
In the Supreme Court of the United States

19-5405

(INDEX NO.)

(CURRENTLY IN THE 2ND CIR. CT. UNDER
DOCK. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392)

ORIGINAL

CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAY 15 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI: U.S.D.O.J.,

HON. LOUIS L. STANTON & PRO SE INTAKE UNIT, S.D.N.Y.

In association with:

"Petition For Peremptory Writ Of Mandamus, In Re., Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al. (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Petition For Redress Of Grievances: Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.;"

"Petition For Waiver Of Sovereign Immunity (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Memorandum Of Law (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Motion For Preliminary Summary Judgment: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Injunctive Relief Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Temporary Restraining Order W/ Notice: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit;"

&

"Motion To Vacate Dismissal Order Of Hon. Lois L. Stanton, In Re.: Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al., 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)"

STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

CESTUI QUE, Pro Sé Litigant

(Currently Displaced)

Fitted Sole Productions, D.B.A. &

Fitted Fables, D.B.A.

(Previously addressed at: 449 E. 14th Street,

Apt. 7d New York, N.Y. 10009)

Having Mail Temporarily Sent To:

AGVA: In Care of Steven Talbert Williams 363 Seventh Ave., 17th Fl. N.Y.C. 10001-3904

STWLEGAL@gmail.com

JULY 23, 2019

In the Supreme Court of the United States

(INDEX NO.)

(CURRENTLY IN THE 2ND CIR. CT. UNDER
DOCK. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392)

CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

U.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI: U.S.D.O.J.,

HON. LOUIS L. STANTON & PRO SE INTAKE UNIT, S.D.N.Y.

In association with:

"Petition For Peremptory Writ Of Mandamus, In Re., Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al. (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Petition For Redress Of Grievances: Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.;"

"Petition For Waiver Of Sovereign Immunity (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Memorandum Of Law (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Motion For Preliminary Summary Judgment: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Injunctive Relief Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Temporary Restraining Order W/ Notice: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit;"

&

"Motion To Vacate Dismissal Order Of Hon. Lois L. Stanton, In Re.: Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al., 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)"

STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

CESTUI QUE, Pro Sé Litigant

(Currently Displaced)

Fitted Sole Productions, D.B.A. &

Fitted Fables, D.B.A.

(Previously addressed at: 449 E. 14th Street,

Apt. 7d New York, N.Y. 10009)

Having Mail Temporarily Sent To:

AGVA: In Care of Steven Talbert Williams 363 Seventh Ave., 17th Fl. N.Y.C. 10001-3904

STWLEGAL@gmail.com

JULY 9, 2019

Not Stamped

In the Supreme Court of the United States

(INDEX NO.)

(CURRENTLY IN THE 2ND CIR. CT. UNDER
DOCK. NO. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392)

CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI: U.S.D.O.J.,

HON. LOUIS L. STANTON & PRO SE INTAKE UNIT, S.D.N.Y.

In association with:

"Petition For Peremptory Writ Of Mandamus, In Re., Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al. (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Petition For Redress Of Grievances: Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.;"

"Petition For Waiver Of Sovereign Immunity (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Memorandum Of Law (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Motion For Preliminary Summary Judgment: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Injunctive Relief Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Temporary Restraining Order W/ Notice: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit;"

&

"Motion To Vacate Dismissal Order Of Hon. Lois L. Stanton, In Re.: Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al., 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)"

STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

CESTUI QUE, Pro Sé Litigant

(Currently Displaced)

Fitted Sole Productions, D.B.A. &

Fitted Fables, D.B.A.

(Previously addressed at: 449 E. 14th Street,

Apt. 7d New York, N.Y. 10009)

Having Mail Temporarily Sent To:

AGVA: In Care of Steven Talbert Williams 363 Seventh Ave., 17th Fl. NYC 10001-3904

STWLEGAL@gmail.com

RECEIVED
JUNE 21 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

LISA AHEARN
COPY RECEIVED

JUN 17 2019

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE SDNY

Civil Clerk

In the Supreme Court of the United States

19-1392

(INDEX NO.)

(CURRENTLY IN THE 2ND CIR. CT. UNDER
DOCK. NOS. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-39, 19-240)

CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

U.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI: U.S.D.O.J.,

HON. LOUIS L. STANTON & PRO SE INTAKE UNIT, S.D.N.Y.

In association with:

"Petition For Peremptory Writ Of Mandamus, In Re., Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al. (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Petition For Redress Of Grievances: Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.;"

"Petition For Waiver Of Sovereign Immunity (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Memorandum Of Law (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.);"

"Motion For Preliminary Summary Judgment: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Injunctive Relief Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit;"

"Motion For Temporary Restraining Order W/ Notice: Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Se Intake Unit;"

&

"Motion To Vacate Dismissal Order Of Hon. Lois L. Stanton, In Re.: Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al., 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)"

STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS

CESTUI QUE, Pro Sé Litigant

(Currently Displaced)

Fitted Sole Productions, D.B.A. &

Fitted Fables, D.B.A.

