

No. 18-7907

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

OCT 08 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOHN HASSAN — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

MARKS, KERR, HBPOA, INC — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS 2ND CIRCUIT
PETITION FOR REHEARING DENIED SEPT 25, 2018/10/2/18
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOHN HASSAN
(Your Name)

43 CYNTHIA LAKE
(Address)

CENTER MORICHES, NEW YORK 11934
(City, State, Zip Code)

631 878-8572
(Phone Number)

I AM TRYING MY BEST TO FOLLOW AND COMPLY WITH ALL UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES 14.1 IF I FAIL AGAIN IT WILL COST VERY MUCH MORE MONEY AND JEOPARDIZE ANY POSSIBILITY TO SUBMIT MY PETITIONS TO THE COURT. I DO NOT WANT THAT TO HAPPEN VERY VERY MUCH!

RULE 14.1 & QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW
DOES HOLIDAY BEACH PROPERTY OWNER ASSN., INC. HAVE A RIGHT TO SEIZE THE 2 ACRE PROPERTY (PLOT A) TO WHICH ALL 556 RESIDENTS OF THIS AREA HAVE A EASEMENT IN OUR DEEDS.

CAN HBPOA INC. INCORPORATE ITSELF AS A CIVIL ASSOCIATION AND ASSESS AND LEVY TAXES, PENALTIES AND INTEREST ON RESIDENTS, WHOSE PROPERTY THEY SEIZED OR COMPEL THEM TO PAY DUES TO HBPOA INC. CONTINUOUSLY AND IN PERPETUITY UNLESS RESIDENT SURRENDER THEIR DEEDER EASEMENT RIGHTS TO HBPOA INC.

HBPOA PUT A FENCE AROUND PLOT A AND BUILT A COMMERCIAL MARINA IN PLOT A. ONLY MEMBERS AND PEOPLE WHO RENT BOAT SLIPS ARE ALLOWED INSIDE. BESIDES LOCKED GATES, THEY HAVE POLICE THEMSELVES

ALL DEEDS 556 HAD BEACH AND BOATING RIGHTS TO A NATURAL STATE OF 2 ACRES AND EQUAL RIGHTS IN 1936 WHEN THIS MANSURY ESTATE WAS DEVELOPED AND SUB DIVIDED. THEY EACH BUILT A HOME ON THEIR LOT. THEN AFTERWARD HBPOA WAS FORMED IN 1951 AND INCORPORATED A YEAR LATER.

THEY STARTED A TAX ON RESIDENTS AND ENFORCED IT WITH A LOCAL LAWYER AND A TITLE GUARANTEE AGENT WHO WOULD BLOCK A CLOSING OF SALE OF PROPERTY UNTIL SELLER PAID THE TAX PENALTY AND INTEREST OR DUES

WHEN JOSEF SCHRABAL SUED HBPOA INC. IN 1987 FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT BECAUSE PRESIDENT EDMUND SJAGY SEIZED HIS BOAT SLIP FOR PRESIDENTS BOAT THE NEW YORK STATE COURT DENIED JUDGEMENT UNTIL AFTER A TRIAL. BUT THERE WAS NO DISPUTE OF FACTS AND NO TRIABLE ISSUES. SCHRABAL RELIED ONLY ON DEED AND PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND REAL ESTATE LAW. SCHRABAL ABANDONED / TERMINATED THE CASE BECAUSE HE WAS CERTAIN IT WAS FIXED IN 1989.

AFTER THAT, SEVERAL SUPREME COURT (NY) JUDGES NUMERARIES ENTERED THE CASE THAT PLAINTIFF SCHRABAL ABANDONED / TERMINATED. SCHRABAL AND I NEVER SAW THESE JUDGES OR KNOW WHAT ACTIONS THEY TOOK BUT HBPOA INC. CLAIMS THEY HAVE COURT ORDERS THAT WE MUST ALL PAY DUES TO HBPOA, INC. BASED ON THE COURT ORDERS OF THESE JUDGES.

IN THE MANDATES OF US COURT OF APPEALS THE CIRCUIT RULED THAT I (HASSAN) WAS NOT THE LOSER IN SCHRABAL

BECAUSE THE CASE HAD BEEN TERMINATED BEFORE THEY ISSUED THEIR ORDERS. COPPERTINO WAS THE JUDGE IN SCHRAIBAL IN 1989 AND HE DENIED ANY JUDGMENT UNTIL A TRIAL THAT NEVER WAS ANY TRIAL

HERBA, INC. WAS A MEMBER OF AFFILIATED BROOK HAVEN CIVIC ASSOCIATIONS (ABCO), ABCO ORGANIZATIONS ORGANIZED MEETINGS BETWEEN CIVICS, JUDGES AND POLITICIANS OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS. THAT IS THEIR PURPOSE. BEYOND THAT IT IS A SECRET ORGANIZATION.

