


Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

RM



Anthony L. Pierce,
Petitioner

Case No. 19-5461

vs.

Lisa Garrett, Susan Cunningham
Respondent(s)

Petition For Rehearing

In accordance with the rules of the court, petitioner is submitting this/his Petition For Rehearing in good faith and have no intentions to delay the court from other pressing matters though, petitioner feel stronger that the allegations made by the district court and/or the court's adoption to impose ~~the~~ stricks against petitioner were not adequately addressed and its for this reason petitioner raise the precise arguments to be addressed.

~~submitted to the court for the~~

Substantial Ground I.

The district court denied petitioner relief due to a claim of petitioner not offering factual evidence to back up his claim when petitioner pointed out to the court in his argument that he had indeed sent the exact copy of the confiscation sheet and/or the Step I and Step II Grievances, as well as the receipt he received from the Regional Director, a Mr. Scott, on two (2) other occasions when the local magistrate dismissed them, for frivolous reasons twice.

Petitioner attempted to offer the court proof that the mail-room supervisor are removing legal documents from petitioner's legal mail, as the former mail-room supervisor did. Still, petitioner's posting a third copy of the confiscated slip and/or Step's I and 2 Grievances to no avail.

Substantial Ground II.

Petitioner submitted two (2) separate Interlocutory Questionnaire's that were ignored by the district court because the court had already adopted the local magistrate's recommendations without affording petitioner the benefit of the doubt, especially in light of the fact that petitioner sorted to resolve the matter in accordance to institutional rules and/or Small

copy

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Anthony L. Pierce,
Petitioner

Case No. 19-5461

vs.

Lisa Garrett, Susan Cunningham
Respondent(s)

Petition For Rehearing

In accordance with the rules of the court, petitioner is submitting this /his Petitioner For Rehearing in good faith and have no intentions to delay the court from other pressing matters, though, petitioner feel stronger that the allegations made by the district court and/or the court's adoption to impose stricks against petitioner were not adequately addressed and

Substantial Ground I.

The district court denied petitioner relief due to a claim of petitioner not offering factual evidence to back up his claim when petitioner pointed out to the court in his argument that he had indeed sent the exact copy of the confiscation sheet and/or the Step I and Step II Grievances, as well as the receipt he received from the Regional Director, a Mr. Scott, on two (2) other occasions when the local magistrate dismissed them, for frivolous reason's twice.

Petitioner attempted to offer the court proof that the mail-room supervisor are removing legal documents from petitioner's legal mail, as the former mail-room supervisor did. Still, petitioner's posting a third copy of the confiscated slip and/or Step's 1 and 2 Grievances to no avail.


Substantial Ground I.I.

Petitioner submitted two (2) separate Interlocutory Questionnaire's that were ignored by the district court because the court had already adopted the local magistrate's recommendations without affording petitioner the benefit of the doubt, especially in light of the fact that petitioner sought to resolve the matter in accordance to Institutional rules and/or Small Claims Court, of which the district court granted petitioner because petitioner showered the court he was barred due to time restraint, and

Substantial Ground I.II.

Petitioner's action was not frivolous and offered arguments to the contrary including legal citation and/or argued the fact that had the institutional rules were actually applied as it is written, a substantial amount of Pro Se litigation would be significantly reduced and its on these three (3) substantial grounds petitioner offer his Petition For Rehearing on the grounds listed ensolve.

Wherefore Premise Considered, Petitioner, Anthony L. Pierce, file this /his Petition For Rehearing on the ground listed herein and state that such filing is not to delay the court in this matter other than to seek a proper ruling on the facts of the case ~~which are filed in good faith and for the best intention seeking only a fair ruling.~~

Respectfully submitted

 Petitioner