

Cal

No. _____

In The Supreme Court of the United States

In Re: ~~Formally Foster, Formally Lockett~~
~~Deborah Elizabeth Gorch-Crassis~~
Petitioners,

v.
Air France
Kamala Harris
Carmen Valijan
State of California
Respondents,

Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus

Formally Foster, Formally Lockett
~~Deborah Elizabeth Gorch-Crassis~~
PO Box 88704
Los Angeles, California 90009
831-383-3437

Questions Presented

1. Judicial Misconduct
2. Fraud Upon the Court
3. Obstruction of Justice
4. Intrinsic Fraud
5. Extensive Fraud
6. Government Malfeasance
7. Intentional Emotional Distress and Mental Anguish
8. Petitioner due process right to a Speedy Trial and Fairness denied
9. Aggravated Identity Theft
10. Judicial Errors
11. Retaliation for Filing Civil Lawsuit
12. Refutation of Character

List of Parties

Formally Foster, Formally Bockitt
Deborah Elizabeth Houch-Chassis

P.O. Box 88704

Los Angeles, California 90009

831-383-3437

Refutations,

Air France (LAX)
International Terminal

380 World Way
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Air France

~~ATTN: Mr. Cutler
Mr. Jackowski
142 W. 57th St. and 147 W. 57th St.
New York, City, NY 10019 New York City, NY 10019~~

Mail Returning in the last 2 Months

Kamala Harris

112 HART, Senator Bldg and

Washington D.C 20510

Carmen Valijan

Attorney General Office

300 S. Spring St, LA, CA 90013

Kamala Harris, CA, AG Office
c/o Carmen Valijan
300 S. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90013

State of California
Attorney General Office
ATTN: Carmen Valijan
300 S. Spring St,
LA, CA 90013
Respondents

Table of Content

Questions Presented

2

List of Parties

3

Table of Content

4-5

Index to Appendix

5

Opinion Below

6

Jurisdiction

Statutory Provisions Involved
Statutes, Rule and Procedure and
Cited Cases

7-13

Statement

A. Statutory Background

B. Factual Background

14-20

Reason for Granting this Extraordinary Writ
Mandamus

21

1. Judicial Misconduct

2. Fraud Upon the Court

3. This case is an ideal vehicle for deciding
the questions presented.

Index to Appendices

Appendix A

Superior Court of California
7/14/17

Appendix B

8/10/17

Appendix C

9/12/17

Appendix D

Court of Appeals, 2nd Appellate
District, California

Appendix E

California Supreme Court

Appendix F

Judicial Misconduct
Board

Appendix G

State of California
Bar Association

Appendix H

Vexatious Litigant
MC-701

Opinions
Petitioner respectfully ask that the Extraordinary
Writ of Mandamus to review below. (Judgment)

The Opinion of California Superior Court, County of
Los Angeles appears at Appendix A, B, and C
to petitioner is unpublished.

The Opinion of Court of Appeals of California,
Second District Court of Los Angeles, California
appears at Appendix D to Petition is unpub-
lished.

The Opinion of California Supreme Court, San Francisco
appears at Appendix E

Appendix F - Judicial Misconduct (6 months pending)

Appendix G - State of California Bar Assoc. (6 months pending)

Appendix H - 'MC-701' (Vexatious Litigant) (3 months pending)

Statutory Provision Involved/Involved

FRCP (Federal Rules of Civil Procedures)

Supreme Court of the United States Rule 44

State of California
is a defendant/respondent

FRCP 4(c)(e)(f)(i)(m)(L)(d)

FRCP 5

12(a)

9

15(B)

15(B)(2)

15(A)

15(c)(1)(A)(B)

15(c)(1)(B)

55(a)(b)

55(b)(2)

28-1915

60(a)

60(b)

United States Codes

15-1811
18-1512

18-1512(B)
18-1512(B)(1)

18-1362

42-373

18-1028

18-1029

18-1505

18-1509

28-455

Federal Practice Digest 28(3)

California Code Gov't Code-12940

43, 45, 46(3) and 47

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

United States Constitutional Articles I, II, III
IV, VII, VI, VIII, XIII, XIV

Civil Rights Act of 1964, XII - Article VI,
Amendment I

7 - Section 2
13 - Section 1
14 - Section 5
15 - Section 2
19 - Section 2

Constitutional Grounds
Challenge for
State of California

Supreme Court Rule 44 but State of
California, is
one of the defendants/respondents.