(Previously addressed at: 449 E. 14th Street,

Apt. 7d New York, N.Y. 10009)

Having Mail Temporarily Sent To:

341 9th Ave. New York, N.Y. 10001

STWLEGAL@gmail.com

MAY 14, 2019

RECEIVED

MAY 21 2019

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
UNITED STATES, ET AL. (U.S.D.O.J.; HON.
LOUIS L. STANTON; PRO SE INTAKE UNIT) — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. USA, et al., 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392(2d Cir.)
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI


STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS, CESTUI QUE

(Your Name)

*American Guild of Variety Artists:
In Care of Steven Talbert Williams
363 Seventh Ave., 17th Fl.*


(Address)

New York, N.Y. 10001-3904

(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A (Contact: STWLEGAL@gmail.com)

(Phone Number)


DONDRE STEVEN PERRY
NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK
No. 01PE6368561
Qualified in New York County
My Commission Expires 12-18-2021

7/25/19

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. **28 USC 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)** and **18 U.S.C. §402** (dismissal for “*frivolous[ness]*,” **U.S. Const. Am. 6, 10**):
 - a. Whether the “**ORDER**” (Appendix A, dated March 22, 2019) of HON. LOUIS L. STANTON was unconstitutionally provided to delay trial and lache upon naming all defendants and exhibits? **U.S. Const. Am. 6, 10; 18 U.S.C. §402**.
 - b. Whether the “**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**” (“Dismissal,” Appendix B, Doc. “4” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY); see Appendix X) of HON. STANTON, for “*frivolous[ness]*” (**28 USC 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)**), was unconstitutionally provided, and to issue sanctions for discriminatory and retaliatory contempt of court processes (**18 U.S.C. §402**), claimed to have induced a delay of trial and laches by the court to provide summonses to defendants after CHIEF J. HON. COLLEEN MCMAHON granted the In Forma (Doc. “6” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY); Appendix C) under **28 USC 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)** (a claim of postfiling delayed review, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(a). See Question 3)?
2. **J. Code 1.3 (C. 1)** (“[a] *position to gain... differential treatment of any kind.*”) (judicial estoppel, collateral and promissory, treasonous rebellion, under **U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3, U.S. Const. Am. 5, 13 §3, 14 §§1, 4**):
 - a. Was HON. STANTON’s Dismissal executed in aid of (**18 U.S.C. §§2, 3**) **UBS AG, Pershing, LLC** and **FMR** (“Fidelity,” formerly **Correspondent Services Corporation**) (as alleged financial institutions of PLAINTIFFS’ alleged custodial and irrevocable beneficial trust), as well as other securitized investments, including highlighted facts related to: (i) *District Attorney’s Office of New York County* (collaterally through the trial of **PEOPLE v. STEVEN WILLIAMS**, Dock. No. 2012NY089333(NYCC). **U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1**); (ii) the *New York Police Department* officers of the *Metropolitan Transit Authority* (collaterally through trials of the *Transit Adjudication Bureau*. **U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1**), who previously utilized the financial assets of the *New York State Department of Transportation*, the dwelling of 2 Rector Street, within the community of *Peter Cooper Village/Stuyvesant Town* (“PCV/ST”); (iii) the investments of **UBS AG** in **Pershing Square Holdings Group, LLC**’s Initial Public Offering; and (iv) the *Commercial Mortgage-Backed Security* investments of PCV/ST, **WACHOVIA BANK COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE TRUST 2007-C30** (claimed a conspired act to evict PLAINTIFF to rid the community of rent stabilized tenants in order to raise dwelling unit prices to market-rate values; a claimed act of Domestic Housing Terrorism. **U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3; U.S. Const. Am. 14 §4**), to further aid in subversion of PLAINTIFFS’ life within impoverishment (**U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3**); all executed to gain the non-pursuance of PLAINTIFFS’ redress within the federal court system, under **J. Code 1.3 (C. 1)**?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402**) be enforced against HON. STANTON for such an act?
3. **Fed. R. Civ. P. 4** and **28 U.S.C. §1915** (“*postfiling delayed review*”): should a granted In Forma (Doc. “6” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY); Appendix C) provide for authorization to proceed upon a complaint, and the issuance of summonses to defendants, which cannot be disregarded without examination of evidence (especially for antitrust claims)?
4. Validating antitrust claims (enforced under the **Sherman Antitrust Act** and **Clayton Act**):
 - a. Should PLAINTIFFS’ “**COMPLAINT**” (“Comp.,” Appendix D, Doc. “2” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), filed December 20, 2018) presenting claims under the **Sherman Antitrust Act** and **Clayton Act** be justifiable for the Court to enforce the standards of **Plausibility, Parallelism** and the alleged mandatory procedure to prove the **existence of a contract** (as delineated within the trials of **ASHCROFT v. IQBAL** (“Matter of Iqbal”), 556 U.S. 678 (2002), **BELL ATLANTIC CORP. v. TWOMBLY** (“Matter of Twombly”), 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (“[‘]a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of an illegal agreement[’]” (*Id. at 1965*),]” Matter of Iqbal citing Matter of Twombly) and **ERICKSON v. PARDUS**, 127 S. Ct. 2197 (2007)) and should such claims be a common procedure of the judicial government for proving antitrust offenses?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402**) be enforced against HON. STANTON for laching upon a pursuit to seek evidence of a contract under Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 or Fed. R. Civ. P. 26?
 - i.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

5. 28 U.S.C. §1927:

- a. If sanctions are enforced against HON. STANTON for an unconstitutional dismissal, and antitrust claims are proven to have been escheated, should such provide for the enforcement of additional sanctions under 28 U.S.C. §1927?

6. U.S. Const. Am. 1, 5, 14 §1 and 18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 1001(a):

- a. Should S.D.N.Y.'s PRO SÉ INTAKE UNIT's personal classification of PLAINTIFFs' Comp.'s case type as "*440 Civil Rights*" (evidenced on the "*CIVIL DOCKET*." *Id.* at p.1; Appendices E and AA; filed by S.D.N.Y.'s Pro Sé Intake Unit's "rdz" and "sc") be seen as unconstitutional (under U.S. Const. Am. 1, 5, 14 §1 and 18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 1001(a)), when PLAINTIFF factually stated the matter concerned the Sherman Antitrust Act and Clayton Act within the Comp. and "*NATURE OF SUIT & DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP*" (Doc "3" of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY); Appendix F)?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (18 U.S.C §402) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?

