


Vincent Lynden Young
CDCR No. K-49033/B3-
Lancaster State Prison
POB 4490 Lancaster, CA.
93539



IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
OF AMERICA

Vincent Young,

Petitioner,

vs.

Debbie Asuncion, Warden.

Respondent. /

Case No. 18-7851

REQUEST FOR REHEARING


Comes now: Vincent Young, Petitioner - with: "Request for Rehearing."
Also that, this petition is presented in good faith. and, not for
delay.

Petitioner asserts that this writ of Certiorari will be in aid
of the Honorable Court's Appellate Jurisdiction That, exceptional
circumstances warrant the exercise of the courts' discretionary
powers. and that, adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other
form or from any other court, pursuant to Rule 20.

The Courts initial Order in this matter was for the Respondent's
to reply to the Petitioner's 'request for Wirt of Certiorari.'
However, the Repspondents failed entirely to serve on the Petitioner
their 'reply.' Thus, preveinting his "Petitioner's" response to
the Respondents Reply making it appear that, the Petitioner had
conceded the factual merit of the Respondent's Reply when he had
not. Petitioner had simply not been served the respondents reply.

I, Vincent Lynden Young, does hereby declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA that, the foregoing is true and correct.

dated: 6/3/19


Vincent Lynden Young
Declarant

Secondly, The issuance by this Honorable Court of an extrodianry Writ authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) is warranted where, here, the Petitioner presented credible evidence of [expert clearly] repudiated his original opinion.

The lower court(s) abused their Jurisdiction by failing to act to prevent a miscarriage of jurstice after the expert the expert admitted to perpetrating fraud on the Court(s). and/or promulgated, implemented a ploicy so deficient that the ploicy itself is a repudiation of Constitutional rights and is the moving force of the Constitutional violation.

Thirdly, Petitioner also asserts that the grounds presented are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

RELEIF SOUGHT

A) That, The Petitioner be permitted to first receive and reply to the Respondents Opposition to the Petitioner's "Petition for Writ of Certiorari" that was not served on Petitioner initially. nor, thereafter;

B) That, Petitioner's Wirt of Certiorari by heard on the merit's. and in contrast to his 'oppostion' to the Respondents Reply not served initially on the Petitioner. Petitioner is entitled to as much, under Due Process Principles.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
Vincent Young
VINCENT LYNDEN YOUNG
Petitioner

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