

ORIGINAL

18-6907

FILED
NOV 26 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Robert J. Kulick, Pro Per — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Leisure Village Association,
Inc., et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals, For 9th Circuit, Case # 18-56000
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Robert J. 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

1. Is 9th Cir. Case#18-56000, Dismissal, 11-29-18, null & void because of defective Defendant-Appellee, when correct was Leisure Village Association, Inc., et al? And, same identical Dismissal, 11-29-18 for 9th Cir. Case#18-55904, without this "et al". This case.
2. Is the Rooker-Feldman doctrine constitutional when it fails, "to protect individual rights under the Constitution...the purpose of the U.S. Supreme Court", according to Chief Justice John G. Roberts & Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy? This case.
3. Is the Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #2, when it also denies my equality under the Constitution too? This Case.
4. Is the Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #2, applicable when one's attorney of record engages in blackmail, malpractice, breach of contract against a client, as well as perjury & obstruction of justice? This case.
5. Is the Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #2, applicable when one's attorney of record unjustly relieved by the court which results in extreme bias against the client in eyes of another attorney for replacement? This case.
6. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2&5, applicable when one is forced into Pro Per status against one's will? This case.
7. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2&5, applicable when Pro Per status unfair & unequal under law, perposterous requirement to know law like attorney, unconstitutional? This case.
8. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above items #s 2&5, applicable when Attorney/Client agreements bias & arbitrary in favor of attorney, denies client rights how case run, attorney has sole judgement, attorney uses conflict of interest to get relieved? This case.
9. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2&5, applicable when State Bars fail to protest clients from dishonest attorneys without obstacles preventing investigation whether allegation(s) true or not? This case.
10. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #1, applicable when Defendant (s) use anti-SLAPP(Calif. Civil Code)to deny Defamation, since freedom of speech can not exist on private property(Home Owner Association), freedom of speech only exists on public property? This case.
11. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2&10, applicable when HomeOwner Association has CC&Rs(governing documents)used in retaliation to silence(chill)its defective operating conditions by the use of fine? This case.
12. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,10&11, applicable when HomeOwner Association had known prior that what was fined as violation of CC&Rs was not anonymous as basis for fine? This case.
13. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,10,11&12, applicable when Home Owner Association(HOA)aids & abets its legal vendors(re above item #9)in the suppression of freedom of the press in a racketeering enterprise under RICO? This case.
14. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,9,10,11,12&13, applicable when The Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act(Calif. Civil Code)basically denies freedom of the press by granting authority to a HOA's Board of Dtrs. to establish CC&Rs(governing documents) that deny this freedom of the press? This case.
15. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,10,11,12,13&14, applicable when HOA's CC&Rs(governing documents)are ambiguous rendering them invalid re defective election process re elected Board member can be removed without reason? This case.

(Cont'd)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED (Cont'd)

16. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,9,10,11,12,13,14&15, applicable HOA's attorneys of record engage in anti-Semitism, aided & abetted by HOA's General Mgr.,(please note: Board of Dtrs.cause this to exist), & existing hate-mongering against HOA,member? This case.
17. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,9,10,11,12,13,14,15&16, applicable when Calif. DOJ given no authority to enforce Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act, & the local District Attorney refuses to get involved in disputes within HOA's senior retirement communities? This case.
18. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,10,11,12,13,14,15,16&17, applicable when this "hate-mongering" used against HOA, member to suppress defective operating conditions of HOA's Board of Dtrs. & HOA's General Mgr.,& legal vendors,et al? This case.
19. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2, 10 to 17 & 18, applicable when HOA's member of Board of Dtrs. violates CC&Rs(governing documents)& that violation is not enforced, a double standard? This case.
20. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2, 9 to 19, applicable when HOA's attorneys of record engage in Defamation against HOA, member with false(untrue& incorrect)facts to all members of HOA, acting on behalf of & at the instruction & authority of LVA & Board members by publishing & disseminating a letter which was false & defamatory on its face, since these attorneys knew in advancewhat they were doing was in fact "false", causing the greatest of harm to that HOA, member? This case.
21. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2, 9 to 20, applicable when the trial court awards HOA's attorney fees based on attorneys of record using Defamation with false facts & having prior knowledge that the facts used were false? This Case.
22. Is the Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,9 to 21, applicable when a law's intent was to provide justice but that justice is denied in any particular case & situation, & later another majority opinion reverses a prior law? This case.
23. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2,10 to 22, applicable when a trial court erred in granting an anti-SLAPP motion & awards of attorney fees~~re~~Defendant(s)? This case.
24. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #s 2, 3 to 23, applicable when denying seniors in retirement communities on a nationwide basis a federal law to protect them? This case.
25. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine re above item #2 to 24, applicable when whether Plaintiff or Defendant,its assets eclipsed as a result of unjust court awarded legal expenses? This case & related two cases.
26. Is Calif. Appeal Court, Case #B281922, applicable when it "affirm" trial court's error granting striking cause of action for defamation, basis anti-SLAPP, when anti-SLAPP denies Kulick's individual rights & equality under the law as guaranteed in U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights,remanding back to trial court for defamation re-in-statement?
27. Is Calif. Appeal Court Case #281922, re above item #26, applicable when it erred in stating "Kulick published Newsletters under an assumed name", contrary to evidence(judicial statement)otherwise, "affirm" defective, to be stricken, remanding back to trial court for re-in-statement of defamation?