7. U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1; 18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 1513; 44 U.S.C. §§3507(e)(3)(B), 3512:

- a. Are the actions by HON. STANTON to provide an dismissal be seen as retaliatory promissory and collateral discriminatory judicial estoppel (under U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1; 18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 1513; 44 U.S.C. §§3507(e)(3)(B), 3512); collaterally associated to the trials of: *CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, ET AL.*, 15-cv-5114(LAP)(SDNY), 16-189cv(ALK)(DJ)(BDP)(2nd Cir. Ct.), 137 U.S. 1611(No. 16M111, 2017); *Estate of Linda Paula Streger Williams*, File No. 2013-3538(SCNY); *PEOPLE v. STEVEN WILLIAMS*, Dock. No. 2012NY089333(NYCC); *MARYLAND v. WILLIAMS, STEVEN T.*, No. ID00283543 (M.C. Dist.Ct., 2012); and *ST OWNER LP v. EUGENE WILLIAMS*, Index No. 52069/12(Chan)(JHS)(NYHC)?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (18 U.S.C §402) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?

8. U.S. Const. Art. 3 and the "*pendent jurisdiction*" rule):

- a. Should PLAINTIFFs' claims involving collateral estoppel from circuit courts of New York State (namely: *Estate of Linda Paula Streger Williams*, File No. 2013-3538(SCNY); *PEOPLE v. STEVEN WILLIAMS*, Dock. No. 2012NY089333(NYCC); and *ST OWNER LP v. EUGENE WILLIAMS*, Index No. 52069/12(Chan)(JHS)(NYHC)) be jurisdictionally enforced within the Federal Courts under U.S. Const. Art. 3 and the "*pendent jurisdiction*" rule?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (18 U.S.C §402) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
 - ii. Alternatively, U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3; U.S. Const. Am. 14 §4, are questioned for whether named defendants of this certiorari aided in antitrust offenses (under 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3) upon validation of claims of PLAINTIFFs' driver's license and Mrs. Linda Paula Streger Williams (PLAINTIFFs' mother's) Social Security Numbers being allegedly exposed to the public by the local and federal court system (a matter of national security if his alleged trust's funds were utilized to fund of terrorist organizations)?
 - iii. Further, upon validation of aiding antitrust claims as accessories after the fact (see subdivision (ii) above), will the Court provide for further questioning upon Fed. R. App. P. 27, L.R. 27(d), (g), (i) and L.R. 40.2 of the *Local Rules and Internal Operating Procedures of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit*, local statute 22 NYCRR 500.20(d) (for collateral claims of pendent jurisdiction), the recently provided dismissals of *CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, ET AL.*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-39(JAC)(PWH)(JMW)(2nd Cir. Ct.) and *CESTUI QUE STEVEN TALBERT WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, ET AL.*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-240(JAC)(PWH)(JMW)(2nd Cir. Ct.) (see Appendices G, H and I. U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi)) and what delineates "*an adequate, alternative mean[] of obtaining relief*" when judicial officials cite "*Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004)*" for a reason to dismiss reconsideration motions?
 - A. Upon affirmation of a justified reconsideration by PLAINTIFF (see Appendix I. U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi)), will the Court see just to provide a sua sponté order to reopen the above trials (Dock. Nos. 19-39 and 19-240), by writ of error, in question of Fed. R. Civ. P. 60?
 - ii.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

9. **Fed. R. Crim. P. 60(b)** and **28 C.F.R. Part 0, Subpart K** (*Scott Campbell, Stephanie Roper, Wendy Preston, Louarna Gillis, and Nila Lynn Crime Victims' Rights Act*):
 - a. Should PLAINTIFFS' antitrust claims have provided for immediate adjudication, under the doctrines of plausibility, parallelism and proof of a contract for being reported as a crime victim (under **Fed. R. Crim. P. 60(b)** and **28 C.F.R. Part 0, Subpart K**), due PLAINTIFF providing proof of account information of the "*Mrs. Linda Paula Streger Williams' (Decedents') Individual Retirement Acct. (IRA) trust (Pershing, LLC & UBS Acct.#: x7439 – EIN#: x8899 – Treas. (IRS) form SS-4#: x6766 and evidence of a W-9 form*)" (Comp. at 5)?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
10. **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)** and **18 U.S.C §402 (U.S. Const. Am. 1; U.S. Const. Am. 10; U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3)**:
 - a. Were PLAINTIFFS' "*Motion For Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a), (b)(1) to (b)(6), (d)(1) to (d)(3) (Coram Nobis/Coram Vobis): Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, 137 U.S.Ct. 1611(2017) (15 U.S.C. §26; Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d); 5 U.S.C. §§552(b)(7), 552a(l)(1); 49 U.S.C. §30301(d)(7))*" (Appendix J. U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi)) hidden in the filings of Doc. "g" of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY) in opposition of **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)**, and, if so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402**) and advocacy offense (**U.S. Const. Am. 1; U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402** and **U.S. Const. Am. 10**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
11. **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)**, **Fed. R. Crim. P. 42** and **18 U.S.C §402 (U.S. Const. Am. 1; U.S. Const. Am. 10; U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3)**:
 - a. Were PLAINTIFFS' two documents of a "*Petition For Permission To Appeal To The United States Supreme Court*" (Appendix K) and "*Affidavit In Support Of Complaint, Part IV*" (Appendix L) missing from the filings of 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY) in opposition of **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)** and **Fed. R. Crim. P. 42**, and, if so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402** and **U.S. Const. Am. 10**) and advocacy offense (**U.S. Const. Am. 1; U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
12. **Fed. R. App. P. 3(b)(2)** ("*separate timely notices of [ap]peal, the appeals may be joined or consolidated by the court of appeals*"), **18 U.S.C §402** and **U.S. Const. Am. 10**:
 - a. Was PLAINTIFF denied the right to file two notices of an appeal under **Fed. R. App. P. 3(b)(2)**, where one appeal was allegedly sought for a class action remedy (see the CIVIL DOCKET's "*Appeal Remark as to 8 Notice of Appeal... (tp) (Entered: 01/03/2019)*," Appendix M)?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402** and **U.S. Const. Am. 10**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?
13. **U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 7** (postal fraud); **U.S. Const. Am. 1, 4, 6, 10; 18 U.S.C. §1001(a)** and **18 U.S.C §402 (U.S. Const. Am. 1; U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3)**:
 - a. Was PLAINTIFFS' federal mail for Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY) sent to "*General Delivery Services 333 1st Avenue NY, NY 10003*" (see the CIVIL DOCKET note, "*(Entered: 12/27/2018)*," by "*aea*," Appendix N) (the address to a trucking company, no longer in service, however, across the street from the community of PCV/ST) and not to the U.S.P.S.'s "*General Delivery*" office in a conspired discriminatory and retaliatory manner of contempt (**18 U.S.C §402**) and postal fraud (**U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 7**) to deprive PLAINTIFF of his requested right to receive federal mail of the court and to falsify information (under **18 U.S.C. §1001(a)**) in order to delay trial under **U.S. Const. Am. 1, 4 and 6**?
 - i. If so, will sanctions for contempt (**18 U.S.C §402** and **U.S. Const. Am. 10**) be enforced against the employees of S.D.N.Y. for such an act?