I WAS ONE OF 7 OR 8 RESIDENTS WHO RECEIVED A SUMMONS BY MAIL FROM SMALL CLAIM COURT 6TH DISTRICT IN AMOUNT OF MONIES DUE \$13,452.50 SWORN BY SECRET AGENT OF HERBA, INC. SHE WHISPERED HER NAME COURT SO I WAS DENIED MY DEMAND TO LEARN HER NAME. I WAS DENIED THE DEMAND I MADE TO SEE THE DOCUMENT SHE GAVE TO THE JUDGE. AND I WAS DENIED THE RIGHT TO TESTIFY BECAUSE I REFUSED TO SWEAR AN OATH BEFORE THE COURT WHICH I SAID HAD NO JURISDICTION OVER ME. I DID NOT KNOW THE JUDGE WAS AN ARBITRATOR EITHER. AND AN ARMED COURT OFFICER TOLD ME I MUST SWEAR AN OATH WHICH I AGAIN REFUSED TO DO. I DEMANDED THAT MY FILING LAWSUIT IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT HAD SUPERIOR JURISDICTION. THE SUMMONS WAS DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2016 10H THE TRIAL DATE WAS JUNE 6, 2016 ABOUT 15 MINUTES

THE ARBITRATOR THREATENED ~~ON~~ ALL HERBA INC DEFENDANTS, IF THEY DID NOT CONSENT TO PAY HERBA INC AND WENT TO TRIAL HE WOULD ORDER THEM TO PAY A HIGHER JUDGMENT. NONE OF US HAD LAWYERS BUT I REFUSED TO PAY ANYTHING AND I WAS THE ONLY ONE WHO WENT TO TRIAL. BECAUSE OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS THE COURT JUDGMENT AGAINST ME WAS AND IS NOW \$1212.50 AND THEY CAN ENFORCE THEIR TAXES, PENALTIES + INTEREST IN THE NEW YORK STATE COURT SYSTEM. I ~~BEHOLD~~ HERBA CONTINUOUSLY AND IN REPEATEDLY AGAINST ME AND HUNDREDS OF OTHER RESIDENTS UNLESS WE SURRENDER OUR BASEMENT RIGHTS TO THEM.

I BELIEVE THERE IS COLLUSION BETWEEN NEW YORK STATE COURT SYSTEM AND HERBA INC - DUPLICITY, FRAUD, SUBVERSION, SUPREMACY, FUGES, EXTORTION, RACKETEERING, SEIZURE OF TITLE TO PROPERTY, CORRUPT ENTERPRISE. THERE IS NO APPEAL BY LAW, ONLY DE NOVO AND VIOLATES UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENT AND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.

THE MAIN BODY OF MY PETITION INCLUDES FURTHER JURISDICTION INCLUDING COURT OF APPEALS MANDATES DATED OCTOBER 2, 2012 AND DENIAL OF REHEARING TO VOID NEW YORK STATE COURT JUDGMENT VS ME \$1212.50. I ASK UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO GRANT ME CERTIORARI AND IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND LEGAL ASSISTANCE AND ALLOW ME TO PRESENT THIS CASE IN UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURT I BELIEVE I HAVE STATED FACTUAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL WORTHINESS AND JUSTIFICATION. I SERVED STATE OF NY, DEFENDANTS WITH CONSENT OF THEIR SECRETARIES OR RECEIPTS TO SEND SUMMONS BY US MAIL.

NOVEMBER 9, 2018

John Nasson Petitioner Pro Se
43 Cypress Cove Center Florida
NY 11934 Phone: 631 878-8572

WOULD THE US SUPREME COURT DEEM THE NEW YORK STATE COURT SYSTEM AND THE ENTIRE STATE GOVERNMENT CONTEMPTFUL AND BIASED TO ALLOW AN ANONYMOUS AGENT TO INIATE MULTIPLE LAWSUITS (SHE IS NOT A LAWYER) BY PAYING \$5.00 TO FOR A POSTCARD SERVED ON DEFENDANTS BY MAIL AND THEN DEMANDING A MORE EXPENSIVE AND CONVOLUTED PROCESS FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND AND VINDICATE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN A LEGITIMATE JUDICIAL COURT?

AND THE US COURT OF APPEALS 2ND CIRCUIT (17-3167) RELIED ON THE ONLY REMEDY THE STATE ALLOWS THE VICTIMS OF THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL COURT "DE NOVO" TO DENY THE STATE AND HEROA, INC. ARGUMENT THAT I AM BARRED FROM FEDERAL COURT BY ROOKER FELDMAN WHICH COURT OF APPEAL RULED COULD NOT APPLY TO ME BECAUSE THE (SUPERNUMERARY - FY TERM) HAD ACTED AFTER THE SCHRABAL CASE WAS TERMINATED.

AND STILL THE ARBITRATORS JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME AND OTHER RESIDENTS IS STILL BINDING AGAINST US IN NEW YORK STATE COURT BASED ON SECRET EVIDENCE WE WERE NOT ALLOWED TO SEE BUT WHICH I AM 99.9% SURE WAS ORDERS FROM SUPERNUMERARY JUDGES 27 YEARS BEFORE OUR JUDGEMENTS WERE ISSUED AGAINST US IN STATE COURT, SHOULD US COURT OF APPEALS EXTEND ITS DE NOVO REVIEW AND VOID ALL OR MY JUDGEMENT \$1212.50 AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES AGAINST NEW YORK STATE COURT SYSTEM AND HEROA, INC.?

