

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Robert Kulick

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

Steven Rein

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals, For 9th Circuit, Case #18-56155

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Robert Kulick in Pro Per

(Your Name)

38122 Village 38

(Address)

Camarillo, CA 93012

(City, State, Zip Code)

310/474-1848

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Why the CA State Bar denied an investigation against Steven Rein, Esq. for his blackmail against me, & why attorneys allowed to be relieved as an attorney of record on their word alone without evidence in support of their relief? And, why are those clients of an attorney forced against their will into a Pro Per status, & why are those in Pro Per status expected to know the law(s) like an attorney? which is unfair, unequal & by common sense preposterous requirement by the court. And, why the CA State Bar further denied an investigation against Steven Rein for his malpractice against me too? Please note: I'm a permanently, physically disabled person under ADA & suffer the side-effects from medications for my physical medical conditions & also suffer from Dyslexia which make my reading & writing most difficult, especially in legal matters, & the specifics of all the above circumstances which I've experienced first hand. Therefore, my understanding in these legal matters are greatly impaired which bear considerable discretion, flexibility & exceptions by this court or any court in the determinations rendered, assuming the merits are taken into these courts in the foregoing determinations where merit is actually redressed, especially in Pro Per status a constitutional issue as to whether that status is truly constitutional in any aspect? Why, since I'm under ADA, does the court expect me to function when I'm in severe & chronic conditions of lack of energy & fatigue, which Exhibit B, attests to my medical conditions that especially makes doing anything or going anywhere a medical & financial hardship. Why Attorney/Client written agreement(s) bias in favor of attorney as well as arbitrary? in their favor too? Why are only an attorney's judgement in handling a litigation which denys a client of any rights in that process, & if

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont'd)

the client object's to an attorney's sole judgement that attorney goes to court & gets to be relieved as the attorney of record by just stating "conflict of interest" resulting in a prejudice in the eyes of another attorney against the client which in part this case before you is all about? Rein uses this "blackmail" tactic against me & the CA State Bar refuses to investigate this issue too. Why are the methods used by State Bars highly bias in favor of attorneys over the rights of clients, especially the burden of proof that automatically in bias for the attorneys? Surely these "methods" need judicial fairness by not allowing clients, their constitutional rights as these Bars are a quasi-government arm of their State's Supreme Court for this investigation to protect clients from dishonest attorneys without obstacles to prevent an investigation to determine whether the allegations are true or not.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

State Bar of CA, 845 S. FigueroaSt., L.A. CA 90017

Please note: The State Bar of CA is mandated to provide Steven Rein a copy of this Petition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A USDC, Central District of CA, Case#CV18-4533

APPENDIX B U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, Case #18-56155

APPENDIX C CA Supreme Court, Case #S247410, State Bar Case#17-16823

APPENDIX D CA VCSC Case#56-2013-00444977-CU-BC-VTA

APPENDIX E CA VCSC Case#56-2016-00478277-CU-DF-VTA

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

U.S. Constitution, Articles 6,7,9, 10, & 14 Section 1. where especially blackmail is a criminal offense & an attorney does not have complete control over a client's case matter

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is ~~missed~~ filing date, which caused lack of jurisdiction/
[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. Since, I'm not aware of.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is a claim that lack of jurisdiction, disputed to 9th/
[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. Since, I'm not aware of.

[] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix C to the petition and is ~~was just denied~~, didn't address merits
[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. Since, I'm not aware of.

The opinion of the CA VCSC Case#444977 court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is judgement(s) against me
[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. Since, I'm not aware of.

Opinions Below (cont'd)

In RE Appendix E, CA VCSC, Case #478277, Court dismissed Defamation but left Declaratory Relief & Injunction for court trial still pending & awarded attorney fees currently on Motions for determinations ahead. This has not been published, since I'm not aware of.

Please note: Currently seeking out of court settlement on global basis on both case #'s 444977/478277, which Exhibit A, addresses

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 9-19-18.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.
~~✓~~

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

M The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 4-11-18.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.
~~✓~~

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The same as cited on Table of Authorities Cited under Statutes
& Rules, please refer to that prior page

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Exhibit C, gives facts material to this case which is RE Steven Rein, Esq., who is subject of Accusation Against An Attorney in Appendix C, that involves in part, the issues of blackmail & malpractice against me & other circumstances related to this case matter which resulted as addressed in Exhibit A, which Rein caused not me, & Rein committed perjury in Exhibit C pages 9-16 of 26 pages & the State Bar of CA just ignored & would not do an investigation with Rein & his position in this perjury matter. The perjury is unrefutable & in part a basis for granting this Petition as a paramount reason to grant this Petition in the good conscience of this court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Besides, decision of lower court errorness, the Constitutional question is why the CA State Bar did not conduct an investigation of Steven Rein to determine that he did in fact engage in blackmail & malpractice against me based on the evidence ~~in~~ support I submitted them, which applies to all State Bars on a nationwide basis, since this denial caused a loss of my constitutional rights as addressed in Table of Authorities Cited under Statutes & Rules, & it's unconstitutional for an attorney on a nationwide basis to be relieved as an attorney of record ~~solely~~^wupon their own word which results in a client ~~be~~ forced into Pro Per status ~~against~~^w that client's will as in this case matter, & a Pro Per status is unconstitutional on its face on a national basis when in that status, a person is expected by the courts on a national basis to know what a lawyer knows in legal matters, & that's unequal, unfair & a preposterous requirement demanded by the court in any manner, shape or form, & the fact that an attorney's Attorney/Client contracts are arbitrary & bias in favor of the attorney, who has automatically a built-in conflict of interest which puts the client at the mercy of the attorney, & gives the attorney control of the client, who has no say how the case is to be handled by the attorney, especially after the contract has been signed, & that control gives the attorney, the conflict of interest that he or she needs to seek from the court, relief as the attorney of record. The client in most cases has no formal law degree or qualifications to be accepted in a State Bar which is the case in my situation. What this court has to decide whether a State Bar must conduct an investigation when the allegations of blackmail & malpractice initially introduced by a client in a Bar complaint without any barriers & in so doing the

Reasons For Granting The Petition (Con'd)

attorney must produce evidence in support that there was no blackmail &/or malpractice, then the State Bar has to decide whether the client or the attorney is right or wrong in the allegation(s) brought forth as the basis of a Bar investigation. If, the State Bar decides that the attorney did in fact & law engage in blackmail & malpractice, then either the local D.A. or the State Attorney General must enter this investigation process & decide whether blackmail & malpractice exists & if so then must prosecute in a court of law. If, the foregoing steps are not undertaken, then how in the world are citizens to have faith, confidence & trust in our judicial system where the Rule of Law rests & that our beloved U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights has any meaning what-so-ever? Are we not a nation under God & all the entails under our Jüdeo-Christain values? This court must search its good conscience & render a just reason whether this Petition for all the reasons given be granted. I did provide the CA State Bar, evidence in support of blackmail & malpractice & more in my initial complaint against Rein which that Bar ignored for an investigation. Had, that Bar concluded after their investigation from Rein's position that indeed he committed blackmail & malpractice, then they are duty bound to turn this matter over to local D.A. or State Attorney General for further investigation & if necessary prosecution of Rein. The Statement of the Case gives evidence in support of Rein's unreftable perjury in court documents, inclusion within court reporter's court transcripts, another reason in granting this Petition.