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ii. Furthermore, was such above act to send federal mail from the District Court to an address not “normally” used by the Court for pro sé litigants without a stable dwelling in aid of antitrust offenses (under 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3, U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3 and U.S. Const. Am. 14 §4?
14. **Fed. R. Civ. P. 3 and Fed. R. Crim. P. 3**, seeking a revising of the federal rules:
 - a. Should federal courts provide a response to a filed complaint within a fourteen (14) day period? See “*Exhibit 46*” [highlighting omitted] of the forthcoming “*Motion For Injunctive Relief Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit*” [highlighting omitted] (“Injunction,” previously filed within Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.), entitled “*Slip Law Draft Of Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure, Rule 3.1, By Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams*” [highlighting omitted] (see Appendix O).
15. **Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e), (f)(1)**
 - a. Should the “**STRIKE ORDER**” (Doc. “104” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) (Appendix P), striking the filing of the Injunction and other supporting documents (including PLAINTIFF’s “*Letter To Chief Clerk Ms./Mrs. Kathleen O’Hagan: Validation Of Filing An Affidavit (Doc. 82)*,” Doc. “88” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) (Appendix Q) and “*Motion To Strike Defectiveness (Doc. 84)*” Doc. “89-I” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) (Appendix R) (both filed on June 3, 2019, prior to the Appellate Court requesting clarification of PLAINTIFF’s strike motion, and again on June 10, 2019 (see PLAINTIFF’s “**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**” for June 10, 2019, Doc. “98-I” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.); Appendix S. U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi))), have been provided, whether or not enforced under **Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e)** or **Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f)(1)**);
16. **U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 17; U.S. Const. Art. 1 §10, 6 §2; U.S. Const. Am. 11; Fed. R. Civ. P. 11; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54; Fed. R. Civ. P. 65; 48 C.F.R. §2815; 28 U.S.C. §651, et seq.; 5 U.S.C. §555(b); The Adequate Remedy Rule; and Economic Benefit Doctrine** (in coordination with seeking waiver of immunity via mandamus, as a “preliminary” semi-safe harbor, or quasi-public good), seeking a revising to constitutional laws and acts of Congress:
 - a. Should revising to constitutional laws and acts of Congress commence to establish a new doctrine to allow a U.S. citizen to obtain sovereign immunity through a settlement, structured or qualified, as such may additionally benefit the U.S. Government not only economically (as a party of interest to a contractual agreement, or treaty), but for society as a whole? See Injunction at “*Exhibit 45*,” [highlighting omitted] an “*Act to Immunize an Individual from Tax liability within Sovereignty*” (shortened title: “*Individual Tax Immunity Act*”) (Appendix T).
17. Seeking a revising to **42 U.S.C. §2000d and Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**, as amended (specifically **§601**):
 - a. Should a revising to **42 U.S.C. §2000d, Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** and other constitutional laws and acts of Congress commence to include the term “*socioeconomic status*” or “*economic status*” and to review the establishment of an act of Congress for “*Deprived Economic Status*” (see Appendix U, entitled “*Slip Law Proposal: Deprived Economic Status*”)?
18. **The Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202** (seeking a sua sponte 28 U.S.C. §1296(b) motion):
 - a. Whether a vacate is justified for a dismissal provided after a granted In Forma and before summonses or acquiring supporting documentation and evidence under **The Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202**? See a forthcoming “*Motion To Vacate Dismissal Order Of Hon. Lois L. Stanton, In Re.: Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)*.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1 to 1.d
JURISDICTION.....	2 to 2.d
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	ORDER, <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “ <u>20</u> ” (by HON. STANTON, dated Mar. 22, 2019).
APPENDIX B	ORDER OF DISMISSAL, “Signed by” HON. STANTON, <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “ <u>4</u> ,” filed by “(mro)” (dated Dec. 26, 2019). See Appendix W.
APPENDIX C	ORDER GRANTING IFP APPLICATION, “Signed by” HON. CHIEF J. MCMAHON, <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “ <u>6</u> ,” filed by “(rdz).”
APPENDIX D	COMPLAINT, <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “ <u>2</u> .”
APPENDIX E	CIVIL DOCKET, <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY). See Appendix AA.
APPENDIX F	“NATURE OF SUIT & DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP,” <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “ <u>3</u> ,” filed by “(sc).”
APPENDIX G	ORDER, denying reconsideration (by Hon. Cabranes and Hon. Hall, “Judge Walker has recused”) (Doc. “ <u>187</u> ” of <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-39</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW), dated June 11, 2019) (see also an accompanying “ORDER,” Doc. “ <u>59</u> ” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-240</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW), dated May 31, 2019); also evidenced as Doc. “ <u>183</u> ” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-39</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW)), denying the filing of Appendices and Exhibits. <i>Id.</i> at App.38).
APPENDIX H	ORDER and MANDATE, denying reconsideration (by Hon. Cabranes and Hon. Hall, “Judge Walker has recused”) (Docs. “ <u>66</u> ” and “ <u>68</u> ” of <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-240</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)).
APPENDIX I	PLAINTIFFS’ “Motion For Reconsideration” (with appendices and exhibits), Doc. “ <u>171-1</u> ” of <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-39</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW) (similar to the motion in Doc. “ <u>50-1</u> ” of <i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> , 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), <u>19-240</u> (2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW)). See accompanying original filings of appendices and exhibits. <i>Id.</i> at App.81 to App.186. See also Appendix X.