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED (Cont'd)

28. Is Calif. Appeal Court, Case #B281922, re above item #s 26&27, applicable when it erred in stating "All but one Newsletter was published anonymously under pseudonym 'Joe Byrne'", contrary to evidence(judicial statement)otherwise, "affirm" defective, to be stricken, remanding back to trial court for defamation re-in-statement?
29. Is Calif. Appeal Court, Case #B281922, re above item #26 to 28, applicable when it erred "affirmed" re prior Case #271709 now U.S. Supreme Case#18-6743 on docket 11-20-18, writ of certiorari-petition re remanding back to trial court for re-trial or possible trial court dismissal via this Petition to U.S. Supreme Court?
30. Is Calif. Appeal Court, Case #B281922, re above item #s 26 to 29, applicable when evidence(judicial statement)otherwise, not a "protected activity" or not "probability of prevailing" or not "in a place open to public" or not "issue of public interest" or not "constitutes a 'public forum'"(use of "may" not a sure thing), or does "Letter falls within" any "purview"(anti-SLAPP still denies Kulick's individual rights & equality under the law) or not "expression of opinion" & not "privileged" or not "litigation privilege"("attorney...made defendant ...behalf of clients...standing...anti-SLAPP) or not "Respondants shall recover costs", remanding back to trial court for defamation re-in-statement?
31. Is USDC, Case #18-5718, 7-9-18 Court Order, re above item #s 2 to 30, applicable when related USDC, Case #CV 18-3392 not "Duplicative Action" when each separate cases with each having different causes of actions & relationship in a name Leisure Village Association, Inc.(without "et al") & do not have same plaintiff or defendant in each separate case which makes this "Order" defective on its face, this action not have been dismissed on the foregoing circumstance?
32. Is USDC, Case#18-5718, 7-9-18 Court Order, re above item #s 2 to 31, applicable when denying federal jurisdiction authorized by the Constitution & Congress re "pleading that states a claim for relief", when the evidence(Judicial statement)given in this case does meet the requirement, & does specify this claim based under clear federal law especially in denial of Kulick's individual rights & equality under the law guaranteed in the Constitution & Bill of Rights?
33. Is USDC, Case#18-5718, 7-9-18 Court Order, re above item #s 2 to 32, applicable when it erred in Analysis "The only facts alleged in this action were raised in Plaintiff's prior federal actions" which is contrary to the evidence(judicial statement)given especially completely separated cases & completely separated causes of actions & completely different plaintiffs & defendants, & for Feldman-Feldman doctrine, it deny's Kulick's individual rights & equality under the law(Constitution & Bill of Rights) & can not supercede these supreme laws?
34. Is U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Cir., Case #18-56000, filed 10-29-18, re above item #s 2 to 33, applicable when it denied Kulick's right to "or argument", violating his individual rights & equality under the law (Constitution & Bill of Rights & can not supercede these supreme laws)?
35. Is U.S. Supreme Court's denial re Petition based "only... 'has chosen not accept'", applicable, last court of resort, when individual rights & equality under the law(Constitution & Bill of Rights) has been violated?

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

36. Is Rooker-Feldman doctrine, re above item #'s 2 to 35, applicable when it denys common law, especially re individual rights(Article 14, Section 1.) & equality under the law under same(Article 14, Section 1.?)
37. Is anti-SLAPP, re above item #'s 2 to 36, applicable when it denys common law, especially re individual rights & equality under the law (Article 14, Section 1.) ?