~~Statutes~~
Statutes, Rules and Procedure

Fraud Upon the Court - FRCP 60, Rule 60B
- California Civil Procedure (CCP)

Judges Bias Prejudice Case - FRCP 28-143 584.585

Federal Practice Digest 28(3) Conspiracy

Aggravated Identity Theft - Judge, Attorney General
and State Department
Abroad in Dubai

Cited Case

Applying v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins 340 F.3d
769, 781

Continental National Bank v. Holland Banking (9th Cir)
Co. 66 F.2d 823, 830 (8th Circuit) 1933

In Re: Bullock v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115,
1121 (10th Circuit 1985)

Kenner v. CIR, 387 F.3d 369 (1968)

In Re: Witt (1191) ILL. 2d 380, 583 N.E. 2d
526, 531, 531, 164 (ILL. Dec 610)

Bowers v. Bernards, 150 Cal App 3d 870, 872
- 73 (1984)

Leming v. Oilfield Trucking Co. 44 Cal 2d 343, 356
(1955)

People v. Azjic, 88 ILL ^{App} 3d 477, 410 N.E. 2d 626
(1980)

United States v. Reynolds 345 U.S. 1 (1953)

1 After case was remanded back to the District
2 Court the District court order the ^{U.S.} Government
3 to produce the documents in order that the court
4 might determine whether documents privileged
5 matters. The U.S. Government declined, so that
6 the Court entered an order, Under Rule 37(b)(2)(i)
7 that the facts on issue of Aguiguer would be
8 taken established in favor of Plaintiff.
9

10
11
12
13 Kenner V.C.I.R. 387 F.3d 689 (1968)

14 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed, p. 512

15
16 [The 7th Circuit further stated "a decision
17 produced by fraud upon the court is not ~~essence~~
18 a decision at all, never becomes final.
19
20

21 (1) intentional fraud

22 (2) by Officers of the Court's

23 (3) Which directed the Court itself, and (4)
24 that facts deceives the Court.
25
26
27
28

//

Writ of mandamus, writ of error
 TO Review the Judgment of an inferior court
 12 USC 1254
 28 USC 1291

Extraordinary Writs - lead to

Ex Parte Bollman, 8 US (4 Cranch) 75 (1807)
 United States Alkali Exp. Ass'n v. United States
 345 US 196 (1945)

De Beers Consol. Mines, Ltd v. United States, 325 US 212 (1945)

In Re 620 Church St. Corps 299 U.S. 24, 26 (1936)

~~Ryan v. Welle - Civ. No 13639, Fed Dist, D. N. C.~~

Deen v. Hickman, 385 US 57 (1958)

Buelo v. Adkins, 424 U.S. 641 (1976)

~~Keer v. United States Dist. Court~~

426 US 394 (1976)

In re "Me" v. State of California

Judges Name.

Question Presented

Rule 14.1(b)
 20.3(a) List of Parties
 Table of Contents

Authorities

Relief Sought

Direct Appeal
 15 days

People v. Proctor (1992)

Re Curiam
 United States v. Reynolds, 345 U.S. 1 (1953)

due process right
 to an impartial judge
 1338/341

Second Circuit -

People v. Mahoney (1927)

210 Cal.
618,622
17-7474

Wagner Spray Tech Corp v. Wolf

113 F.R.D 50 (S.D.N.Y. 1986)

Rehearsal
page 4

3rd Root Refining Co. v. Universal Oil Products

169 F.2d 514 (C.C.A. 3d Cir 1948)

So bad
you have to
start over
with deny's
to case
has
Notre

7th Taft v. Donnellan Quome
F.2d.