INDEX TO APPENDICES (CONTINUED)

- APPENDIX J *“Motion For Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a), (b)(1) to (b)(6), (d)(1) to (d)(3) (Coram Nobis/Coram Vobis): Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, 137 U.S. S.Ct. 1611(2017) (15 U.S.C. §26; Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d); 5 U.S.C. §§552(b)(7), 552a(l)(1); 49 U.S.C. §30301(d)(7)),”* hidden in the filings of Doc. “g” of Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY).
- APPENDIX K Missing filings of *“Petition For Permission To Appeal To The United States Supreme Court”* from *Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), stamped by S.D.N.Y. as filed on January 7, 2019.
- APPENDIX L Missing filings of *“Affidavit In Support Of Complaint, Part IV”* from *Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), stamped by S.D.N.Y. as filed on January 7, 2019.
- APPENDIX M The CIVIL DOCKET’s *“Appeal Remark as to g Notice of Appeal...(tp) (Entered: 01/03/2019),”* S.D.N.Y.’s PRO SE INTAKE UNIT employee, tp, stating:
“LITIGANT INSISTED ON FILING TWO SEPARATE NOA’S. EACH NOA HAS OTHER DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO IT. NOA #2 IS ATTACHED TO THE FIRST”
- APPENDIX N CIVIL DOCKET mailings to *“General Delivery Services 333, 1st Avenue NY, NY 10003”* (a trucking company, no longer in service) entered by “(aea)” on “12/26/2018” and “12/27/2018,” as well as “(vn)” on “1/11/2019.”
- APPENDIX O *“Slip Law Draft Of Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure, Rule 3.1, By Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams”* (see *“Exhibit 45”* [highlighting omitted] of the Injunction for the mandamus action, Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
- APPENDIX P *“STRIKE ORDER,”* Doc. “104” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) (dated June 27, 2019). See the accompanying *“NOTICE OF DEFECTIVE FILING”* (Doc. “84” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) and the confirmation *Filing Numbers to PLAINTIFFS’ “Letter To Chief Clerk Ms./Mrs. Kathleen O’Hagan: Validation Of Filing An Affidavit (Doc. 82)”* (Appendix Q) and *“Motion To Strike Defectiveness (Doc. 84)”* (see Appendix R).
- APPENDIX Q *“Letter To Chief Clerk Ms./Mrs. Kathleen O’Hagan: Validation Of Filing An Affidavit (Doc. 82),”* Doc. “88” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
- APPENDIX R *“Motion To Strike Defectiveness (Doc. 84)”* Doc. “89-1” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
- APPENDIX S PLAINTIFF’s *“CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE”* for June 10, 2019, Doc. “98-1” of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
- APPENDIX T *“An Act to Immunize an Individual from Tax liability within Sovereignty”* (*“Individual Tax Immunity Act”*). See *“Exhibit 44,”* [highlighting omitted] of the Injunctive motion for the mandamus action of this certiorari, Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
- APPENDIX U *“SLIP LAW PROPOSAL: DERIVED ECONOMIC STATUS”* and *“AMENDMENT TO §2000D OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.”*
- APPENDIX V *“RE: Williams v. United States[,] USCA Nos. 19-39, 19240, 19-1392 (?)”*, letter from the Clerk of the U.S.S.Ct. (Scott S. Harris, Jacob Levitan), dated June 7, 2019. See the accompanying two letters from the U.S.S.Ct. (all dated June 21, 2019), entitled: (i) *“RE: Williams v. United States[,] USCA2 Nos. 19-39, 19240, 19-1392 (?)”* (two pages); and (ii) *“RE: In Re Williams.”* See also the accompanying two U.S.S.Ct. letters (both dated June 4, 2019), entitled: (i) *“RE: On Petition for Waiver of Sovereign Immunity ..[.]”* and *“RE: In Re Williams.”*
- APPENDIX W CIVIL JUDGMENT, *Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States et al.*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), Doc. “5.” See Appendices A and B.

INDEX TO APPENDICES (CONTINUED)