SHOULD FEDERAL COURTS ALSO FIND EVIDENCE OF COLLUSION EXTORTION RACKETEERING FRAUD ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF OUR PROPERTY CORRUPT ENTERPRISE DUPLICITY SUBVERSION SUBTERRUGES WHICH I HOPE WILL CAUSE THE US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO INVESTIGATE AND TAKE FURTHER ACTION AND ENFORCE ARTICLE 4 SECTION 4 OF US CONSTITUTION AND MY 1ST AMENDMENT AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS?

ISN'T THE STATE COURTS APPARENTLY CREATING RULES TO BAR FEDERAL COURTS FROM INTERFERING IN THEIR SYSTEMIC CORRUPTION AND CRIMINAL ACTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS WITH IMPUNITY? DOESN'T THE US COURTS HAVE AN OVERRIDING AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE FEDERAL LAWS AND GUARD OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS?

THE STATE COURT DENIED MY DEMAND FOR DISCOVERY AND AN ACCOUNTING OF ALL INCOME AND EXPENSES OF HEROA INC. WHICH I BELIEVE A GOVERNMENT OR TAX AUTHORITY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE TO TAXPAYERS AND OR SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE IN A LAWSUIT FOR MONIES DUE OR TO COMPEL RESIDENTS TO PAY DUES TO ANY POLITICAL/CIVIL ASSOCIATION.

THE STATE COURT AND HEROA, INC. COMMITTED AN ARMED ROBBERY AGAINST ME AND MANY OTHER CURRENT AND FORMER RESIDENTS AND DOES CONTINUOUSLY AND PERPETUALLY AND WE AND I HAVE A RIGHT TO THE PROTECTION OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN UNITED STATES COURTS AND UNITED STATES JUDGES ARE UNDER OATH OF OFFICE TO EXAMINE OUR PLEADINGS AND ADJUDGE AND UPHOLD OUR RIGHTS TO PROPERTY AND THE PROCESS AND LIFE AND FREEDOM AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORIGINALS BELOW

JURISDICTION : NEW YORK STATE LAW DOES NOT ALLOW
APPEAL FROM DISTRICT COURT ARBITRATOR ONLY
DE NOVO

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED :
1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENTS AND ARTICLE 4 SECTION 4
THE COURTS VIOLATE MY AND OTHER RESIDENT'S EASE-
MENT RIGHTS AND GIVE HBPOA, INC. (A CIVIC ORGANIZATI-
ON THE RIGHT TO ASSESS, LEVY TAXES, PENALTIES, INTEREST
AND MEMBERSHIP DUES ON ME AND HUNDREDS OF OTHER
RESIDENTS SINCE 1957 AND WITH COURT SANCTION IN 1988-
1989 SCHRABAL VS HBPOA, INC. THEY HIRE A LADY WHO IS
ALLOWED TO SUE US FOR ASSESSMENTS, PENALTIES
INTEREST (MEMBERSHIP DUES) IN STATE COURTS FORCED
ARBITRATION IN WHICH I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO TESTIFY OR
SEE DOCUMENTS THIS ANONYMOUS LADY GAVE TO THE
ARBITRATOR AT THAT "TRIAL". I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO
KNOW HER NAME OR BUSINESS BUT SHE WAS KNOWN TO
THE COURT. THE US COURT OF APPEALS RULED DE NOVO
THAT THE (SUPERNUMERARY - MY TERM) JUDGES RULES IN
SCHRABAL VS HBPOA, INC. DID NOT APPLY TO ME AS THAT
CASE WAS TERMINATED BEFORE THEIR RULINGS, BUT
THE US COURT OF APPEALS DENIED MY PETITION FOR RE-
HEARING TO VOID THEIR \$1000.00 JUDGEMENT BY
ARBITRATOR AGAINST ME.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A ORDER OF US COURT OF APPEAL DENYING
MY PETITION FOR REHEARING TO VOID ARBITRATOR'S
\$1000.00 JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME

APPENDIX B SUMMARY ORDER OF US COURT OF APPEALS
PARTIAL DE NOVO RULING THAT SCHRABAL VS HBPOA, INC.
JUDGES RULINGS DID NOT APPLY AGAINST ME BECAUSE
THAT CASE WAS TERMINATED BEFORE THEIR RULINGS.

APPENDIX C ORDER OF US DISTRICT COURT DISMISSING
MY PETITION TO THE COURT

PAGES 1 (HANDWRITTEN) MY EXPLANATION OF MY SERVICE OF MY
PETITION FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE US DISTRICT COURT

PAGES 2-6 (HANDWRITTEN) STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was AUGUST 22 2018 / 10/2/18

☐ 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: SEPT. 25 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix 10/2/18.

☐ 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 _____.
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).

TO MY KNOWLEDGE, THERE WERE TWO OBJECT-
IONS BY DEFENDANT/APPELLES: THE ROCKLER
PRECEDENT WHICH THE US COURT OF APPEALS RULED
DID NOT APPLY TO ME (IN THEIR SUMMARY ORDER
BECAUSE THE NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT
JUDGES RULINGS WERE ISSUED AFTER THE LAWSUIT
FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT "SCHRABAL" 1988 HAD
BEEN TERMINATED BEFORE THOSE JUDGES HAD
ENTERED THE CASE.