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:

Please note: RE: your prior page in re Question(s) Presented, the "et al" left out are the following Defendants: besides Leisure Village Association, Inc.(LVA): Robert Schaeffer(current LVA General Mgr. , Linda J. Grant(past LVA BOD), Robert Riveles/Theodore Lansing/Charles Kiskaden(current LVA BOD), Patrick Price/John Mayer/Donald Marquardt/ Rita Linsey/Gerald Rosen(past LVA BOD), Robert Ellis(deceased past LVA BOD), Jeffrey A. Beaumont(current LVA attorney of record), Larry F. Gitlin (was LVA attorney of record with Beaumont Gitlin & Tashjian), Lisa A. Tashjian/Tara Radley(current LVA attorneys of record with Beaumont Gitlin Tashjian now Beaumont Tashjian):

Petitioner's former attorney of record, Steven Rein(see U.S. Supreme Court Case # 18-6383, Robert J. Kulick v. Steven Rein)

Please note: RE U.S. Supreme Court Case, Robert J. Kulick vs. Leisure Village Association, Inc.(not "et al"), submitted on 11-12-18 & now awaiting status from court clerk(on this related case)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A USDC, Central District of CA, Case #2:18-cv-05718-PA-SS

APPENDIX B U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, Case # 18-56000

APPENDIX C CA Supreme Court, Case # S248692

APPENDIX D CA Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six,
Case #B281922

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

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Calif. Court of Appeals, Case # B281922, please see Exhibit D	
& Calif. Supreme Court, Case #S248692, please see same Exhibit D	

STATUTES AND RULES

U.S. Constitution under Articles 7,9, 14 Section 1
& Civil Rights Act of 1964 & 1st Amendment rights
& my rights to freedom of speech/freedom of the press:which were
violated that are the fundamental basis which I'm still engaged
Robert J. /
in this case & other case re/Kulick vs. Leisure Village Association,
Inc.(not "et al") :

OTHER

Please note: Just seeking somekind of definitive resolvement, one
way or the other & that may well be a denied from
U.S. Supreme Court, & if not earthly judge in my
favor then God will judge puttingto final rest this
case & other two related cases as referenced in this
case matter, since my good conscience in these cases
demonstrates to God that whatever I did was the right
thing to do, my values are in tact-Judeo-Christain &
our U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights are the corner-
stone of our democracy under GOD a founding principle

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 B to the petition and is Denied with explanation

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is Denied with explanation

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

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 Denied without explanation

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the Appeals, 2nd Appellate Dist. Div. Six court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is Denied with explanation

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 10-29-18.

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.

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 _____.

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

Please refer to the same cited on Table of Authorities & under Statutes & Rules on that prior page

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Robert J. Kulick, The original complaint contained three causes of action: First: Defamation; Second: (Declaratory Relief); Third: (Injunction Relief).
2. Please see Exhibit A, which eclipses my assets in this case & the other related VCSC Case #56-2013-00444977-CU-BC-VTA, submitted on 11-12-18 to U.S. Supreme Court, Robert J. Kulick vs. Leisure Village Association, Inc. (not "et al") & know awaiting status from court clerk (on this related case). Please-Exhibit B, re Defamation; 7-6-15 letter from Beaumont Gitlin Tashjian by Jeffrey A. Beaumont, Esq. (please note: his signature which a handwriting expert would find interesting from an emotional point of view as an unquestionably disturbed person), & June 2015 edition of Leisure Village News, & 6-4-15 Sir Speedy Invoice, stating, "Joe Byrne, editor", & Leisure Village Association (LVA)'s 2015, 1.01, 1.03 & 2.08 Rules & LVA's 2018, Rule 1.01 a. now "\$100 for each infraction" (further fine Leisure Village News another retaliation), & 8-14-15 fax to LVA, Attn: BOD, paid fine \$100 "Under Protest", & Refax, 8-14-15 to: LVA, Attn: BOD, with enclosed copy of 8-14-15 fax to Beaumont, et al, copy of LVA mailing envelope cancellation date 8-12-15 (LVA violated Davis-Stirling Act by not mailing to homeowner's mailing address in LVA's file), & 6-9-10 to LVA, Attn: BOD, Gen. Mgr. Robert Scheaffer, AGM re LVN, & prior 8-5-09 fax to LVA, Attn: BOD, Scheaffer, AGM re LVN, & 10-23-09, VC Clerk Recorder re FBN dba LVN (evidence in support that Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter to ALL Owner, LVA not just defamatory but intentionally deceitful since LVA & Beaumont knew that Kulick was the publisher of LVN as of 8-5-09). The foregoing re prior Question(s) Presented item #s 10 to 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23 to 25, especially related. Also, in Exhibit B, refax: 7-17-15 to: LVA, Attn: BOD, re Beaumont, et al, 7-6-15 letter re "any fines levied", etc., & 7-17-15 fax to Beaumont, et al, re 38122 (my wife) Mrs. Kulick resides & a Holocaust survivor (re prior Question(s) Presented item #16, "anti-Semitism". Exhibit C, re 8-27-18 fax to: Edward Vaisbort, Esq., 's conduct
3. Please see prior Question(s) Presented, item #s 4 to 9, request that this court reviews U.S. Supreme Court Case #18-6383, Robert J. Kulick v. Steven Rein, placed on docket 10-18-18. 11- /
4. Please note: Above item #2, re "submitted on 12-18 to U.S. Supreme Court, Kulick v. LVA (not "et al"), request that this court review this case if court clerk has put it on court docket yet, since vital add'l statements related to this case too, for this Statement Of The Case.
5. Because, the court dismissed Defamation Cause of Action based on anti-SLAPP motion (Calif.C.C.P. #426.16, the trial court denied granting the anti-SLAPP motion & award of attorneys fees. Why? a. Plaintiff's LVN is "Opinion & Analysis" publication independent of LVA: b. Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter was false & defamatory on its face (with authority of LVA & board members, was published & disseminated to only 2,136 titleholders of LVA); & the true facts & circumstances were known prior by defendants that Plaintiff owned LVN as early as 2009 unrepentable & not just "ascertained the identity of the author/publisher of the Newsletter" (LVN) & was intended to directly to injure plaintiff re his reputation, occupation & business (tendency to lessen its profits) & was culmination of a long & on-going pattern & course of conduct by defendants to expose plaintiff to hatred, contempt, ridicule, shame, degradation, & disgrace & or cause plaintiff to be shunned or avoided or discourage other

