

19-5503

No. _____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 11 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Patricia Gill — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Mercy College et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Patricia Gill
(Your Name)

2354 Paulding Ave
(Address)

Bronx NY 10469
(City, State, Zip Code)

(347) 327-7312
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTE

Plaintiff does not feel that the court of appeals decision does not reflect the whole truth in this case. The appeals decision states that Plaintiff is without merit. Plaintiff feels that Judge Nelson S. Roman heard this case in it's entirely, he did not dismiss this case of lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and Instead Judge Roman suggested that defendant contact plaintiff to come to some resolution in this case, and additions to this Judge Roman instructed Plaintiff to seek help for her case at the *pro se* office, either at white plans or at the Manhattan office. Judge Roman's action in this case holds merits. Plaintiff feels that Judge Nelson S. Roman acted in Bad faith when he spoke about this case in the Nyack College case. She was only informed that hearing would be about Nyack College issues. Plaintiff feels that she is being ostracize for speaking out for herself.

¹ The prosecutions undertaken by state officials in bad faith with the intent to harass the defendant/Plaintiff and discourage her from exercising her federal constitutional rights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A SUMMARY ORDER April 16, 2019 of United State Court of Appeals

APPENDIX B JUDGMENT April 23, 2018, United State District Court

APPENDIX C JUDGMENT August 1, 2018, United State District Court

APPENDIX D JUDGMENT February 13, 2015, Supreme Court of the State Court

APPENDIX E February 24, 2015 Appellate Division Supreme Court

LIST OF PARTIES

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

☒ 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:

Mercy College, Evan Imber- Black, Michael Sperling

Lois Wims, Kimberly Cline, Shelly Alkin, and Deirdre Whitman and

The City Of New York Commission on Human Rights

Rule 12.6 states that all parties to the proceeding whose judgment is sought to be reviewed shall be deemed parties in this Court, and that all parties other than petitioner shall be respondents. The court whose judgment you seek to have this Court review is not a party.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

No case at this time

STATUTES AND RULES

No case at this time

OTHER

Rebuttal

Attach Exhibit documents

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 B 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 D 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 April 16, 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: April 23, 2018, 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).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was February 24, 2015.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix E.

☐ 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

No cases at this time.

No constitutional and statutory provisions involved at this time.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Plaintiff commenced a lawsuit at the United States district court against The New York Commission on Human Rights charging Mercy College respondent with an unlawful discriminatory practice relating to education because of disability in violation in Section 8-107(4)(a) of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, and have injured him Complainant thereby, and violated her rights. Petitioner also feels that The Commission on Human Rights violated her constitutional rights and Mr. Carlos, Velez (Executive Director) and Mr. Raymond Wayne's (preparer), was "arbitrary and capricious." The law calls such decisions and actions arbitrary and capricious decisions or action is one taken "without sound basis in reason and ... without regard to the facts or laws."

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Plaintiff feels that Judge Nelson S. Roman heard this case in it's entirely, he did not dismiss this case of lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and Instead Judge Roman suggested that defendant contact plaintiff to come to some resolution in this case, and additions to this Judge Roman instructed Plaintiff to seek help for her case at the *pro se* office, either at white plans or at the Manhattan office. Judge Roman's action in this case holds merits.


Plaintiff feels that Judge Nelson S. Roman acted in Bad faith when he spoke about the Nyack College case, when instructing plaintiff to go the pro se office. Plaintiff was not there for the Nyack College case. The prosecutions undertaken by state officials, in bad faith with the intent to harass the defendant/Plaintiff and discourage her from exercising her federal constitutional rights,

Plaintiff has demonstrated that she falls under the guidelines of the Supreme Court of the United States a poor person relief, by supplying documentation to the court.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'P' followed by several loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Date: June 11, 2019