



In the Supreme Court of the United States
Washington DC

Robert L. Clark,
Petitioner,

v.S.

Attorney General,

*Case no: 18-8206

*

Petition for rehearing

Comes now the petitioner, in the above-styled case files this timely petition, and states the following: This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith, and not for a delay. I certify this.

Grounds for rehearing

1.

The U.S. Court of Appeals has violated this Honorable Court's rulings, by its failure to uphold this Honorable Court's rulings concerning governmental liability, as stated in Harlow V. Fitzgerald, 457, U.S. 800, 818, 102, S.ct. 2727, 2738, 73, Ed 2d. 396, (1982) Case law is necessary in this case, and the only court that can establish this case law is this Honorable Court. Please see Marsh V. Butler County, 268, F.3d 1014, 1032, n.10, (11th Cir 2001).

1.

2.

The issue in this case is can the attorney general be held liable for his employee's actions that have violated the petitioner's 6th, 8th, and 14th amendment rights. U.S.C.A.? Please see *Ferner V. Boykins*, 271, U.S. 240, 40, L.Ed. 924, 46, S.Ct. 492.

3.

Did the U.S. Court of Appeals properly review the petitioner's request for appeal in forma pauperis?

4.

Because the U.S. Court of Appeals erroneously passed on this indigent's application for leave to appeal, and in doing so violated all of this Honorable Court's cases cited by the petitioner. Please see *Farley V. United States*, 354, U.S. 521, 77, S.Ct. 1371, 1, L.Ed. 2d. 1529, *Delbridge V. United States*, 355, U.S. 36, 78, S.Ct. 124, 2, L.Ed. 2d. 72, *Ellis V. United States*, 356, U.S. 674, 78, S.Ct. 974, 2, L.Ed. 2d. 1060, *Hill V. United States*, 356, U.S. 704, 78, S.Ct. 1139, 2, L.Ed. 2d. 1145.

5.

Also because it is held in 1915 (b) (3) that in no event shall a prisoner be prohibited from bringing a civil action or from appealing a civil action or a criminal judgment for

2.

the reason that the prisoner has no assets, and no means by which to pay the initial partial filing fee.

6.

Because the U.S. Court of Appeals failed to rule on the petitioner's substantive claim of false imprisonment and illegal use of the legal process. The U.S. Court of Appeals also failed to show that the certificate lack good faith.

7.

Because the U.S. Court of Appeals also failed to provide counsel and the record to allow the petitioner to make a showing that his request for a (COA) was taken in good faith. Please see 28, U.S.C.A. 1291, 1294, 1915, 2255, Fed Rules Crim Proc rules 34(a) (2) 39, (c) 18, U.S.C.A. U.S. Ct. App. D.C. Cir Rules 18(a), 33, (b)(c) 28, U.S.C.A.

Conclusion

Because of the violations of substantive law by the U.S. Court of Appeals, the petitioner prays that this Honorable Court will grant this timely petition for rehearing.