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

from association or dealing with him & thereby to silence his efforts to exercise his constitutionally guaranteed rights of free speech & freedom of the press: c. Plaintiff believes Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter was libel per se, because his statements were not true & with malice, motivated by hatred, ill will or improper motive against plaintiff, in retaliation for plaintiff's LVN edition, June 2015, plaintiff did not lie about VC Judge during settlement conference (Beaumont was not even inside Judge's closed door chambers but he sat outside of it), by defendants using anti-SLAPP, they just not destroy plaintiff's right's to freedom of speech & freedom of the press but squelch his dissent, which he had no personal gain, just to protect helpless seniors in LVA that resulted in trial court's dismissal of Defamation Cause of Action: c. LVA is private property not public & to get in for its seniors only as Titleholders or anyone else not Titleholders, one needs written authorization from LVA, anit-SLAPP only applies to public property not LVA, by entering via a special pass for others, does not transform LVA's private property into a public property, #425.16 only applies to public property status, hence no protection under #425.16: d. This case, plaintiff was acting as a private citizen & he was fined for publishing LVN "anonymously", LVN was only sent LVN owners not anyone else (public), criticizing the BOD but in general, its expressed intent was to give "another side of the story" about matters of concern to only LVA's owners & residents. It was the 7-6-15, Beaumont letter which politicized the situation that defendants are now trying to take advantage of their defamatory statements under the cloak of the anti-SLAPP statute, they no plaintiff seek to abridge free speech & freedom of press & should not benefit from this transparent tactic. Plaintiff was not a person in the public eye; the conduct complained of by plaintiff against defendants does not affect a large number of people beyond the direct participants, Kulick & LVA; the controversy does not involve a topic of widespread, public interest. The defendants actions in sending this 7-6-15 letter to "all owners" which made public a matter which until then was just between Kulick & the BOD. There was no public participation or public issue, with respect to Kulick's attempt to restrain LVA from imposing future fines on an "anonymous" publication LVN. This anti-SLAPP violates plaintiff's federal individual rights & plaintiff's equality under law & this makes anti-SLAPP unconstitutional & this Calif. statute can not supercede U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights in this foregoing regards. It's not so that Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter was made in a public forum & to claim otherwise is preposterous & unconscionable to one's sense of common decency & respect, what a statute should & must stand-for. And, the foregoing also holds that letter in not shape, form or manner constitutes any public issue either, or of any public interest too, or any public concern, as these non-starters relate to all of the above. Further, Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter in no way was made in the context of a public controversy & the cover of a privacy curtain was not lifted & to state otherwise is not just misleading & not applicable but most disheartening when this anti-SLAPP use unconstitutional per all above. Neither, the notion that a contract which is ambiguous could be valid as in this case.

