

No. 19-1343

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE EDWARD STARLING

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States District Court
For The District Of Columbia

PETITION FOR REHEARING
ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO [RECONCILE] THE DATE
OF [ENTRY DECISION] OF OCTOBER 5, 2020
ESTABLISHING THE [DEADLINE DATE OF OC-
TOBER 30, 2020 TO [THE RENEWAL DATE OF
NOVEMBER 03, 2020 DEADLINE DATE] AND
[FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN]

PETITIONER-APPELLANT timely moves by filing the
above-captioned Motion pursuant to Supreme Court Ru-
les 21 Motions To The Court; Clearly Stating Its Pu-
rpose And The Facts On Which It Is [BASED]; And [PR-
ESENTS LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT THEREOF]; which a-
re [Concise] and [Compliance] with Page Limits; and
Rule 17.3 [Within] The Court's [Original Jurisdicti-
on; and Rule 33.2 with an [Original] and Ten (10) C-
opies; and Rule 29 [Accompanied] by Proof Of Service
to wit:

I.

THE [CLEARLY STATED PURPOSE] AND
[THE FACTS] ON WHICH IT IS
[BASED]

1. The Court's [Decision] was [ENTERED] on October 5, 2020; with [A Notice Date Affixed] at October 30, 2020 [For A Petition For Rehearing To Be Filed] thereby [Granting The Twenty-Five (25) days Thereafter] To File [The Petition For Rehearing].

2. However, The Court [Did Not Address Or Consider The Fact] that Petitioner's [25 Days "Toll-Time"] did not [Commence To Run Until] until The Court's [Decision Notice] was [Served Upon Petitioner] until October 12, 2020 [By The United States Postal Service] thereby [Restablshing] the [Deadline Date To File For A Petition For Rehearing] by or at November 04, 2020 [Due To That Revisioned Date].

3. Accordingly, The Court [Verified] the Filing Date [As November 01, 2020] by The United States Postal Service [PostMarked Date]; therefore [The Petition For Rehearing Was Timely Filed]; with [Three (3) Days to Spare]. Id.
[EMPHASIS ADDED].

II.

THE [LEGAL ARGUMENTS] IN [SUPPORT]
THEREOF THAT ARE [IN COMPLIANCE
WITH SUPREME COURT RULES 17.3;
21.1 THRU .4; 29; AND 33.2

1. In [Civil Law], a [Renewing] of a [Former Date To File]; and [Reconsideration] as [Normally Used [In Context Of Administrative Adjudication "Reconsideration" implies "Reexamination": and "Possibly" [A Different Decision by

[The Entity Jurist Initially "Deciding It"]. See, Kerr-McGee Nuclear Corporation v. New Mexico Inviromental Imp. Board, App., 97 N.M. 88, 637 P.2d 38, 43.

2. The Term "NOTICE"; in its Lagal Sense; as applies herein; refers to "Information" [Concerning A Fact]; actually [Decided on October 5, 2020] with an [Established Date of October 30, 2020] to [File A Petition For Rehearing]; which "Totald Twenty-Five (25) days to do so"; but; The Court Decision [Omitted The "Toll-Time" of 25 Days "To Commence" on The Date-Of-Receipt Of Said Notice]; which was on October 12, 2020; by The United States Postal Service; that [Modified The Date To File Petition For Rehearing "From" October 30, 2020 "To" November 04, 2020]; which The Court "VERIFIED" the "Postal Service's PostMarked November 01, 2020 Filing Date"; with Three (3) days To Spare. See, United States v. Tuteur, C.A.Ill., 215 F.2d 415.

3. The Court's "NOTICE" [Did Not Consider and or Did Not Address "The Fact" [Of "WHEN" Petitioner's "Toll-Time" [ALLOTTED FOR RESEARCH AND PREPARATION] for the very important [Substantial Grounds Not Previously Presented]; [New Intervening Circumstances Grounds]; [Extraordinary Unprecedented And Discriminating New Intervening Circumstances Grounds "FOR "PAID COURT DECISIONS"]; and [NEW INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES GROUNDS FOR ALL CASES RESOLUTION BY SUPREME COURT'S "AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS FOR ALL CLAIMS CONCESSIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT'S AUTHORITY PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 1254(2)]; which [Required Time Consuming To Get Them Right]. Id. [EMPHASIS ADDED].

