

No. 18-5765

---

---

IN THE  
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

DeAndre' Russell, *Petitioner pro se'*

v.

Redstone Federal Credit Union/Anthony Ingegneri, et. Al., *Respondent*

**Submitted**

**February 9, 2019**

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals for the  
Eleventh Circuit**


---

**PETITIONER PRO SE' MOTION TO POSTPONE THE COURTS SCHEDULED  
CONFERENCE OF HIS PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

DeAndre' Russell, *Petitioner pro se'*  
4882 James Street  
Huntsville, Alabama 35811  
(256) 851-6658

---



i.

**LIST OF PARTIES PURSUANT TO RULES 14.1(B) AND 29.1**

Petitioner pro se' DeAndre' Russell, filed suit for injuries caused by those of his (2011) bankruptcy, on December 31, 2013 and March 27, 2015. Redstone Federal Credit Union, attorney(s) for Redstone Federal Credit Union, C. Howard Grisham and Jeffery L. Cook, John Larsen and Melissa Larsen (2011) bankruptcy attorney(s) for debtor/petitioner, Philip A. Geddes and Michael Ford Federal Bankruptcy Trustees, in the (2011) bankruptcy, Anthony Ingegneri, Revenue Officer for the Alabama Dept. of Revenue, Mark Peterson, Revenue Officer for Alabama Dept. of Revenue, Mark Griffin, attorney for the Alabama Dept. of Revenue, Kelley Askew Gillikin, assistant Attorney General/attorney for the Dept. of Revenue and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are all Respondent(s).

---

1.

## **MOTION TO POSTPONE THIS COURT'S SCHEDULE CONFERENCE**

Pursuant to **Rule 21** of this U.S. Supreme Court, Petitioner pro se' DeAndre' Russell presents his Motion that this Honorable Supreme Court would postpone the February 15, 2019 Schedule Conference, of his Petition for Rehearing, pending the outcome of this court's decision on whether it will grant or deny the upcoming Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, that pertains to a case that now involves his wife, Constance F. Russell, for which the Honorable Clarence Thomas has now granted an extension of time to file her Writ, (**Application No. 18A724**). The purpose of requesting this postponement is due to the following reasons that are listed below, in this motion.

It is now no secret that petitioner pro se' DeAndre' Russell has made known his respectful argument, to this court and ***others outside of this court***, on how he considers it to be unjust and possibly unconstitutional that the highest court in our country would be allowed to ignore his Writ of Certiorari, with a **"no opinion"** ***ruling***, that presented claims with **facts and evidence** of wrong-doing by the named parties involved in this case, along with his claims of misconduct by federal judges of the lower courts, on how they handled these matters.

**Attached to this motion to postpone are petitioner's exhibits D, E, and F which are a copy of the letters that he sent to the Honorable Charles Grassley and Dianne Feinstein of the Senate Judiciary Committee and to the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.**

Petitioner make known that his purpose of sending these letters were not intended to disrespect this Honorable Court, nor attempt to have others circumvent its jurisdiction, (*which was respectfully made known in all letters*) but rather, they were sent out because of genuine concern over a judicial system that would not only allow judges to inconsistently interpret the law, (***their way***), but moreso a system whereby Congress has delegated the authority to this Hon. U.S. Supreme

Court, under the Rule making provisions that it is giving, to create rules that would allow judges to deny cases, (no matter the merits or violations of a parties Constitutional Rights) based solely on an, "***opinion or lack thereof***". It is petitioner pro se' DeAndre' Russell's argument to this Honorable Court that Congresses delegation of such authority, to those judges, (especially federal judges who are appointed for life) that may deny legitimate matters of a parties claim or redress of grievances without commenting on the facts and evidence presented violates the checks and balances of our 3-tier system of governing, that our founders put in place, in our Constitution.

The above statements have been made known because the purpose of requesting a postponement of the February 15, 2019 Schedule Conference, on Petitioner's Rehearing is that the up-coming Writ that will be presented by my wife and I, (Application No. 18A724) will now present a case that challenges the Constitutionality of this self-made court rule, by presenting a subject-matter that raises the question, ***Can a "no opinion ruling" of a case that presents indisputable evasion of facts and wrong-doing, violate a parties Constitutional Rights.***

Because this court has already denied petitioner's Writ of Certiorari without any ruling on the validity of the facts and evidence, Petitioner pro se' is now asking that this Hon. Court would postpone its scheduled conference until the argument on **Constance F. Russell v. Alabama** is made, presented and considered, by this court.


Although this argument has been made by others such as *Leiser Law Firm v. Virginia Supreme Court*, it is petitioner's contention that it has yet to have been properly presented from the stand point of how this rule violates not only a party's due process rights, but moreso how this rule violates the ***religious clause of the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment to the Constitution.***

3.

Your Honorable Justices of this U.S. Supreme Court, there is a proper argument to be made that presents a Question of Law as to whether it is Constitutional for Congress to allow the Third Branch of Government, (the judicial branch) whose business is to administer expeditious equity and justice, in all cases, to say to a party, "no, I do not want to hear or rule on a matter, because I do not **think, feel, or believe** that the matter is important enough. This along with making rulings based on an opinion of the facts, will present the argument as to whether this rule contradicts judge's oath of office and their duties of upholding the Constitution.

Petitioner pray that this Hon. Court would grant the postponement of the schedule conference and allow this argument to be heard and presented before it decides whether it will issue another "no opinion ruling" on his Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,



DeAndre' Russell  
4882 James Street

Huntsville, Alabama 35811

Petitioner pro se'

February 9, 2019