

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SAMUEL H. WILLIAMS

V.S.

CASE 18-8907

SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S.

NOTICE OF REHEARING

ON THE MERITS / WRIT PROHIBITION / WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PETITIONER IS SEEKING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR THE FOLLOWING FACTS YES PETITIONER HAVE REPEATEDLY FILE PETITION'S SEEKING JUSTICE RELIEF FROM BEING UNCONSTITUTIONAL VINDICTIVELY AND WRONGFULLY SENTENCE TWO 30 YEARS SENTENCES 60 YEARS THAT IS LIFE IN PRISON FOR A WHITE MAN COMEING IN TO WHERE PETITIONER LIVE AND ATTACKING PETITIONER AN END AS A RASULT OF THAT ATTACK THE WHITE MAIL END UP WITH A LACERATION ON THE LEFT WRISK THE MEDICAL REPORTS STATES THAT THE MAN THAT ATTACKED PETITIONER HAD BEEN STUB IN THE CHEST AND IN THE LEFT WRISK LONG BEFORE HE RECEIVER A LACERATION ON THE SAME WRISK ATTACKING PETITIONER, PETITIONER HAVE ENCLOSED EXHIBITS LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN EVERY WRIT PETITIONER AND MOTION TO THE COURTS PROVEING PERJUDICE FRAUD DECEIT PURJURY EXECUTED IN EVERY WAY, IN EVERY COURT STATE COURTS AND IN THE FEDERAL COURTS, PROVEING THAT THE CHARGES AND CASES OF MALICIOUS AND FRIVOLOUS THIS IS THE RASULT OF PURJUDICE RACE'S HATE FOR PETITIONER FILING LAW SUITS

IN 2008, PETITIONER HAD THE COURT TO ISSUE SUMMONION
TO RESPONDENTS TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE RELIEF SOUGHT
SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED THE COURT DISMISS THE CASE
DEPRIVING PETITIONER OF A OPPORTUNITY TO
PRESENT EVIDENCE THE FACTS THAT WILL SUPPORT THE
MERITS OF PETITIONER'S ALLEGATIONS, WITH OUT CON-
DUCTING A EVIDENTIARY HEARING, THE COURT TOLD
PETITIONER THAT I HAD TO FILE AN A APPEAL IN THE
EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS WHERE THE CASE
WOULD GET DISMISS FOR FORMA PAUPERIS, THE COURT
KNOW VERY THAT PETITIONER HAVE KNOW INCOME AND
CANNOT PAY THE FEE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN EQUAL
PROTECTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA

IN FEBRUARY OF 2009 FEDERAL JUDGE DORR ISSUES AN ORDER
TO RESPONDENTS TELLING RESPONDENTS TO SHOW CAUSE
WHY THE RELIEF SOUGHT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED ONCE
AGAIN THE COURT USED SOME KIND OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL
TACTICS TO DISMISS THE CASE AND HAVE PETITIONER
APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND DENY TO PETITIONER
EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND LAWS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEBRUARY OF 2014 FEDERAL JUDGE KAYS ISSUES AN ORDER TELLING RESPONDENTS TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE RELIEF SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED ONCE AGAIN PETITIONER IS DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT EVIDENCE THE FACTS THAT WILL SUPPORT THE MERITS OF PETITIONER'S ALLEGATIONS

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE PROVIDES THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL AND THAT MEN CREATED GOVERNMENT TO SECURE THE RIGHTS OF MEN PURSUANT TO THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE JULY 1776 B.A.R. TERRORISTS AND GOVERNMENT) AGAINST OF FILERS AND OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUPPORTING EVIDENCE ACCORDINGLY ALTHOUGH WE IN MAKE NO VIEW ON THE MERITS OF PETITIONER ALLEGATIONS WE CONCLUDE THAT HE IS ENTITLED TO AN OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER PROOF, HANES V. KERNER-404 US 519, 522.

ON MARCH 28-2019 THE SUPREME COURT RETURNED THE PETITION TO PETITIONER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS COURT RULES 34.1(D) AND (E) A COPY OF THIS IS ENCLOSED.