4. Under [Commercial Law]; in reference to this case herein; a [Person] (meaning the Petitioner herein); "Notifies" or "Gives" a notice or "notification to another" (in reference to the 1100 Tax Clients and or Their Assigns) by "Taking Such Steps" as may be "Reasonably Required To Inform The Others" (again The 1100 Tax Clients); in [Ordinary Course]; whether or not [Such Others] actually comes to know of ["IT"] (meaning The Petitioner's [Departure] from [Demanding] to [Concessions] upon [Their Entitled \$100,000.00 and \$50,000.00 Lost Income Tax Refunds]; for The Supreme Court On Its Own Motion; pursuant to Title 28, U.S.C., Section 1254(2) [To Adjudicate And Decide The Entire Matter-In-Controversy]; "EXPECTATIONS"; who are [Persons Entitled To "Receive Notice or Notification when: (a) It "Comes To Their Attention"; or (b) It is "Duly Delivered by The Petitioner herein"; at [Their Homes] and or [Churches]; through which [Their 1100 "Contracts With Petitioner Were Made"; or at [Any Other Place] (meaning in Chief District Court Judge Wilbur D. Owens, Junior's [COURT]); by Class Action-Civil Action Complaints in 1986 [By The Petitioner For Them]. See, U.C.C., Section 1-201(26).

5. Under [The Uniform Commercial Code; [THE LAW] on [NOTICE]; "actual" or "inferable"; is [PRECISELY THE SAME]; whether the "instrument" is [Issued To A Holder] (meaning The 1100 Tax Clients); or [Negotiated To A Holder] (meaning The Petitioner For Them in Court in 1986); which [Was Accomplished within "The-Toll-Time 25 days within Was Allotted To November 03, 2020"]. See, Eldons

Super Fresh Stores, Inc. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., 296 Minn. 130, 207 N.W.2d 282, 287.

6. Constructive "Notice" includes "Implied Actual Notice" (the term "implied"; as "Interpreted" by petitioner to mean: Twenty-Five Days [following The "Receipt" of "The Court's Entry Date"]); therefore, the "Toll Time" commenced on "October 13, 2020; which was One Day (1); after the October 12, 2020 "Received Date"; which "Deserves An [Inquiry Reconsideration]". See, F. P. Baugh, Inc. v. Little Lake Lumber Company, C.A.Cal., 297 F.2d 692, 696; See, also, Fed.R.Civil P.5(a) and 77(d).

7. Finally, Petitioner received a "Notice" from The Department Of Veterans Hospital, 1670 Clairmont Road, Decatur, GA 30033; by telephone; from "Healthcare Provider Doctor Manzoor Ali's Office"; to "set-up a meeting regarding [My Health]"; but was "unable to reach me"; so; on October 16, 2020; when "I drove to the VA Hospital" an "Attendent [Placed a "Temperture Device at or near the Center Of My Forehead"; [DENIED] my Entery; and "Instructed me to [RETURN HOME] and [QUARANTINE FOR TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS] do to a [POSSIBLE COVID-19 INFECTION]; which I [COMPLIED WITH]; The Attendent was R.N. Katie Voss.

8. More importantly, [This Case Herein] involves [Constitutional Guarantees] for [The Supreme Court Of The United States]; [On ITS OWN MOTION]; pursuant to Title 28, U.S.C., Section 1254(2); [For The Compelling Reasons] and [Extraordinary Circumstances Presented]; upon [Its Judicial Discretion]; [To Enter "A FINAL JUDGMENT ORDER" TO END

THIS CASE IN CONTROVERSY] and [ENTER JUDGMENT PAYMENT ORDERS FOR "WHATEVER MONETARY AWARDS" IT "SEEM DEEM"]; [More Importantly]; [No "Warnings" were "Contained In The Notice" stating that: "[I]f No Petition Is Filed By October 30, 2020; [IT] will be [DENIED]; that is [NORMALLY INCLUDED IN NOTICES] and [WOULD HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH]; Additionally, Petitioner [IS PROCEEDING AS A VETERAN] and due to [THE FACT] that Petitioner's Supreme Court Rule 22.1 Application To [Individual Allotted Justice to the [Circuit]; The Honorable Jurist Brett Kavanaugh; who [DID NOT] become [INVOLVED] in the [DENIAL]; Petitioner [WAS DENIED ACCESS-OPTION] To File An Application arising from the United States Court Of Appeals for the District Of Columbia; arising also; from the United States Court Of Appeals for the Armed Forces; addressed to the Chief Justice; when [The Circuit Justice "Is Unavailable "For Any Reason". See, Supreme Court Rule 22.3. Id. Thus, [THE GOOD CAUSE SHOWN IS HEREINABOVE SUBSTANTIATED].

III.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

This Motion Contents Format is submitted on 8½-by 11-Inch Paper; and Does Not Exceed The Word Contents Allowed.

IV.

This Certifies that, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29 Accompanied by Proof Of Service, All Parties Required To Be Served, was Submitted to The Honorable William P. Barr, United States Attorney General, United States Department Of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washin-

gton, D.C. 20530-0001, on this 18th day of November, 2020.

WHEREFORE it is PRAYED this ENTITLED Motion be GRANTED
[FOR GOOD CAUSE(S) SHOWN.

Respectfully submitted this 18th day of November, 2020.

"s/", Edward Starling SSGT USAF RET
EDWARD STARLING
Movant-Petitioner
Pro Se Counsel
(470)503-8180