9th Cir - In Re Int'l, 66 F.3d 1002, 32 Fed R. Serv.
303 1094 (9th Cir) 1995

Mahoney

U.S Supreme Court -

U.S. v. Beggs, 524 US 38, 118 S.Ct 1862, 141 L. Ed. 2d 32, 40 Fed R Serv. 3d 756 (1998)

Seventh

F.R.C.P. on the court should be embrace only that speaks of
found which does or attempts to, Subvert the integrity of the court
itself, as a fraud perpetrated by officers of the courts

(Citation omitted) Kern v. Med. Prods, Inc v. N. & H. Inst
Inc, 616 F.2d 833, 837 (1st Cir 1980)

FRCP 60(b)

5/18/87

Statements

A. Statutory Background

Petitioner, ^{Originally} filed (2) two small claim lawsuits for \$10,000 each, (1) one for Lost of Luggage which contained all that petitioner had left of her life including family and personal documents. This happened when petitioner went to Dubai 2016, January 7th to relocate. (1) one lawsuit was for item stolen off persons, and being robbed to personal items, which petitioner did file a claim against government for Reimbursement. The claims were personally hand carried to the Chief of Police Office, Sheriff of Los Angeles, Attorney Kamala Harris and Los Angeles Board of Supervisors to be reimbursed for my loss while in Los Angeles County California. In addition for the ^{Small claims} lawsuit. After returning from Dubai petitioner was attacked on 29 February 2018 in Beverly Hill, Cedar Sinai hospital around 3pm in Broad daylight.

1 This attack by unknown person generated over
2 \$100,000. in medical bills. Which plenty
3 was charged for 20% it due to being disability
4 from the United States Army & I am required to
5 pay the other 20%. The Victims Assistance at
6 the police station did not want to assist me.
7 Neither did the State of California, Victims Assi-
8 stance would not reimburse me for hotel bills
9 or medical, that is all I had Requested from
10 the State of California. On both occasion
11 with the loss of luggage, stolen property, and
12 this attack from unknown, due to State
13 of California, Governor Constituent office, Adrian
14 they would not assist me even though funds
15 were available. Adrian told the clerks at
16 the above agencies to remove my documents and
17 for me to come to him for assistance. Adrian
18 is the character that works for the Governors
19 office, which should not have shut me off
20 from seeking any type of assistance from anyone.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Also refused any assistance from the Governor Brown of California on a personal not as a relative. April 2017 I was attacked by another unknown person and they caused bodily injury, which hasn't been corrected yet. Since I was first attacked.

B. Factual Background

The State of California from San Francisco to Los Angeles County has not done anything at all to assist me from October 2012. Los Angeles County, City and State employees and officials has not assisted me for the last 4 years as Petitioner has been stranded, sleeping on the street, and the social programs has done anything either. When Petitioner first filed this lawsuit in August 2016, the Attorney General's Office representative has purposely, intentionally sabotaged my cases along with a couple of

1 Corrupt judges in State Court which is trying
2 to Sabotage my Federal Cases in the 9th Circuit
3 and Supreme Court of the United States. The
4 Magistrate/Presiding Judges can not correct
5 or reprimand the Judges for Administrative
6 Purposes Only, Which leaves the Californian
7 Governor Jerry Brown and President Trump
8 as their Superiors. What has happened to the
9 Petitioners by Government and Official is actually
10 Criminal.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 State of California, Air France deliberately
2 let someone still my identity in Dubai
3 and claimed that I denounced my citizenship
4 and was detained in Dubai for 30 days and Air France
5 sent me Norway with the help of the two
6 individuals that appeared at the Airport in Dubai
7 is not true. The judge Tagasaki was out of control
8 and crossed the line with whatever he said he
9 heard from Carmen Valijan and Air France all
10 was in collusion together for some unknown reason.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Petitioner purchased her own ticket Roundtrip
and asked the 2 employees that met with
me at Airport for assistance as I sought
Political Asylum in Dubai until connecting with
King Salman of the Saudi Royal Family which I know
their families prior to me going to school. Judge
Tagasaki along with Carmen Valijan, Air France
and other defendant in UCLA Extension, Petitioner
165TS006659

1 Suresh Patel DBA
2 La Mirage Motel, Public House,
3 17 STSC00767, 17 STSC07997

4 Purposely Claimed I was a vexatious litigant when
5 Carmen Valyan acted as if she didn't understand
6 the judge McChuda for over Year and a half and
7 Should not have been representing Kamala Harris
8 then Attorney General now California Senator, State
9 of California and Air France She's not an
10 attorney and as she dragged on Court and she
11 Motion the Court with nonsense when I responded
12 they purposely held these cases up when I
13 had already planned to relocate abroad in
14 August 2016, when the defended started the lying
15 stealing the documents and what they tried
16 to portray of the Petitioner is actually themselves
17 and it needs to be corrected so that plaintiff
18 should have had 2 years ago.