- APPENDIX X “*Letter To Hon. José A. Cabranes, Hon. Peter W. Hall & Hon. John M. Walker, Jr.,*” Doc. “179” of Dock. No. 19-39(2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW). See Appendices G, H and I.
- APPENDIX Y N.Y.A.G.’s MS./MRS. JAMES’ “*LETTER*” to the Appellate Court and PLAINTIFF, notifying them of not receiving a summons (see Doc. “60” of Dock. Nos. 19-39(2nd Cir. Ct.)), and U.S. ASST. ATTORNEY, BENJAMIN H. TORRANCE’s “*LETTER*” to the Appellate Court and PLAINTIFF, notifying them of not receiving a summons (Doc. “40” of Dock. Nos. 19-39(2nd Cir. Ct.)).
- APPENDIX Z PLAINTIFFS’ “*COMPLAINT: STATEMENT OF NAMED PARTIES*” [highlighting added] (filed December 20, 2018), evidencing pages 1 and 21, naming One Hundred & Seventy-Six defendants, not “*169*” as evidenced by HON. STANTON within the Dismissal
- APPENDIX AA A comparison of named defendants on CIVIL DOCKET (Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY)) to those listed upon the General Dockets of the Appellate Court for Dock. Nos. 19-39(2nd Cir. Ct.), 19-240(2nd Cir. Ct.), 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.). See Appendix BB.
- APPENDIX BB “*General Docket*” for Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 678 (2002)	i
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007), 127 S. Ct.	
<i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States</i> ,	
18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-39, 19-1392(2 nd Cir. Ct.)	ii, iv, vii, viii, 1, 2, 4
<i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> ,	
18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 19-39(2 nd Cir. Ct.), 19-240(2 nd Cir. Ct., Mandamus) ...	i to iv, vi to viii,
<i>Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al.</i> ,	1, 2, 4
15cv5114(LAP)(SDNY), 16-189cv(ALK)(DJ)(BDP)(2 nd Cir. Ct.),	
137 U.S. 1611(2017)(No. 16M111, 2017)	ii, iii, vi
<i>Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.</i> , 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004)	ii
<i>Erikson v. Pardus</i> , 127 S. Ct. 2197 (2007)	i
<i>Estate of Linda Paula Streger Williams</i> , File No. 2013-3538(SCNY)	ii
<i>Ex parte Republic of Peru</i> ,	
318 U.S. 578, 588, 63 S.Ct. 793, 799, 87 L.Ed. 1014 (1943)	4
<i>Ex Parte United States</i> , 287 U.S. 241, 245, 248, syll. n. 1, 4 (1932)	4
<i>Hon. Herbert L. Will J. U.S. N. Dist. Ct. of Illinois v. United States</i> ,	
389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 19 L.Ed.2d 305 (1967)	4
<i>La Buy v. Howes Leather Co.</i> , 352 U.S. 249, 77 S.Ct. 309, 1 L.Ed.2d 290 (1957) ...	4
STATUTES AND RULES	
U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 7	iii, 3
U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 17 ...	iv, 3
U.S. Const. Art. 1 §10	iv, 3
U.S. Const. Art. 3, §2, Cl. 1 ...	2 to 4
U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3	i, ii, iv, 3
U.S. Const. Art. 6 §2	iv, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 1	ii, iii, 3, 4
U.S. Const. Am. 4	iii, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 5	i, ii, 3, 4
U.S. Const. Am. 6	i, iii, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 8	3
U.S. Const. Am. 10	i, iii, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 11	iv, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 13 §3	i, ii, 3
U.S. Const. Am. 14 §1	i, ii, 3, 4
U.S. Const. Am. 14 §4	i, iv, 3
U.S. S.Ct. Rule 11	2, 4
U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi)	ii to iv, 3
U.S. S.Ct. Rule 33.2(b)	4
U.S. S.Ct. Rule 34	4
Fed. R. Civ. P. 3	iv, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 3.1 (proposed)	iv
Fed. R. Civ. P. 4	i, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)	iii, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)	iv, 3, 4
Fed. R. Civ. P.12(e), (f)(1)	vii, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 16	i, 3, 4
Fed. R. Civ. P. 26	i, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 42	4
Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), (c)	iv, 3, 4
Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a), (b)(1) to (b)(6), (d)(1) to (d)(3)...	iii, vi
Fed. R. Civ. P. 65	iv, 3
Fed. R. Crim. P. 3	iii, 3
Fed. R. Crim. P. 42	iii, 3
Fed. R. Crim. P. 60(b)(2), (b)(3)	iii, 3, 4
Fed. R. App. P. 3(b)(2), (c)	iii, 3
OTHER	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

<i>Maryland v. Williams, Steven T.</i> , No. ID00283543 (M.C. Dist.Ct., 2012)	ii
<i>People v. Williams, Steven</i> , Dock. No. 2012NY089333(NYCC)	ii
<i>ST Owner LP v. Eugene Williams</i> , Index No. 52069/12(Chan)(JHS)(NYHC)	ii
<i>Wilbur v. United States, Ex Rel. Kadrie</i> , 281 U.S. 206, 218 (1930)	4

STATUTES AND RULES

Fed. R. App. P. 15.1	4	28 U.S.C. §503	v
Fed. R. App. P. 16(a)	4	28 U.S.C. §515(a)	v
Fed. R. App. P. 19	4	28 U.S.C. §651, et seq.	iv, v, 3
Fed. R. App. P. 21(a)	4	28 U.S.C. §1251(a)	4
Fed. R. App. P. 27	ii	28 U.S.C. §1253	4
J. Code 1.3 (C. 1)	i, 3	28 U.S.C. §1254(1), (2)	2, 4
L.R. 27(d), (g), (i)	ii	28 U.S.C. §1257(a)	2
L.R. 40.2	ii	28 U.S.C. §1296(b)	iv
48 C.F.R. §2815	v, 3		
28 C.F.R. §0.5	v	28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i)	i, 3
28 C.F.R. Part 0, Subpart K	iii, 3	28 U.S.C. §1927	ii, 3, 4
5 C.F.R. §1201.43	4	28 U.S.C. §1361	4
49 U.S.C. §30301(d)(7)	iii, vi	28 U.S.C. §1391(e)	4
44 U.S.C. §3507(e)(3)(B)	ii, 3	28 U.S.C. §1404(a)	4
44 U.S.C. §3512	ii, 3	28 U.S.C. §1631	4
42 U.S.C. §2000d	iv, 3	28 U.S.C. §1651(a)	4
28 U.S.C. §158(d)(2)(A)(ii),	4	28 U.S.C. §1657	4
(d)(2)(A)(iii)		28 U.S.C. §2201	iv, 3

