


ORIGINAL  
PROVIDED TO  
SANTA ROSA C.I. ON  
MAY 20 2019  
FOR MAILING BY

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



NASEORA LUMPIKIN - PETITIONER  
(YOUR NAME)

VS,

PAMELA JO BOND, JULIE HOGAN RESPONDENT(S)  
NICHOLAS B. COX, HARRIS PRITZ

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL FOR ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

NASEORA K. LUMPIKIN DC# Y02264  
(YOUR NAME)

5850 G. MILTON ROAD  
(ADDRESS)

MILTON, FLORIDA. 32583  
(City, State, Zip code)

N/A

(PHONE NUMBER)

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. WHETHER REVIEW OF THE RECORD AS PROVIDED IN WRIT OF CERTIORARI BEFORE SUPREME COURT REVEAL MISMANAGE OF JUSTICE OR AN ABUSE OF THE APPEAL COURT'S DISCRETION ON THE FACE OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT SUCH THAT REVERSAL OF DISMISSAL ON CIVIL COMPLAINT IS REQUIRED?
2. WHETHER DEFAULT ON CIVIL PROCEEDING WAS CAUSE BY PETITIONER IF FEDERAL STATUTE BY SUPREME COURT 28 U.S.C 1915 IS ACCURACY IN FEDERAL COURT'S TO PROCEED FOR CIVIL RIGHT ACTION?
3. WHETHER DUE PROCESS CAUSE UNDER CONGRESS CONSTITUTIONAL LAW REQUIRE DISMISSAL OF CIVIL RIGHT COMPLAINT IN FEDERAL COURT'S WITHOUT REACHING MERIT OR PROVIDE FULL AND FAIR ADVERSARY?

## LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[x] 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:

1. PAMELA JO BONDI

POSITION: FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR STATE OF FLORIDA

ADDRESS: THE CAPITOL PL-01

CITY/STATE: TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA, 32399

2. HONORABLE JOSEPH MARX

POSITION: TRIAL JUDGE

ADDRESS: FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT  
205 NORTH DIXIE HWY

CITY/STATE: WEST PALM BEACH, FL, 33401

3. NICHOLAS B. COX

POSITION: STATEWIDE PROSECUTOR

ADDRESS: THE CAPITOL PL-01

CITY/STATE: TALLAHASSEE, FL, 32399

4. JULIE HOGAN

POSITION: STATEWIDE PROSECUTOR

ADDRESS: 110 SE SIXTH STREET, SUITE #900

CITY/STATE: FORT LAUDERDALE, FL, 33301

5. HARRIS PRINZ

POSITION: PUBLIC DEFENDER

ADDRESS: 205 NORTH DIXIE HWY.

CITY/STATE: WEST PALM BEACH, FL, 33401

## 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 *UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR ELEVENTH CIRCUIT,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT*

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

|                                                     |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Bell v. Hood 327 U.S. 670                           | PG. 15 |
| SWAFFORD v. TEMPLETON 185 U.S. 487                  | PG. 15 |
| THE FAIR v. KOHLER DIE & SPECIALITY CO. 228 U.S. 22 | PG. 15 |

### STATUTES AND RULES

42 U.S.C. 1985  
28 U.S.C. 1915

PG. 15  
PG. 15

### OTHER

BILL OF RIGHTS  
DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AMENDMENTS VII

PG. 15  
PG. 15

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 A 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 A 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

## JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was ~~MARCH 8, 2019~~ MAY 13, 2019.

☐ 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: MARCH 68, 2019, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

PERSON LITIGATION REFORM ACT OF 1995

BILL OF RIGHTS

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AMENDMENT VII

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

DUE PROCESS CLAUSE

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE AROSE FROM AN ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT ON OR ABOUT JAN. 07, 2019 (CASE NO. 18-12860-H) WHICH DENIED MOTION FOR FORMA PAUPERIS IN A CONFLICTING ORDER BY ORDERING PETITIONER TO FILE NOTICE TO DISTRICT COURT CLERK TO CURE DOCKETING AND FILING FEES. THE ENTIRE CONTROVERSY ON THIS APPEAL IS WHETHER THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA (CASE NO. 9:18-CV-80577-DMM) HAD JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN A CIVIL RIGHT COMPLAINT UNDER 42 USC 1985 IN DE NOVO REVIEW. THIS SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES HAS JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. 1651, THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS HAVING CERTIFIED ITS ORDER ENTER ON JAN. 07, 2019 BY DISTRICT JUDGE GERALD J. OFAT INVOLVES A CONTROLLING QUESTION OF LAW AS TO WHICH POWER UNDER ARTICLE III THE OPINION TERMINATION REST UPON THE PETITIONER TO ENFORCE THE DISTRICT COURT TO ADMINISTER ADVERSARY PROCEEDING OR JUDGES OF THE CONSTITUTION TO DIRECT THE DISTRICT COURT? ALL OF THE RESPONDENT IN SAID COMPLAINT BEFORE FEDERAL COURT ARE STATE OFFICIALS, LOCATED IN STATE OF FLORIDA.

ON MAY 03, 2018 THE PETITIONER FILED A CIVIL RIGHT COMPLAINT IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR CAUSE OF ACTION UNDER JURISDICTION 42 USC 1985 IN FEDERAL COURT UNDER CONGRESS LAW TO RECOVER AGAINST THE RESPONDENT FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF PETITIONER FEDERAL CONSTITUTION RIGHTS.