THE SECOND OBJECTION WAS THAT I BEGAN
THE PRESENT LAWSUIT IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT BY IMPROPER SERVICE I DENY THAT OBJECT-
ION. THE DEFENDANTS BEGAN THIS LAWSUIT AGAINST
ME IN BROOKHAVEN TOWN COURT SMALL CLAIMS //
SUFFOLK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT // NEW YORK STATE
BY SERVICE BY MAIL SUMMONS SWORN UNDER OATH BY
WHO AN AGENT WHO WAS ALLOWED BY THE COURT TO
CONCEAL HER NAME FROM ME BUT WAS KNOWN BY THE
COURT CLERKS. THE STATE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE SAID
SHE IS NOT A LAWYER AND THEY HAD NO AUTHORITY OVER
HER. THEN BEFORE THE RETURN DATE OF THEIR
SUMMONS I FILED AN ANSWER TO THEIR SUMMONS AND
DEMAND FOR THEIR LEGAL JUSTIFICATION AND MY RIGHT
TO DISCOVERY WITH NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT
SYSTEM (MARKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND SUFFOLK
COUNTY DISTRICT COURT (KERR, SUPERVISOR) AND HBFOA,
INC. AT THEIR PO ADDRESS ON SUMMONS. I TELEPHONED
NY STATE COURTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE IF I COULD SERVE
THEM BY MAIL AND RECEPTIONIST SAID "YES" SHE SAID OR
ANYONE REPRESENTING ME WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO
THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND THAT US MAIL WAS ACCEPTABLE.
I ALSO TELEPHONED THE SUFFOLK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
AND I GOT THE SAME ANSWER TO MY REQUEST TO SERVICE
BY MAIL AND I FILED THE EXACT SAME PAPERS TO HBFOA,
INC. TO THEIR LISTED PO ADDRESS ON SUMMON (THEIR PO
ADDRESS ON SUMMONS.

SIMULTANEOUSLY I FILED THE SAME PAPERS
WITH THE US DISTRICT COURT EDNY FOR ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE TO BLOCK THE NEW YORK, SUFFOLK, BROOKHAVEN
TOWN SMALL CLAIMS COURT LAWSUIT AGAINST ME.
WHICH WAS DENIED BUT I OBTAINED SUMMONS FOR ALL
PARTIES AND I SERVED ALL PARTIES THE SAME WAY
THEY SERVED AND INITIATED THEIR LAWSUIT AGAINST ME
AND WHICH I HAD THEIR CONSENT AND LEGAL RIGHT TO DO.
FOR THEIR LAWSUIT AGAINST ME NONE OF THEM NOTIFIED
ME THAT THEY WERE REPRESENTED BY ATTORNEYS.

AFTER THEY ISSUED JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME I WAS
INFORMED THAT THE TRIAL JUDGE WAS AN ARBITRATOR
AND THERE WAS NO APPEAL BUT ONLY A DE NOVO AND U.S.
COURT OF APPEALS SUMMARY ORDER WAS A "DE NOVO"
BUT THEY DENIED MY REQUEST TO VOID THE DEFENDANTS
JUDGEMENT AGAINST AND THEY IGNORED MY CLAIMS OF THEFT
DEFENDANTS FRAUD, EXTORTION, RACKETEERING, TITLE AND
CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE AGAINST ME AND SEVERAL OTHER
RESIDENTS AT THE SAME LOCAL COURT IN VIOLATION OF
OUR U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
AT THE SAME DAY

THE COURT OF APPEALS SUMMARY JUDGEMENT 17-3167 REFERS TO MY FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM AND I AM ASKING NOW IF THE FACTS I AM REPEATING NOW AND CONTAINED IN MY ORIGINAL COMPLAINT WHEN I OBTAINED THE SUMMONES FROM THE US DISTRICT COURT AND SERVED DEFENDANTS MARKS, NEWY STATE COURT SYSTEM, KERR, SUFFOLK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT AND HOLIDAY BEACH PROPERTY OWNERS ASSN. INC.

I AM RECALLING FROM MEMORY THESE FACTS BUT THEY CAN BE VERIFIED BY THE DOCUMENTS I SERVED ON THE ABOVE DEFENDANTS. BUT I ALSO WANT TO NOTE THAT THE US DISTRICT COURT CLERK LOST MY FIRST PAYMENT CHECK FILING FEE OF \$500 AND RETURNED OTHER PAPERS TO ME. I PHONED THE CLERK AND I INSISTED THAT I HAD INCLUDED THE PAYMENT CHECK AND SHE SAID SHE WOULD SEARCH FOR IT. I THEN SENT A SECOND CHECK FOR \$500 BACK TO THE CLERK WITH THE SAME PAPERS SHE RETURNED TO ME. I THEN WAITED UNTIL ONE OF THE CHECKS CLEARED THE BANK AND ASKED THE BANK TO CANCEL THE OTHER SO NOW I WONDER IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER MIX UPS IN THE US DISTRICT COURT OFFICE OF CLERK.

I CLAIMED THAT HBPOA INC, NEVER HAD ANY LEGAL RIGHT TO SEIZE MY PROPERTY (EASEMENT) OR TO BUILD A COMMERCIAL MARINA AS A CORRUPT ENTERPRISE AND SLANDER OF TITLE.