1 the case was (5) five against Air France, Kamala
2 Harris, Carmen Valijan and State of California
3 were combined 16STSC02527, 16STSC02530
4
5 Next after hold the cases for over a year, Petitioner
6 sued them at home and ask for permission
7
8 to serve them in court. 16STSC05891, 16STSC07169
9
10 where Adrian? at the Governor Constituent gave
11
12 purposely since 2013 refused to assist me
13
14 with contacting the Governor for personal help nothing
15
16 to do with State of California at all. Every word
17
18 that was spoken by the Attorney General's Office Carmen
19
20 Valijan was perjury, straight lies and defamation
21
22 of Character. And No I was not reject by the
23
24 Saudi Royal Family or UAE another lie with
25
26 my families identity and intellect is stolen
27
28 while low life Americans try to discredit
my cases as I am the victim makes no sense.

Reason for granting this Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus:

This is to right the wrongs by law. For all the corruption that has risen out of this case

(1) Fraud Upon the Court (Judges)

(2) Judicial Misconduct

(3) Fraud on the Court (Clerk, Supervisor, government official)

(4) This case is good to set precedence for laws to establish and will be a good vehicle for deciding the questions presented provided with laws substantial lawsuits.

No. _____

Certificate of Compliance

Formally Foster, Formally Bickell
Deborah Elizabeth Leah Chassey
Petitioners,

v.

Air France
Kamala Harris, Senator
Carmen Valuyan
State of California
Respondents,

As required by US Supreme Court Rule 33.1(h), I certify
that Petition for Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus contains

Words, excluding the parts of the petition that
are exempted by US Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d).
I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing
is true and correct.

Executed: 20 July 2018

Respectfully,
Deborah Elizabeth Leah Chassey
Formally Foster, Formally Bickell

Certification of Good Standing / Jack

Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus on the Supreme Court of the United States has Constitutional grounds given to be heard by the Justices. Petitioner has under the penalty of Perjury in the State of California, County of Los Angeles has honestly pleaded all documents from Superior Court of California to California Supreme Court with due diligence and honesty. Petitioner has used all legal Resources to expedite case without delay to the Court System.

Verification

This is to verify that I am the Petitioner in this case, and all documents and statements are correct.

Respectfully

Executed: 20 July 2018

Deborah Elizabeth Gould
Formally Jack, Formally Jack

Certificate of Counsel

The Undersigned Certifies that this matter should be heard in Supreme Court of the United States, Jurisdiction is from California Supreme Court.

I declare under the penalty of Perjury that the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully,

Executed: 20 July 2018

Rebecca Elizabeth Hand-Crossin
Formally Foster, Formally Lovell

Conclusion

Petitioner request Supreme Court of the United States to grant this Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus because all the lower courts has refused to make the correct decision and no other Court can make this judgment but Supreme Court of the United States. Because of fraud upon the Court, one Judge decided to join hands with State of California Attorney Generals Office to make

Petitioner a vexatious litigant after defendant's
and Court System has deliberately continued
Court for 2 years in Small Claims Court, Next
when the State of California learned that it was
on the wrong court, Petitioner upgraded to Civil
Unlimited Case BC 654324. After asking with

Permission and Moving Case to a higher Court
at Carmen Valijan Request, as a paralegal representing
all the defendant, Petitioner, asked Judge McCheida
to be able to serve all the defendant in court because
the defendants were rejecting service by the US Marshals
and Sheriffs of Los Angeles. All defendants were served
and abandoned the case and judgment should have been
rendered for plaintiff. The reasons again that this
Case should be granted is Petitioner, did due diligence
on the case and all defendants were served correctly
and default judgment should have been awarded
to Plaintiff, while all defendant Respondent
abandoned Case.

Executed: 20 July 2018

25

Georgiana Elizabeth Lloyd
formally Foster, formally Lockart