ON APRIL 19-2019 YOUR COURT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PLACE THE PETITION ON THE DOCKET AFTER THE CORRECTION WAS MADE BY PETITIONER THIS WAS DID ON APRIL 19-2019 CASE NO. 18-8907, A COPY OF THIS IS ENCLOSED AS WELL,

THE CORNERSTONE TO DUE PROCESS IS NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY. ASENT PROPER NOTICE AN ACCUSED MAY BE ABSOLUTELY DEPRIVED OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEFEND LIES FRAUD DECEIT SHYSTER SHENANIG-AMS? AND OTHER TREACHERY FAIL AS TO PROPER NOTICE ONCE DUE PROCESS IS DENIED ALL JURISDICTION) CEASES AS PER YOUR VERY OWN, 5 U.S.C. 556(D), 557, - 706. JUDGES HAVE NO IMMUNITY, AS OWEN VS. CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, 100 S.Ct. 1398, MAINE VS. THEODORE, 100 S.Ct. 2502, AND HAFFER VS. MELO, 502 U.S. 21. JUDGES ARE DEEMED TO KNOW THE LAW AND SWORN TO UPHOLD THE LAW, JUDGES CANNOT CLAIM TO ACT IN GOOD FAITH IN WILFUL DEPRIVATION OF LAW, THEY CERTAINLY CANNOT PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE LAW EVEN THE CITIZEN CANNOT PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IT IS INDICROUS FOR A LEARNED JUDGE TO PLEAD IN IGNORANCE OF THE LAW THEREFORE THERE IS NO JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IN MATTERS OF RIGHTS SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, SEE TITLE 42 U.S.C. 1983 AND FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT EXCEPTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS, AS WELL AS 18 U.S.C. 241/242.

CONSTRUCTIVE [LEGAL] FRAUD COMPRISES ALL ACTS OMISSIONS
AND CONCEALMENTS INVOLVING BREACH OF EQUITABLE
OR LEGAL DUTY TRUST OR CONFIDENCE AND RESULTING IN TO
ANOTHER, 38 C.A.L. R.P.T.R. 148, 157, I.E., NO SCIENTER IS REQ-
(USED) THUS THE PARTY WHO MAKE THE MISREPRESENTATION
NEED NOT KNOW THAT IT IS FALSE, SEE 437 S.W. 2D 20, 28,

FRAUD INTENTIONAL DECEPTION RESULTING IN INJURY TO
ANOTHER, ELEMENTS OF FRAUD ARE A FALSE AND MATERIAL
MISREPRESENTATION MADE BY ONE WHO EITHER KNOWS IT
IS FALISITY OR IS IGNORANT OF ITS TRUTH, THE MAKER'S
INTENT THAT THE REPRESENTATION BE RELIED OF THE
PERSON AND IN A MANNER REASONABLY CONTEMPLATED
THE PERSON'S IGNORANCE OF THE FALISITY OF THE REPRESENTATION
THE PERSON'S RIGHTFUL OF JUSTIFIED RELIANCE, AND PROXI-
MATE) INJURY TO THE PERSON, SEE 301 F. 2D 262, 267, IT
USUALLY CONSIST OF A MISREPRESENTATION CONCEAL-
MENT OF OR DISCLOSURE OF A MATERIAL FACT OR ACT
LEAST MISLEADING CONDUCT DEVICE OF CONTRIVANCE
234 F. SUPP. 201, 203 IT EMPRACES ALL THE MULTIFAROUS
MEANS WHICH HUMAN INGENUITY CAN DEVISE TO
GET AN ADVANTAGE OVER ANOTHER IT INCLUDES ALL
SURPRISE TRICK CUNNING, DISSEMBLING AND UNFAIR
WAY BY WHICH ANOTHER IS CHEATED AT LAW FRAUD SHOW
FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES FROM WHICH IT MAY BE
PERSUMED, 425 P.2D 974, SEE GENERALLY MODEL PENAL
CODE 224, SEE ALSO DECEITS,