THEY HAVE NO LEGAL RIGHT TO SET UP LOCKED GATES AND FENCES TO BAR MY ACCESS TO EASEMENTS TO CREATE THEIR OWN GOVERNMENT AND POLICE OFFICERS, TO ASSESS AND LEVY TAXES OR COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP FEES PENALTIES AND INTEREST, GOVERNMENT POWERS AND STATE AUTHORITY WITHOUT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK STATE LAW AND SECRETARY OF STATE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL UNDER ARTICLE 4 §4 AS CONSTITUTION THAT ALL DEFENDANTS ENGAGED IN FRAUD, EXTORTION RACKETEERING COLLUSION SUBTERFUGE SUBVERSION AND DO SO CONTINUOUSLY EVERY YEAR SINCE 1957 AND FOREVER IN PERPETUITY.

THAT I DID NOT KNOW THAT THE BROOKHAVEN TOWN COURT TRIAL WAS CONDUCTED BY AN ARBITRATOR - NOT A JUDGE AND THAT NEW YORK STATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER ARBITRATORS BUT I DID PROTEST THAT TOWN COURT HAD NO JURISDICTION OVER ARBITRATORS. I DISCOVERED HE WAS AN ARBITRATOR WHEN I RECEIVED THE COURT JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME A WEEK AFTER THE TRIAL.

I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO KNOW THE IDENTITY OF THE ONLY WITNESS AGAINST ME WHO HAD SWORN THE SUMMONS & C AGAINST ME AND OTHER RESIDENTS BUT SHE IS NOT A LAWYER AND IS NOT SUBJECT TO GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE. SHE CLAIMED TO REPRESENT HBPOA, INCORPORATED AND HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS BUT WHEN I ASKED HBPOA INC, RENTER BOAT SLIPS AND MEMBERSHIP TO NON RESIDENTS, SHE SAID SHE DID NOT. WHEN I ASKED HER AGAIN IF HBPOA INC.

DID ACCEPT MEMBERSHIP PAYMENTS A BOAT SLIP FROM
NON RESIDENTS - SHE HESITANTLY ANSWERED YES.

I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO SEE OR HAVE COPIES OF THE
DOCUMENTS SHE GAVE TO THE ARBITRATOR BUT I AM
SURE THAT IT WAS A DECISION FROM A STATE SUPREME
COURT JUDGE (BUT NOT THE ASSIGNED JUDGE, JOHN
COPPERTINO) ISSUED AFTER SCHABAL ABANDONED THE
CASE IN 1989, WHICH THE COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED IN
17-3167 SUMMARY JUDGEMENT THAT I AM NOT THE LOSER - AND
THEREFOR IS NOT ENFORCEABLE AGAINST ME

I CLAIM THAT THIS TRIAL WOULD NOT ALLOW ME TO TESTIFY
BECAUSE I REFUSED TO SWEAR AN OATH AND ALL THE
SUBTERFUGE, SUBVERSION AND COLLUSION AND PREJUDICE
VIOLATED MY US CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, ILLEGAL SEIZURE
OF MY PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

AND I CLAIM THAT COMPELLING ME TO PAY TO HBPOA, INC. IS
A VIOLATION OF MY FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS NOT TO
SUPPORT AN ORGANIZED CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE AND IN
PERPETUITY.

HBPOA, INC WOULD NOT PROVIDE ME AN ACCOUNTING OF THEIR
INCOME AND EXPENSES AS I DEMANDED AND THE COURTS
WOULD NOT COMPEL THEM TO DO SO

HBPOA INC COERCES RESIDENTS TO SURRENDER THEIR
EASEMENTS TO HBPOA INC IN RETURN FOR EXEMPTION
FROM HBPOA INC MEMBERSHIP DUES, TAXES, INTEREST
PENALTIES.

I BELIEVE THE ARBITRATORS VERDICT SHOULD BE
VOIDED AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES IMPOSED ON HBPOA, INC.
AND THAT THE COURT SHOULD INVITE OR URGE THE U.S.
DEPT. OF JUSTICE TO INVESTIGATE THEIR ACTIONS FOR
VIOLATING U.S. CRIMINAL LAWS: EXTORTION, FRAUD
RACKETEERING, CORRUPT ENTERPRISE AND OTHER
U.S LAWS. STATE LAWS ARE ALSO VIOLATED, BUT THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL KNOWS THAT AND HAS KNOWN THAT
ABOUT 30 YEARS.

I am willing to serve this petition before September 5th
2018

I do not have access to my original complaint to the
US District Court but I do remember making the claims
stated above and which I believe my case should be
remanded. There are other issues that were included in
my original complaint that are not fresh as those above
right now

John Hassan Petitioner:
43 Cynthia Lane
Center Moriches New York 11931
Appellant

August 31 2018

IN 1955 THE MASURY ESTATE IN CENTER MORICHES WAS SOLD AND SUBDIVIDED INTO 556 LOTS AND EACH DEED PROVIDED AN EASEMENT TO A 2 ACRE PLOT A FOR BEACH AND BOATING. H.B.P.O. ASSN, ~~THE~~ WAS FORMED BY SOME RESIDENTS WHO 1 YEAR LATER INCORPORATED (1957) AND CLAIMED THAT ALL RESIDENTS MUST PAY MEMBERSHIP DUES. WHEN A RESIDENT SOLD HIS LOT OR HOME A LAWYER AND A TITLE GUARANTEE AGENT WOULD THREATEN TO BLOCK THE SALE UNLESS THE RESIDENT PAID ALL DUES CLAIMED BY HBPOA, INC.

