

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BONNIE ROBLES — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Brookwood Terrace
Apartments — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

State of Kansas Supreme Court
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BONNIE ROBLES

(Your Name)

1243 SW Western Avenue, Apt. B-18

(Address)

Topeka, Kansas. 66604

(City, State, Zip Code)

(785) 409-5690

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Why should it be lawful for the lower court to ignore
"STATUTORY PROCEDURE" violations by the Respondents
during a lower court hearing and then questionably use
statutory procedure against the Petitioner on appeal?

LIST OF PARTIES

BR

- 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:

Gabriel M. Robles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Decision of Kansas Court of Appeals

APPENDIX B

Decision of Shawnee County (Kansas) District Court

APPENDIX C

Decision of Kansas Supreme Court

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Vaughn v. Vaughn et. al.	
U.S. Supreme Court No. 01-5825	5.
Gabriel M. Robles v. United States of America. United States Supreme Court No. 17-6118.	5.

STATUTES AND RULES

18 U.S.C. 1961, sec. 1341	4.
18 U.S.C. 2071	4.
18 U.S.C. § 241	5.
18 U.S.C. § 242	5.
Constitutional Amendment 1.	5.
Constitutional Amendment 5.	5.

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 _____ to the petition and is

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 is unpublished.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 _____ to the petition and is

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 is unpublished.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

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 is unpublished.

The opinion of the Kansas Appeals court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

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 _____.

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 10/30/18. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

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

**"BECAUSE APPELLANTS DID NOT FOLLOW THE STATUTORY PROCEDURE
AND OBTAIN A STAY, THIS APPEAL IS DISMISSED."**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On October 31, 2017, Respondents placed a "NOTICE TO TERMINATE TENANCY" on the ground near our Apartment on a windy day. (attempt to avoid "statutory procedure" and secure eviction by trickery)

On December 8, 2014, Respondents and their counsel along with our racist neighbor Frank Walmer, attempted to intercept a "SUMMONS" to this Petitioner. (2nd attempt to avoid **statutory procedure** and secure eviction by trickery.)

On December 19, 2017, (Eviction hearing) Judge Brett Berry and counsel for the Respondent were shocked when my husband mentioned our "Defendant's Answer & COUNTERCOMPLAINT". We believe the male lawyer was aware that we were aware of the attempted trickery and bowed out of the case based on fear and possible prosecution. That male is David Watson, #18783, and he failed to advise the court or his replacement Betsy A. Baker, #25942, of the document. They later (4 days after hearing) answered COUNTERCOMPLAINT and falsified court records to cover up their **statutory procedure** violation. (18 USC 1961, sec. 1341. 18 USC 2071) Petitioner was not allowed by the lower court to present their case which included a 14 page document dated April 12, 2016 to July 16, 2016, 50 hours of videotape, and 50 hours of audiotape against Respondents.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner and my husband are Christians. We do not drink, do drugs, or cheat on each other since we were joined in Holy Matrimony on August 7, 2006. It seems as though we have been in a legal pissing contest since we were forced to defend our Constitutional and civil rights against the judicial system since "Vaughn v. Vaughn et. al. SC# 01-5825".

I take this opportunity to thank the Court for putting an end to my wage garnishment and giving me an \$1,100.00 check from the Treasury. My maiden name is Vaughn.

The Petitioner's husband Gabriel M. Robles, is on the low-income "HUD/VASH" housing program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development agency delayed our complaint against the Respondent in violation of their own guidelines. For this delay we became homeless.

The Veterans Affairs caseworker's were well aware of our living conditions and simply paid us lip service. In a medical malpractice lawsuit the U.S. Attorney and my husband's caseworker attempted to trick my husband into signing an "Advanced Directive" to involuntarily incarcerate him.

In concert (or collusion) with the above named agencies, the Topeka, Kansas., housing authority ignored our complaints and our evidence (almost 100 hours of audio/video recordings) and State and Federal laws that should have protected us from this type of religious and political harassment/discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Robles

Date: January 16, 2019