OTHER

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. §2202	iv, 3	5 U.S.C. §500, et seq.	4
28 U.S.C. Ch. 16	4	5 U.S.C. §552(b)(7)	iii, vi
28 U.S.C. Ch. 51	4	5 U.S.C. §552a(l)(1)	iii, vi
28 U.S.C. Ch. 158	4	5 U.S.C. §555(b)	iv, 3
28 U.S.C. Ch. 161	4	5 U.S.C. Ch. 5, Subch. I	4
18 U.S.C. §2	i, ii, iv, 3	22 NYCRR 500.20(d)	ii
18 U.S.C. §3	i, ii, iv, 3	CRM §1064	4
18 U.S.C. §241	ii, 3, 4	<i>Administrative Procedure Act</i>	4
18 U.S.C. §371	ii, 3, 4	<i>An Act to Immunize an Individual from Tax</i>	
18 U.S.C. §402	i to iii, 3	<i>liability within Sovereignty (Individual Tax</i>	
18 U.S.C. §1001(a)	ii, iii, 3	<i>Immunity Act) (as proposed)</i>	iv
18 U.S.C. §1513	ii, 3	<i>Civil Rights Act of 1964, Titles VI, VII (§601)</i>	iv, 3
18 U.S.C. §2521	4	<i>Clayton Act of 1914</i>	i, ii, 3
18 U.S.C. §3173	4	<i>The Declaratory Judgment Act</i>	iv, 3
18 U.S.C. §3174	4	<i>Scott Campbell, Stephanie Roper, Wendy</i>	
18 U.S.C. §3771(d)(3)	4	<i>Preston, Louarna Gillis, and Nila Lynn</i>	
15 U.S.C. §1, et seq.	3	<i>Crime Victims' Rights Act</i>	ii, 3
15 U.S.C. §26	iii	<i>Sherman Antitrust Act of 1980</i>	i, ii, 3

OTHER

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 _____ 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 Southern District Court of the State of New York; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished. (ORDER, Doc. 20, Appendix A, Dock. No. 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY);
See PLAINTIFFS' mandamus action for sanctions of Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.)).

☐ 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 ^{District Court}~~Court of Appeals~~ decided my case was Mar. 22, 2019 (Dock. No. 18-cv-12064(S.D.N.Y.), 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.).
U.S. S.Ct. Rule 11. See Appendices A, G and H).

☒ 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: _____, 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. § 1254(1).

- Additionally enforced under: U.S. Const. Art. 3, §2, Cl. 1; **U.S. S.Ct. Rule 11.**
- This matter was sought for sanctions in the mandamus action of Dock. No. 19-39, assigned to Dock. No. 19-1392(2nd Cir. Ct.) (undocumented from Dock. No. 18-cv-12064(SDNY)) when the District Court's ORDER (Appendix A), referencing both Dock. No. 19-39 and Dock. No. 19-240, were issued by HON. STANTON.
- Mandate for Dock. No. 19-240(2nd Cir. Ct.) was issued after filing of the Certiorari.