ON MAY 28, 2018, THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE PATRICK A. WHITE FILED HIS REPORT TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT ON THE GROUND THAT THE DISTRICT COURT LACKED JURISDICTION. HEARING WERE HELD ON JUNE 24, 2018, THE DISTRICT JUDGE DONALD M. MIDDLEBROOK ISSUE HIS "ORDER" ADOPTING DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

— AND CERTIFYING THAT CONTROLLING JURISDICTION TO REVIEW COMPLAINT IS FROM THE UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, TO REVIEW COMPLAINT UNDER JURISDICTION 42 USC 1985. THE DISTRICT COURT ORDER CONTAINED NO REFERENCE TO A PROCEEDURE OR JURISDICTIONAL STATUTE BY CONGRESS TO NOT CONDUCT DE NOVO REVIEW OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT. THE DISTRICT COURT RELIED UPON ITS OWN LAW TO RECONSTRUCT LABEL OF COMPLAINT TO BARRED DE NOVO REVIEW OF CLAIMS, AND THE COURT GAVE NO FACTUAL BASIS FOR A DECISION TO SUGGEST A CONCLUSION TO BE GRANT FROM ELEVENTH CIRCUIT FOR JURISDICTION.

PETITIONER FILED NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR 11th CIRCUIT (NO. 18-12860-H) ON JULY, 05, 2018 FOR REVIEW OF DISTRICT COURT ORDERS AND CONCLUSION.

THE MAGISTRATE REMOVE HIMSELF FROM CASE ONCE "NOTICE OF APPEAL WAS FILED TO 11th CIRCUIT AND TRANSMITTED THERE JURISDICTION OVER CASE ON JULY. 05, 2018 TO DISTRICT COURT. THE PETITIONER FILED ANOTHER APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS PURSUANT TO 28 USC 1915 WITH 11th CIRCUIT APPEAL COUNTS TO PROCEED ON APPEAL. THE APPLICATION WAS HEARD, AND PERMISSION DENIED. FURTHER, THE COURT ORDER PETITIONER TO FILE NOTICE WITH DISTRICT COURT TO CURE DEFICIENCY FOR PAYMENT OF DOCKETING AND FILING FEES.

PETITIONER FILE NOTICE TO DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NO RESPONSES FROM DISTRICT COURT.

THE SOLE ISSUE IS WHETHER THE 11th CIRCUIT —

- HAD ARTICLE III JURISDICTION TO ALLOW DISTRICT COURT TO CONDUCT ADVERSARY PROCEEDING ON SUIT BROUGHT BY THE PETITIONER, AGAINST RESPONDENT BECAUSE NO OTHER BASIS FOR JURISDICTION EXISTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF-  
STRICT COURT PURSUANT TO COURT FINAL ORDER ENTER JUNE, 26, 2018.

THE PETITIONER ARGUE THAT THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AND BILL OF RIGHTS EXPRESSLY AUTHORIZED A RIGHT FOR A PERSON TO FILE SUIT UNDER ACTS OF CONGRESS RELYING UPON; BELL V. HODD 327 U.S. 679, SWAFFORD V. TEMPLETON 185 U.S. 487 AND FAIR V. KOHLER DIE & SPECIALITY CO. 228 U.S. 22

PETITIONER FURTHER ARGUE, THAT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE REQUIRE A APPLICATION FOR FORMA PAUPERIS RECEIVE AN ADVERSARY PROCEEDING, TO ALLOW A PETITIONER TO PROCEED IN CIVIL ACTION IF UNABLE TO MAKE FULL PAYMENT OF DOCKETING AND FILING FEES UNDER 28 USC 1915.

ALTHOUGH THE CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTING OF PETITIONER CLAIMS OF INNOCENCE IN THIS CASE, IT WAS NECESSARY TO SEEK RELIEF IN FEDERAL COURT, IF STATE COURT GAINED REVIEW OF EVIDENCE OF CONSPIRACY AGAINST STATE OFFICIALS, AS WELL MAGISTRATE JUDGE PATRICK A. WHITE IN FEDERAL HAS. EARNS ALLOWING STATE OFFICIALS TO WITHHOLD RECORDS OF INNOCENCE, THE 11th CIRCUIT ON MARCH 08, 2019 ENTER ANOTHER ORDER FOR WHICH WAS CONCLUSIVE TO ITS ORDER ON JANUARY 07, 2019, NO SATISFACTION TO CURE DEFAULT BY DISTRICT COURT OR REQUIREMENT OF DUE PROCESS ON CLAIMS IN SAID COMPLAINT UNDER FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. ON MAY 13, 2019, THE APPEAL COURT FAILED TO REACH JUDGMENT OF COMPLAINT, AN DISMISSAL REVEAL A MISMANAGEMENT OF JUSTICE. PG. 15

(CONTINUED)

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE WRIT IS APPROPRIATE HERE BECAUSE NO ADEQUATE ALTERNATIVE REMEDIES WAS PRESENT BY EITHER FEDERAL COURT OR CLAIMS IN COMPLAINT. THE COURTS ARTICLE III RESOLUTION WILL AID THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND PETITIONER HAVE SHOWN A "CLEAR AND INDISPUTABLE RIGHT TO THE WRIT BECAUSE THE DISTRICT COURT ORDER UNDENIABLY FAILED TO ADMINISTER CONGRESS LAW UNDER BILL OF RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHT ACTION, AS WELL AS PERMANENT COURT FAILURE TO REVERSE DISTRICT COURT ORDER ON DEFAULT OF DE NOVO REVIEW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 42 U.S.C. 1985.

CONCLUSION

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD BE GRANTED.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



DC# Y02264

DATE: MAY, 20, 2019.

DECLARATION

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT  
THIS IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED ON:

MAY, 20, 2019

DATE



(SIGNATURE)