IN 1988 THE PRESIDENT OF HBPOA INC., EDMUND SILAGY, ORDERED A RESIDENT TO REMOVE HIS "HOBIE" (2 PERSON SAILBOAT) FROM A SPOT THAT SILAGY WANTED FOR HIMSELF. THE HOBIE OWNER JOSEF SCHRABAL SUED HBPOA, INC. AND SILAGY FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT IN NY STATE SUPREME COURT BASED ON PUBLIC DOCUMENT (DEED) AND REAL ESTATE LAW. THERE WAS NO FACTUAL DISPUTE BUT THE COURTS RULED THAT HBPOA, INC. HAS A RIGHT TO TRIAL. THERE WAS NO IDENTIFIED ISSUE TO BE PROVED AT TRIAL AND SCHRABAL WAS DENIED RIGHT TO APPEAL UNTIL A TRIAL WAS HELD. HBPOA INC. WAS A MEMBER OF ABCO (AFFILIATED BROOKHAVEN CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS). ABCO ARRANGES POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR ITS MEMBERS INCLUDING AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO JUDGES AND POLITICIANS. I JOINED SCHRABAL AS INTERVENOR IN 1989 AFTER I READ ABOUT THE LAWSUIT IN A LOCAL NEWSPAPER AND FOUND SCHRABAL'S PHONE LISTED IN A DIRECTORY. THEN SCHRABAL ABANDONED THE LAWSUIT. HE SAID THE CASE IS FIXED AND HIS ELDERLY AGE AND HIS LOVE FOR SAILING, NOT TO SPEND HIS REMAINING LIFE IN COURT.

AFTER SCHRABAL ABANDONED HIS LAWSUIT BEFORE JUDGE JOHN COPPERTINO, SEVERAL OTHER JUDGES ENTERED AND RULED THAT HBPOA, INC. CAN COLLECT DUES. IN 2016 HBPOA INC FOUND A PERSON, UNIDENTIFIED AND NOT A LAWYER, (POSSIBLY A BILL COLLECTOR) WHO WAS EXPERIENCED IN LOCAL SMALL CLAIMS COURTS AND SHE SUED SIX RESIDENTS FOR SEVERAL THOUSAND \$ EACH AND AN LOCAL SMALL CLAIMS COURT ARBITRATOR GRANTED HER DEMANDS. I SUED IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT BUT WAS DISMISSED VS NY STATE COURT SYSTEM FOR IMPROPER SERVICE AND ROCKLER PRECEDENT. I CHARGED ALL DEFENDANTS WITH FRAUD, SUBTERFUGE COLLUSION SUBVERSION RACKETEERING, EXTORTION, SLANDER OF TITLE CORRUPT ENTERPRISE, 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENT ART IV §4 U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE ARBITRATOR REFUSED MY RIGHT TO TESTIFY OR SEE THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY THE UNIDENTIFIED AGENT OF HBPOA INC.

H3PO4, INC PURCHASED MASURY ESTATE GUEST HOUSE WHICH THEY RENT FOR CATERING PARTIES (MASURY BALLROOM - PLOT B) WITH MONEY THEY EXTORTED FROM RESIDENTS AND THEY OFFER TO STOP CHARGING DUES OR ASSESS AND EVEN TAXES IF RESIDENTS WILL SURRENDER THEIR EASEMENTS TO H3PO4 INC. THE PUT LOCKED FENCES AROUND PLOTS A AND B AND HAVE SECURITY OFFICERS, THEY HAVE RESIDENTS AND NON RESIDENTS MEMBERS. THE BUILT A COMMERCIAL MARINA IN PLOT A

THE US COURT OF APPEALS SUMMARY ORDER OF AUGUST 22 2018 (17-3167) (17-316T) AFFIRMED US DISTRICT COURT (16 CV 1653) EDNY EDNY 2ND CIRCUIT BUT COA STATED THAT HASSAN (ME) IS NOT THE LOSER IN NY SUPREME COURT BECAUSE THAT CASE WAS TERMINATED BEFORE THE DECISIONS WERE MADE BY "SUPERNUMARY" JUDGES DECISIONS. SUPERNUMARY IS MY IDENTIFICATION OF JUDGES I NEVER SAW OR KNEW OF.

H3PO4 AGENT GAVE DOCUMENTS TO THE ARBITRATOR THAT I'M SURE WERE SUPERNUMARY'S DECISIONS THAT I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO SEE OR HAVE COPIES AND I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO TESTIFY BECAUSE I REFUSED TO SWEAR AN OATH AND THE ARMBG COURT OFFICER SAID I MUST TAKE THE OATH

THE ARBITRATOR JUDGEMENT THAT I MUST PAY \$1000.00 TO H3PO4 INC DUES PENALTIES AND INTEREST (AFTER EXCLUDING \$2000.00 (STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS) WHILE COURT OF APPEALS STATED I AM NOT THE LOSER BECAUSE THE NY SUPREME COURT CASE WAS TERMINATED BEFORE THE EXTRA JUDGES DECISIONS, AND COURT OF APPEAL RULED THAT THEREFORE "ROCKLED" PRECEDENT DOES NOT APPLY TO ME.