☐ 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

- Q1. U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3; U.S. Const. Am. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13 §3, 14 §1, 14 §4 (28 USC 1915(e)(2)(B)(i); 18 U.S.C. §402);
- Q2. J. Code 1.3 (C. 1); U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3, U.S. Const. Am. 5, 13 §3, 14 §§1, 4 (18 U.S.C. §§2, 3, 402);
- Q3. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (28 U.S.C. §1915);
- Q4. *Clayton Act of 1914; Sherman Antitrust Act of 1980*; 18 U.S.C §402; Fed. R. Civ. P. 16, 26;
- Q5. 28 U.S.C. §1927 (15 U.S.C. §1, et seq.)
- Q6. U.S. Const. Am. 1, 5, 14 §1 (18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 402, 1001(a));
- Q7. U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1 (18 U.S.C. §§241, 371, 402, 1513; 44 U.S.C. §§3507(e)(3)(B), 3512);
- Q8. U.S. Const. Art. 3 (including U.S. Const. Art. 3 §3; U.S. Const. Am. 14 §4, for aiding claimed antitrust offenses (18 U.S.C. §§2, 3, 402) (U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi)));
- Q9. Fed. R. Crim. P. 60(b) (28 C.F.R. Part 0, Subpart K (*Scott Campbell, Stephanie Roper, Wendy Preston, Louarna Gillis, and Nila Lynn Crime Victims' Rights Act*); 18 U.S.C. §402);
- Q10. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4) (U.S. Const. Am. 1, 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3, 402, aiding in subversion of life within impoverishment) and Fed. R. App. P. 27, L.R. 27(d), (g), (i) and L.R. 40.2 (22 NYCRR 500.20(d)) (U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi));
- Q11. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4), Fed. R. Crim. P. 42 and 18 U.S.C. §402 (U.S. Const. Am. 1, 10, 13 §3; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3);
- Q12. U.S. Const. Am. 10, Fed. R. App. P. 3(b)(2) and 18 U.S.C §402;
- Q13. U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 7; U.S. Const. Am. 1, 4, 6, 10, 13 §3 (18 U.S.C. §§402, 1001(a));
- Q14. Fed. R. Civ. P. 3 and Fed. R. Crim. P. 3 (U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.1(i)(vi));
- Q15. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e), (f)(1)
- Q16. U.S. Const. Art. 1 §8 Cl. 17; U.S. Const. Art. 1 §10, 6 §2; U.S. Const. Am. 11; Fed. R. Civ. P. 11; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54; Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 (48 C.F.R. §2815; 28 U.S.C. §651, et seq.; 5 U.S.C. §555(b));
- Q17. 42 U.S.C. §2000d and *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, as amended (Titles VI, VII (§601)); and
- Q18. 28 U.S.C. §§2201-2202 (*Declaratory Judgment Act*).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter is brought before the *Supreme Court of the United States* (“U.S. S.Ct.”) from an appellate mandamus action associated to the trial of *Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States*, 18cv12064(LLS)(SDNY), 1932(2nd Cir. Ct.)(JAC)(PWH)(JMW), where such seeks a response to requested orders for sanctions from HON. CHIEF J. MCMAHON against HON. STANTON and employees of the PRO SÉ INTAKE UNIT of the SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (“S.D.N.Y.”) for claims of contempt of court processes and conspired retaliatory promissory and collateral discriminatory estoppel (U.S. Const. Am. 5, 14 §1; 18 U.S.C. §§241, 371), perpetrated in aid of subversion of PLAINTIFFS’ life within impoverishment, as an accessory after the fact (U.S. Const. Am. 1; 18 U.S.C. §§2, 3) of antitrust claims of Dock. Nos. 19-39 and 19-240 of the Appellate Court, to profit from claims of the illegal reinvested assets of PLAINTIFFS’ alleged beneficial trust (“Trust LPSW,” managed by PERSHING, LLC, UBS AG and FMR, LLC); as such claimed illegally reinvested assets are evidenced as being illegally reinvested into the rent stabilized residential community of *Peter Cooper Village/Stuyvesant Town* (“PCV/ST,” of PLAINTIFFS’ beneficial real property of a claimed illegal eviction), where the Assets Under Management of UBS AG (with use of Trust LPSW) were reinvested into the Initial Public Offering of PERSHING SQUARE HOLDINGS GROUP, LLC and further reinvested into the prior securitized trust of PCV/ST (WACHOVIA BANK COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE TRUST 2007-C30 (“TRUST2007-C30”), including affiliated tranches and foreign BONDHOLDERS). U.S. Const. Art. 3 §2, Cl. 1; U.S. S.Ct. Rule 11, 33.2(b), 34; Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c), 16, 37, 42, 54(c), FRAP. 15.1, 16(a), 19, 21(a); Fed. R. Crim. P. 60(b)(2); 5 C.F.R. §1201.43; 5 U.S.C. Ch. 5, Subch. I, §500, et seq. (see Administrative Procedure Act and Ethics in Government Act of 1978); 18 U.S.C. §§3173, 3174, 3771(d)(3); 28 U.S.C. §§158(d)(2)(A)(ii), (d)(2)(A)(iii), Ch. 16, Ch. 51, 1251(a), 1253, 1254(2), 1361, 1391(e), 1404(a), 1631, 1651(a), 1657, 1927, Ch. 158, Ch. 161. See *WILBUR v. UNITED STATES, ex Rel. KADRIE*, 281 U.S. 206, 218 (1930), “to direct the retraction or reversal of action already taken[.]” See also the opinion by Hon. Chief J. WARREN within *HON. HERBERT L. WILL, J., U.S. N. DIST. CT. OF ILLINOIS v. UNITED STATES*, 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 19 L.Ed.2d 305 (1967):

“the writ has been invoked where unwarranted judicial action threatened ‘to embarrass the executive arm of the government in conducting foreign relations,’ Ex parte Republic of Peru, 318 U.S. 578, 588, 63 S.Ct. 793, 799, 87 L.Ed. 1014 (1943)[.]... and where a district judge displayed a persistent disregard of the Rules of Civil Procedure[]... La Buy v. Howes Leather Co., 352 U.S. 249, 77 S.Ct. 309, 1 L.Ed.2d 290 (1957)[.]” [emphasis added]

See also U.S. Attorneys Criminal Resource Manual §1064:

“18 U.S.C. § 2521,... directs the court to proceed ‘as soon as practicable’ to the hearing and determination of such an action, and... to prevent a continuing and substantial injury to the United States or to any person[.]” [emphasis added]

See also *EX PARTE UNITED STATES*, 287 U.S. 241, 245, 248, syll. n. 1, 4 (1932):

“[t]his Court has full power in its discretion to issue the writ of mandamus to a federal district court, although... this Court ha[s] ultimate discretionary jurisdiction by certiorari, [wherein] such power will be exercised only where a question of public importance is involved, or where the question is of such a nature that it is peculiarly appropriate that such action by this Court should be taken[,... and whereby a] grand jury conclusively determines the existence of probable cause for the purpose of holding the accused to answer.” [highlighting and emphasis added]

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Granting permission to review this matter of contemptuous judicial estoppel claims, seeking sanction awards, should be had in the interest of justice to:

1. hold federal officers and officials liable for damages (upon granting of waiver of immunity. See "*Petition For Waiver Of Sovereign Immunity (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.)*." See also "*Petition For Peremptory Writ Of Mandamus; In Re., Cestui Que Steven Talbert Williams v. United States, et al. (Sanctions Upon Hon. Louis L. Stanton & Pro Sé Intake Unit, S.D.N.Y.)*;"
2. advance upon legal revision; and
3. to expedite trial proceedings, for the U.S. Government to make a superior ruling of illegalities, where the interests of society are benefitted by a settlement, agreeing to the acceptance of lesser damages, which will, in turn, benefit society through the use of revolving real property and securitized accounts, and where defendants, as proposed, shall perform two years of community service as a moral reform program, benefiting from their contributions to intellectual property (receiving royalty payments from psychology textbooks and other materials) and other forms of monetary benefits, where they will have the opportunity to return to their positions within S.D.N.Y. or decide to invest within real estate, where partial profits are provided to the Government as a quasi-public good and semi-safe harbor agreement, under the economic benefit doctrine.

CONCLUSION


The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Talbert Williams, Cestui Que (PLAINTIFF, Pro Sé)

Date: ²⁵July 23, 2019 (resubmitted)



DONDRE STEVEN PERRY
NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK

No. 01PE6368561

Qualified in New York County

My Commission Expires 12-18-2021

7/25/19