requests for recusal filed in this case that they failed to decide on January 8 and February 26 of 2018 respectively, and the Justices of this Court would have no reason not knowing this lawsuit when they were served twice by the professional server in June and July of 2018, this case that involves their buddy, the major donor of the American Inns of Court, is still set for conference on November 16, 2018. Therefore, SHAO decided to file this 4th Request for Recusal, or, motion to disqualify.

Appendix No. 1, i.e., Renewed Recusal A. 002-004, in Petition No. 17-613 mentioned the clerks "sponsored" by the 7 Justices (all except Justice Kennedy as he had been retired)

While Jeff Atkins refused to post the Appendix, despite the undersigned's repeated requests, at least two pages of material evidence were attempted purged about the same time. One is Renewed Recusal A Ma.012 and another, A.008. A.012 is Attorney Manuel Sanchez's statement inside the YouTube video of the American Inns of Court which is named "American Inns of Court Member Services." He publicized one of the major function of the Inns of Court is to provide a chance to let the attorneys meet the judges outside of the courtroom in a social setting which "really able to establish the rapport."

In this case, SHAO is alleging that the major founder of William A. Ingram American Inn of Court and S.F. Bay Intellectual Property Rights American Inn of Court, James McManis, his partner Michael Reedy and McManis Faulkner Law Firm, have been using this "rapport" function/service of the American Inns of Court to cause judiciary corruption where SHAO is a victim. They misused their judicial influence through the American Inns of Court to cause permanent parental deprival of SHAO, in order to help on their only defense against SHAO's lawsuit. See declaration of Meera Fox (Renewed Recusal A.075—107. They are so influential that they were able to cause the Santa Clara County Court to process a fake Notice of Non-compliance on Saturday (Renewed Recusal A.105) and cause ex-Presiding Justice Conrad Rushing at the Sixth District Court of Appeal to dismiss the custody appeal the first thing in the morning of March 14, 2016.

Another file deleted that was inside the Appendix that Mr. Atkins knowingly refused to put on the Court's website in 17-256 and 17-613 was A.008, a news release published by McManis Faulkner which was purged in late January 2018 simultaneous with the American Inns of Court's attempted purging with Attorney Sanchez's video (A.012) A.008 shows the relationship

between Chief Justice John G. Roberts and James McManis where Justice Roberts was the 2nd and McManis was the 3rd to receive the highest honor—the Honorary Bencher from the Kings' Inn.

Besides this Honor based on American Inns of Court, Chief Justice Roberts further received Honorary Bencher from Middle Temple. See Renewed Recusal A.191-92.

Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has an Inn under her name. See A.059.

There were many irregularities involved in the proceedings for 17-82, 17-256 and 17-613 as having been extensively discussed in the Renewed Request for Recusal filed with this Court on February 2 or 6 of 2018 in No. 17-613.

All these Petition as well as this Petition involves a request for certiorari about whether the member judges/justices should disclose the social relationship through the American Inns of Court or through their Charters when the attorney members appear in front of them. As the 7 Justices have direct conflicts of interest and have financial interest with the American Inns of Court (Judicial notice is requested for the Renewed Request for Recusal in 17-613, the entire Request as well as its 218 pages of Appendix).

For this financial conflicts of interest, as well as the direct conflicts of interests where the 7 Justices are pending default entry since October 16, 2018 in 1:18-cv-01233-RC as requested by SHAO, SHAO moves the 7 Justices to be recused.

As Associate Justice Gorsuch is also involved with the financial interests by sponsoring his Clerk to receive the same scholarship in 2018, SHAO also requests him to be recused, even though he does not have the severe direct conflicts of interest as the other 7 Justices. Yet his receiving this large amount of gift will cause him unable to deliver objective opinion on this Petition. This will leave only one Justice to decide this Petition.

SHAO believe the traditional rule by 4 should not apply under the special circumstances of direct conflicts of interest.

A true copy of the docket of 1:18-cv-01233-RC, the updated Recipient list for the Temple Bar Scholarship, the news release of November 12, 2018 and the purged evidence (A.012 was put back to internet later) are attached hereto. Again, SHAO requests the Court to take judicial notice of the Renewed Request for Recusal and its 218 pages of Appendix in Petition No. 17-613 that was filed on or about 2/2/2018 and will not repeat the contents contained inside the Renewed Request for Recusal.

SHAO could not have filed this motion earlier as after SHAO requested to enter default against 8 Justices (including Justice Kennedy) in 1:18-cv-01233 (October 16, 2018), her home was burglarized 4 times and suspected to have been done by Kevin L. Warnock, a network expert of Intel Corporation where James McManis is its counsel. There were about 350k files found deleted by Mr. Warnock. See the News Release about the burglaries.

VERIFICATION

The undersigned swear under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the U.S. that the foregoing is all true and accurate to her best knowledge.

Dated: Nov. 14, 2018

Respectfully submitted,



Yi Tai Shao

[1] The Clerk's Office, for unknown reason, docketed the date of filing to be February 6, 2018 even though the Renewed Request for Recusal was submitted for filing simultaneously with the Petition for Rehearing. It was the third request for recusal.

Sia Norouzi / notary public
SIA NOROUZI

Acknowledgment attached

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.