I HAVE MADE A MOTION TO US COURT OF APPEALS 2ND CIRCUIT (17-316T HASSAN VS MARKS) OF AUGUST 31 2018 FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION.

WHEN WE HAD A PUBLIC MEETING AT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY, MEN FROM H3PO4 INC YELLED LOUDLY SO THE PEOPLE FLED IN FEAR OF VIOLENCE AND THE MEETING ENDED IMMEDIATELY.

THE CIVICS AND JUDGES JOINED IN POLITICAL ALLIANCE WITH NEW YORK STATE AUTHORITIES AWARENESS FOR THEIR MUTUAL BENEFIT IN EXTORTION, RACKETEERING, FRAUD, SUBVERSION SUPTERFUGE ~~THEY~~ SEIZE OUR EASEMENT RIGHTS AND CONVERT OUR PROPERTY AS THEIR OWN COMMERCIAL MARINA AND ASSESS AND LEVY TAXES ON US OR COMPELL US TO PAY MEMBERSHIP DUES (THEY CALL IT MAINTENANCE) AS THE MAFIA CALLED IT "PROTECTION", UNLESS AND UNTILL WE SURRENDER OUR EASEMENTS TO THEM. I BELIEVE THEIR COMMITTING FELONIES UNDER UNITED STATES AND NEW YORK STATE LAWS AND THEY VIOLATE OUR 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND ARTICLE 4 SECTION 4 OF UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. ALSO CORRUPT ENTERPRISE. AGAINST HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS OF OUR COMMUNITY SINCE 1951 WITH THE SUPERNUMARY JUDGES ADDITIONAL RULINGS IN SCHRABAL VS HERBOA, INC (AFTER THE CASE WAS TERMINATED IN 1989.

THEY EAGERLY EMPLOY A NON LAWYER (ACTING ANONMOUSLY (TO US)) TO SUE US IN NEW YORK STATE COURT WHERE I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO SEE THE DOCUMENTS SHE GAVE TO THE ARBITRATOR (I DID NOT KNOW HE WAS A ARBITRATOR UNTIL I RECEIVED HIS JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME FOR \$1000.00 A WEEK LATER.) BUT NOW THEY EMPLOY A LAWYER TO BLOCK ME FROM ADJUDICATING THEIR EVIDENCE AND MY RIGHTS DE NOVO IN UNITED STATES COURTS. AND THEY WILL CONTINUE FROM 1951 PERPETUALLY IN NEW YORK STATE COURTS. THE GET JUDGEMENTS AGAINST SEVERAL OTHER RESIDENT IN THE SAME NEW YORK STATE COURT ON THAT SAME DAY.

WILL THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN LAW AND JUSTICE TO CONSIDER MY ENTITLEMENT TO FULL DE NOVO UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

PS: WHEN SOME RESIDENTS HELD A MEETING AT THE G.M. PUBLIC LIBRARY, A GANG CAME FROM HERBOA INC. AND YELLED AND SCARED THE ELDERLY PEOPLE AWAY. THEY PUNCTURED A HOLE IN SCHRABAL'S 2 PERSON SAILBOAT ETCETERA.

DATED OCTOBER 3, 2018

John Hassan

YOURS TRULY
JOHN HASSAN PETITIONER
43 CYNTHIA LANE CENTER MORICHES
NEW YORK 11934
PHONE 631 878 8572

REASONS FOR GRANTING MY PETITION

SEVERAL HUNDRED RESIDENTS OF MY COMMUNITY ARE VICTIMS ABOARD MY COMMUNITY AND FORCED TO PAY TAXES, PENALTIES, INTEREST (CALLED MEMBERSHIP DUES TO AN ORGANIZATION, HOLIDAY BEACH PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC (HBPOA, INC) THAT HAS NO RIGHT TO DEMAND THOSE PAYMENTS OR TO PERFORM ASSESSMENTS OR LEVY OR LEGISLATE ANY.

ALL OUR DEEDS ARE THE SAME AND INCLUDE EASEMENTS TO 2 ACRES (PLOT 4) BEACH AND BOATING RIGHTS BUT AN ORGANIZATION WAS CREATED 1 YEAR LATER AND INCORPORATED IN 1957 AND ASSUMED THE POWER TO GOVERN THESE EASEMENT RIGHTS AND ALL RESIDENTS AND DEMAND ALL RESIDENTS TO BECOME MEMBERS

THEY USED A LOCAL LAWYER AND A TITLE INSURANCE AGENT TO BLOCK RESIDENTS (AT CLOSINGS) TO SELL THEIR HOMES UNTIL DUES WERE PAID STARTING IN 1957. THEN A RESIDENT, JOSEF SCHRABAL SUED HBPOA INC IN 1987 OVER A BOAT MODDING HIS 2 PERSON "HOBIE" SAIL BOAT. I MOVED HERE IN 1988 AND I JOINED SCHRABAL. HE WANTED SUMMARY JUDGEMENT BASED ON DEEDS AND REAL ESTATE LAW. HBPOA INC OBJECTED THAT SUMMARY JUDGEMENT WITHOUT TRIAL. BUT NOONE COULD CITE ANY ISSUE THAT HAD TO BE PROVED AT TRIAL. THEY AGREED TO ALL THE FACTS ON WHICH SCHRABAL SUED FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

