

No. 18-6907

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

ROBERT J. KULICK, Pro Per,

Petitioner,

vs.

LEISURE VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, INC., et al.,

Respondents.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Ninth Circuit**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

ROBERT J. KULICK, Pro Per
38122 Village 38
Camarillo, CA 93012
310/474-1848

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OTHER GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRE- SENTED	1
CONCLUSION.....	3
CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH.....	4
APPENDIX	
Exhibit A. Superior Court Minute Order.....	App. 1
Exhibit B. Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Attorney Fees	App. 4
Exhibit C. Compendium of Evidence for Motion for Appellate Attorney Fees	App. 11

**OTHER GROUNDS NOT
PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED**

1. In Exhibit A, How can Leisure Village Association, Inc. (LVA) be entitled to Appeal's attorney fees (& costs) in Re: anti-SLAPP a Calif. law when that law is superseded by U.S. Constitution "when that law" denies Robert J. Kulick (Kulick) his individual rights under the Constitution & when those attorney fees (& costs) violate "that Law" since "that law" states, "may only include compensation for work done in connection with the anti-SLAPP motion", & this appeal?
2. In Exhibit A, How can Rooker-Feldman doctrine still be applicable when it's superseded by the U.S. Constitution which protects Kulick's individual rights under the Constitution to redress a miscarriage of justice as far as the U.S. Supreme Court a court of last resort?
3. In Exhibit B, How can the LVA have justification to be awarded attorney fees (& costs) in this Appeal when that award violates what the anti-SLAPP states, "may only include compensation for work done in connection with the anti-SLAPP motion", & this appeal?
4. In Exhibit B, How can LVA be awarded attorney fees (& costs) for Kulick's bankruptcy case or settlement conference or mediation or correspondence issues unrelated to anti-SLAPP motion, & this appeal, as addressed in above item #s 1, 2, & 3?
5. In Exhibit B, How can excessive billings in Appeal for 128.50 hours for attorney fees be awarded

when they are in violation as addressed in above item #s 1, 2, 3, & 4? in RE: under anti-SLAPP, Calif. law?

6. In Exhibit C, How can LVA's billing invoice for charges not be in violation of the anti-SLAPP, Calif. law which states, "may only include compensation for work done in connection with the anti-SLAPP motion, & this Appeal, as addressed in above item #s 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5?
7. How can this court ignore two U.S. Supreme Court, Case #18-6383 & # 18-6743 which are related & intertwined when combined for this court's kind consideration, since these cases do provide this court with sufficient mitigating circumstances of law & facts in contributing to not sustain the awarding of attorney fees (& costs) in Re: for this Appeal in \$49,256.50 in attorney fees to be awarded to LVA, et al, as addressed in the above item #s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6?
8. How can this court ignore that LVA's litigation against Kulick was retaliatory to stop his publication of the Leisure Village News which denies Kulick's rights under the Constitution of Freedom of the Press in above Case #18-6743?
9. How can this court ignore that the defamation by LVA, et al, against Kulick was not "public forum" but was "private forum" which was in a letter by LVA's attorney of record Jeffrey A. Beaumont that was U.S. mailed exclusively to only All Owners in the LVA no one else & that letter was false making it not just defamation but mail fraud?

10. How can this court ignore that Kulick's reputation was unjustly damaged by Beaumont's above "letter" in Re: defamation against Kulick?
11. How can this court ignore above item #s 8, 9 & 10, when above Case #s 18-6383 & 18-6743 provide this court with "sufficient" mitigating law & facts to support why the award for attorney fees (& costs) in this Appeal, should not be awarded, as addressed in above item #s 1 to 7 & including this item # 11 with item #s 8, 9 & 10? These "Cases" included in book in process The Leisure Village Story.
12. This court, as a public agency under the Americans With Disabilities Act, is required to accommodate disabled persons like myself, who are medically certified as permanently, physically disabled, to refund my \$200 court filing fee & after that to grant Robert Kulick a hearing, & because the Rooker-Feldman doctrine prevents any "protection of the people" & their "human dignity," especially when "the law promises to enhance life," & is not that the intent of the Rule of Law? (Former Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy)

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT J. KULICK, Pro Per

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

1. This petition presented is in good faith & not for delay.
2. The grounds for this Petition are limited intervening circumstances for other grounds not previously presented.

ROBERT J. KULICK

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