6. Please see Exhibit D, re Cases under Table Of Authorities Cited.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

7. Exhibit F, 4-11-11 letter Beaumont, To All Owners, "(1)...believes it has identity of the author/publisher" re LVN which was identical words used in Beaumont's 7-6-15 letter, To ALL Owners, @this deception & defamation are facts/supporting evidence that Kulick's June 2015 edition was true & correct, & the allegation of retaliation by LVA's BOD & Beaumont, et al, in VCSC, Case #444977, LVA v. Kulick, was true & correct also; March 2011 edition of LVN; 8-8-18 letter by Kulick, To Owners, RE LVA; 6-15-18 letter by Kulick, To Owners, RE LVA; Inside Leisure Villag (ILV) 3-1-13 edition does not state "author/publisher" yet LVA does not fine it as an anonymous" publication like it did Kulick's LVN: ILV's 6-1-18 edition with same circumstance(s) re ILV's 3-1-13 edition: March 2015, Village Voice, edition re ILV; Nov. 2018, Village Voice, edition re ILV; 5-28-87 letter from Moses re LVA's decal, giving Kulick status as 38122 not vacant re LVA's CC&Rs,*otherwise can not issue "decal"; 6-11-98 letter from LVA's Ombudsman re "necessitates a legal decision" 9-2-98 fax to LVA's BOD, re ILV & other issues for resolvement, got no response from BOD: So here you have documentation attesting to why this 'defamation" should be Remanded back to trial court for its re-instatement in Case #478277.

* and, the add'l LVA's monthly assessment payment for extra person residing at 38122

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Because, of all the 37 items addressed under Question(s) Presented & including all 7 items addressed under Statement Of The Case, & if this court sets aside Rooker-Feldman doctrine which fundamentally denies me, my individual rights, equality under the law, freedom of speech & freedom of the press, since this doctrine can not supersede the foregoing when the supreme U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights is the only prevailing judicial document(s) this court is sworn to obey & rule-on.
2. Because, this Petition is just not solely about me, its paramount intent is to give this court some precedent to protect seniors in retirement communities(HOA) on a nationwide basis from corrupt Boards of Dtrs. & their corrupt legal & insurance representatives. As for me, I'm looking forward to be with my most beloved wife, who's in heaven but still very much alive in my mind, she passed away at 86 years of age on 1-22-17, 2:30 a.m., we were married 51+ years of 53+ relationship, I was reborn with her, she made my life, she was my whole life, so the defendants most likely stripped me of a lot of my financial assets, including the home where my wife's spirit still resides but they will not take my soul. The income I get from Social Security & my VA compensation on a monthly will be enough to sustain me until it's my time to be called by God & be with my wife again & those I've loved & miss so much. The foregoing about "me", etc. are not the "reasons for granting the petition", these kind of thoughts are wrapped around a good conscience that whatever I've done I've always felt was the right thing to do. A Saint, I'm not, since I make mistakes & pay for them but will not if possible pay for the mistakes of other(s). What's above, in item 1 & the "precedent" in the foregoing, are I hope sufficient for this "granting". If, not then at least I've had my day in court & that's what USA is all about that "day" under the Rule of Law which those that died & those injured for our U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights should not have been in VAIN!!!
3. Request this court to review Calif, Supreme Court, Case #S188202 filed on 11-12-2010, Accusation Against An Attorney, Arnold Grant, now the former husband of Linda J. Grant a former President of the LVA & one of defendants in this case. Because of her primarily the LVA sued me in LVA v. Kulick now awaiting your court clerk's status on Kulick v. LVA(without "et al"), her extreme hatred of me & that extreme hatred against me from LVA's attorneys of record Jeffrey Beaumont & Tara Radley was why I was sued, & the causes of actions were the excuse for that suit. Your "review" will give you add'l evidence in support for this "granting" too. And, further request this court to review U.S. Supreme Court, Case #18-6383, Kulick v. Rein, my former attorney of record for both cases, LVA v. Kulick, #444977 & Kulick v. LVA, et al, #478277, since there's also evidence in support in that case for this "granting" too.
4. There's a miscarriage of justice for this court to set right, however, if this court does not set aside Rooker-Feldman doctrine, nothing can be "set right" in the best interests of not just the law but justice, itself, which is what the law is all about. Please note: because of my Dyslexia, reading & writing for me most difficult & since I've not finished my schooling, my legal writings are parroted from lawyer's writings(a lot), the rest self-taught from going to work at age 13 & my retirement in 1985 & subsequent "rest" after that to this date. It does not help that I'm a permanent physically disabled person under ADA, with a lot of physical medical conditions & their medications side effect, /my legal so-called writings. Do not have computer or Smartphone/ for/ do not know how to use them

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Kulick in Pro Per

Date: 11-26-18

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