AFTER YEARS OF APPEALS TO NO AVAIL, NO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT WAS ISSUED AND THERE WAS NO TRIAL SO SCHRABAL DECIDED THE CASE WAS FIXED AND HE ABANDONED THE CASE. SOON AFTER THAT NEW JUDGES WE NEVER SAW OR HEARD OF MADE RULINGS WHICH HBPOA INC USED TO CLAIM A LEGAL RIGHT TO ENFORCE THEIR POWER TO TAX US OR DEMAND MEMBERSHIP DUES. I WAS ONE OF SEVERAL RESIDENTS SUED BY HBPOA INC IN 2016 (I CANT SWEAR TO THE DATE BUT I BELIEVE IT WAS 2 YEARS AGO.) FOR PAST YEAR DUES, PENALTIES AND INTEREST THEY ASSESSED AGAINST ME.

WE WERE ALL TOLD BY THE JUDGE (ARBITRATOR) THAT WE HAD TO PAY BEFORE TRIAL OR WE WOULD HAVE TO PAY MORE IF WE WENT TO TRIAL. I HAD ALREADY FILED A PETITION IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND I REFUSED TO PAY AS THE JUDGE ORDERED. I TOLD THE JUDGE (ARBITRATOR) THAT HE HAD NO JURISDICTION (I DID NOT KNOW HE WAS AN ARBITRATOR UNTIL I RECEIVED HIS JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME FOR \$1000

MARKED SOL WHICH I BELIEVE MEANS STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. I ~~WAS~~ WAS INFORMED THAT MY RIGHT TO DENY AND I CONTINUED WITH MY US COURT PETITION.

OVER 180 YEARS AGO ANOTHER ORGANIZATION ALSO DEMANDED THAT PEOPLE PAY PROTECTION AND THEY WERE SENT TO FEDERAL PRISONS OR ELECTROCUTED FOR MURDER FRAUD EXTORTION KIDNAPING ETC. (THE MAFIA OR THE BLACK HAND). THEY AND HBPDA INC ALSO COMMITTED THEIR CRIMES CONTINUOUSLY AND IF PERPETUITY, BUT, HBPDA INC. ALLOWS RESIDENTS TO BUY OUT. IF WE SURRENDER OUR EASEMENTS TO THEM, THEY WILL STOP TAKING US OR CHARGING US DUES.

THE DEFENDANTS DEMANDED THAT MY CASE BE DISMISSED BECAUSE OF ROCKLER DECISION BUT US COURT OF APPEALS RULED THAT I WAS NOT THE LOSER IN THE SCHRABAL DECISIONS BY NEW YORK STATE (NUMERARIES) SUPREME COURT JUDGES DECISIONS BECAUSE THE CASE WAS TERMINATED BEFORE THEIR DECISIONS.

I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO TESTIFY IN HBPDA INC. LAWSUIT VS ME IN 2016 BECAUSE I REFUSED TO SWEAR AN OATH AND AN ARMED COURT OFFICE ORDERED ME TO SWEAR AN OATH. AND I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO SEE DOCUMENTS GIVEN TO THE JUDGE ARBITRATOR BUT I AM 99% SURE IT INCLUDED SUPERNUMERARY JUDGES DECISIONS AFTER SCHRABAL CASE WAS TERMINATED AND US COURT OF APPEALS RULED I WAS NOT THE LOSER.

HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS OF MY COMMUNITY HAVE OR ARE VICTIMS OF HBPDA INC. AND THEIR FRAUD EXTORTION IS CONTINUOUS AND IN PERPETUITY. BUT THESE COURT ACTIONS ARE NOT LIMITED TO THIS COMMUNITY ALONE. THE MAFIA COULD NOT BE PROSECUTED UNDER THESE COURT RULES AND THE RESIDENTS OF MY COMMUNITY CANNOT AFFORD TO PAY LAWYER TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AND CAN BE SCALD TO VICTIMIZE MANY THOUSANDS MORE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, WHO LIKE VICTIMS OF THE BLACK HAND CANNOT DEFEND THEMSELVES OR PAY FOR PROFESSIONAL HELP. AND THEY NEVER JOINED OR HEARD ABOUT SCHRABAL VS HBPDA INC EITHER.

I BELIEVE THAT IF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JUDGES READ THIS PETITION AND CONSIDERATION THEY WILL CONSIDER THIS A SHOCKING ASSAULT ON OUR SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT AND ARTICLE 4 SECTION 4 AND 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENT UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION GIVE EVERYONE EQUAL PROTECTION AND DUE PROCESS OF LAW!

ALSO HBPDA INC. SEIZED OUR PROPERTY (POTA) PUT 70 FT FOOT FENCES AND LOCKED GATES AROUND IT AND CONSTRUCTED A COMMERCIAL MARINA INSIDE.

AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT US COURTS MEAN WHEN THEY SAY I FAILED TO MAKE A STATEMENT OR CLAIM.

John Hoxan Petitioner

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:
