

OUTGOING LEGAL MAIL
PROVIDED TO TAYLOR C.I. FOR

8.6.19 mp 3

DATE (MAIL ROOM USE ONLY) OFFICER INT.

19-5626

Journal #

IN RE VINODIT RAWHUR
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

8.3.19

VINODIT RAWHUR
PETITIONER / PLAINTIFF V. SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, U.S. DISTRICT
COURT, U.S. COURT OF
APPEALS, RESPONDENTS

NOTICE OF FILING AS TO "PETITION FOR
WRIT OF PROHIBITION AND MANDAMUS DATED 7.14.19,
PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 7.16.19, U.S. SUPREME COURT
STAMPED 7.23.19"

FILED
JUL 23 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

COMES NOW, PETITIONER VINODIT RAWHUR, RESPECT-
FULLY NOTICES THIS COURT OF FILING OF THE ENCLOSED
"PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION AND MANDAMUS" DATED
7.14.19, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 7.16.19, U.S. SUPREME
COURT STAMPED 7.23.19. (19 PAGES TOTAL).

PURSUANT TO THE CLERK'S 7.29.19 CORRESPONDENCE,

1. THE PETITION COMPLIES WITH RULE 20.1
2. THERE IS NO SPECIFIC OR SINGLE ORDER TO BE
REVIEWED PURSUANT TO THE ATTACHED "CONDUCT," WITHIN
THE PETITION. THE PETITION IS EXPLANATORY.
3. SEE PAGE 1.1, "QUESTION"
4. THE PETITION COMPLIES WITH RULE 14 AS REQUIRED BY 20.2
5. COPY HAS BEEN SERVED
6. ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND THE MOTION FOR IFP.

RECEIVED

AUG 13 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

1 of 2

1 VINODIT RAUWIR, SWEAR UNDER PENALTIES OF PERJURY,
THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE, CORRECT, AND NOT MEANT
TO MISLEAD. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT A TRUE, CORRECT
COPY HAS BEEN FORWARDED. 8.3.19

8.3.19 ATTORNEY GENERAL 444 SHADLER BLVD 500
TAYLOR BRANCH, FLORIDA 32118

8.3.19 U.S. DISTRICT COURT 401 W. CENTRAL BLVD 1200
JUDICIAL BLDG ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32801

8.3.19 USCA11 JUDICIAL BLDG 56 FORTYTH STREET N.W.
WWW ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303


Vinodit Rauwir THURSDAY 8:01 HAMILTON SPAINISH
PRISON, FL 32848

OUTGOING LEGAL MAIL
PROVIDED TO TAYLOR C.I.
MAILING ON MP M
DATE (MAIL ROOM MAIN UNIT) OFFICER INT.

IN RE VINODH RAGHUBIR DOCKET #
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

VINODH RAGHUBIR
PETITIONER / PLAINTIFF V. SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, U.S. DISTRICT
COURT, U.S. COURT OF
APPEALS, RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION
AND MANDAMUS



VINODH RAGHUBIR PRO. SE
X 92396
TAYLOR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE
8501 HAMPTON SPRING ROAD
PERRY, FLORIDA 32348

7.14.19

J. R.

QUESTION PRESENTED

When, pursuant to the ongoing, systematic course of conduct, "CONSPIRING TO PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS" WHERE DISQUALIFICATION WAS MANDATORY, "TO PREVENT EVEN THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY", HOWEVER THE JUDICIARY CHOSE TO "ENGAGE IN CONDUCT PREJUDICIAL TO THE EFFECTIVE & EXPEDITIOUS ADMINISTRATION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE COURTS", INTENTIONALLY MISCONSTRUING, INTENTIONALLY MISFILING, ABRIDGING, ALTERING, MODIFYING, ENLARGING RULES OF PROCEDURE & SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS, EXERCISING ABUSE OF DISCRETION, MISAPPROPRIATION, USURPTION OF POWER, TO THE EXTENT OF ORGANIZED FRAUD & RACKETEERING, WHERE THE CONDUCT FACILITATED UNLAWFUL ATTEMPT &/OR ACTUAL INSOLVENCY, &/OR COLLECTION OF FEES, COSTS, FINES, CONFINEMENT, & ALLEGED RESTITUTION, AND THAT CONDUCT HAS INFLECTED JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, INCLUSIVE OF EVERY ORDER, JUDGMENT, OR DECREE, PRE & POST ARREST & CONVICTION IN ALL CASES, INCLUDING & ARISING FROM 2016 CF 1833 / 6:18.W.1016. ORC. 3741 & 2016 CF 5231 / 6:18.CV.1017 ORC. 1842S / 2R4, DENYING MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO THE COURTS, UNCONSTITUTIONALIZING THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM, ARE THE JUDGMENT & CONVICTION IN THOSE CASES NULLITY, THUS THE CONDUCT & ENFORCEMENT PROHIBITED?

Per Rule 20.1, "to justify the GRANTING of ANY SUCH WRIT", THIS PETITION'S GRANTING WILL BE IN AID OF THE COURT'S APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION, BY ~~RE~~ "CONSTITUTIONALIZING" THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM, PROMOTING THE "EFFICIENT AND EXPEDIENTS ADMINISTRATION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE COURTS", REQUISITE OF THE JUDICIARY & PROSECUTION TO DEMONSTRATE CONSTITUTIONALLY APPROPRIATE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR SPECIFIED DUTIES, CONTRA "INTENTIONAL MISCONSTRUCTION & INTENTIONAL MISFEASANCE", IN COMPLETE ABSENCE OF JURISDICTION, ALLOWING THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO BE FREE FROM OVERSIGHT & RESPECTIVELY ADMINISTERING JUSTICE TO MORE OF THE CASES & QUESTIONS PRESENTED, RESTING UPON PROPER DISCRETIONARY DECISIONING OF THE LOWER TRIBUNALS, AS WAS INTENDED BY THE CONSTITUTION.

BECAUSE THE DESCRIBED CONDUCT, WITHIN THE PETITION AND ALL PLEADINGS RELATED TO 2016 CF 833/6:18-W-1016-37ME & 2016 CF 5231/6:18-W-1017-18KRS/WRIT, PURSUANT TO THE "CONSPIRACY TO PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS", COMMENCED IN THE TRIAL COURT, AND HAS EXTENDED THROUGHOUT ALL STATE, DISTRICT, AND FEDERAL APPELLATE COURTS, REMEDY IS UNAVAILABLE IN THOSE COURTS. < SEE DOCKET #'s 19-5140 & 19-5148 > + < MANDAMUS PETITION DATED 5.29.19, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.31.19, U.S. SUPREME COURT STAMPED 6.07.19 > + < PETITION DATED 6.30.19, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 7.02.19, U.S. SUPREME COURT STAMPED 7.10.19 >.

- Table of Contents
1. COVER PAGE 1.1 QUESTION 1.2 "PER PAGE 20.1"
 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS
 3. TABLE OF CITATIONS
 4. STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS, ARGUMENT, CONCLUSION
 5. CERTIFICATE

- Table of Citations
1. GILF JOHNSONS V. NLRB 461 US 731 741 103 SUPREME COURT 1983
 2. PENNSYLVANIA V. FINLEY 481 SSJ 557 107 SUPREME COURT 1987
 3. ASHELMAN V. POPE 769 F.2d 1360 9TH CIRCUIT 1985
 4. MATEK V. CITY OF RIVERSIDE
 5. WILKINSON V. BILAL 2018 US DIST LEXIS 187497 2018
 6. BENJAMIN V. STEWARTS 2018 US DIST LEXIS 175471 2018
 7. STAFKA V. ZILLY 337 F. SUPP. 3d 1079 9TH CIR 2018
 8. DUNLAP V. PRAIRIE STARS 181 FED. APPX 673 9TH CIR 2006
 9. FINDER V. ADAMS. CLARK COUNTY EX REL O'DONNELL 11TH CIR 1995
 10. BRUMMERT V. GAMBLE 946 F.2d 1178 11.14.91 5TH CIR
 11. BOYD V. BIGGERS 31 F.3d 279 8.26.94 5TH CIR
 12. KIVISTO V. SUIFER 587 FED. APPX 578 9.17.14 11TH CIR 2014
 13. HART V. HODGES 587 F.3d 1388 11.17.2009 11TH CIR 2009
 14. CAROL V. GROSS 984 F.2d 392, 393 11TH CIR 1993
 15. US CONSTITUTION
 16. LILJEBERG V. HEART SERVS. ACQUISITION CORP SUPREME COURT
 17. FED. R. CIV. P. 455
 18. MARINGO V. DEPT. OF HOMELAND SEC. 307 FED. APPX 2009
 19. MIRALLES V. WACO, 502 US 9. 11.12 112 SUPREME COURT 1991
 20. CITY OF MONMOUTH V. FLA. CANCER SPECIALISTS, D.C. 2018
 21. COLEGROVE V. HOOPA TIMBER CORPORATION 9TH CIR 1981
 22. SOLANBERGER V. MOUNTAIN STATES TBA CO 1989 74 NM 706 F
 23. FED. R. CIV. P. 60
 24. FL. R. CIV. P. 1.54

25. BUCK V. DAVIS 137 S. CT. 759 197 LEd 2d 2017
26. DAVIS V. AYALA 576 US —, —, S. CT 2187 192 LEd 2d 383
27. Fed. R. App. P. 45
28. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULE 25
29. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS DATUM DATED 5.29.19, FILED
IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.31.19,
SUPREME COURT STAMPED 6.07.19 + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS
30. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS DATUM DATED 5.25.19, FILED
IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.28.19,
SUPREME COURT STAMPED 6.05.19 + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS
31. PETIT FOR WRIT OF HABEAS DATUM DATED 5.25.19, FILED
IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.28.19,
SUPREME COURT PRESUMED 6.05.19 + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS
32. PRAYER TO & MOTION TO EXPEDITE / PLACE ON PRIORITY
DOCKET DATED 6.30.19, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED
7.02.19, ALSO FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT +
APPENDIX / EXHIBITS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS.
ARGUMENT.
CONCLUSION.

For decades, State, District, & Circuit courts
have "UNCONSTITUTIONALIZED" the judicial system, failing
to provide "MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO THE COURTS,"
denying due process, the right to petition the
government for redress of grievances, BILL
JACKSONS V NLRB 461 US 731 741 103 SUPREME COURT
2161 70 LEd 2d 277 1983, & the equal protection
guarantee of PENNSYLVANIA V. FINLEY 481 564 567
107 S Ct 1090 95 LEd 2d 539 1987,

INTENTIONALLY MISCONSTRUING,
INTENTIONALLY MISFILING,
ABRIDGING, ALTERING, MODIFYING, ENLARGING,
RULES OF PROCEDURE & SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS,
EXERCISING ABUSE OF DISCRETION, MISSAPPROPRIATION,
USURPATION OF POWER, TO THE EXTENT OF ORGANIZED
FRAUD & RAULTEERING, WHERE THE CONDUCT FACILITATED
UNLAWFUL ATTEMPT & /OR ACTUAL INSOLVENCY, & /OR
COLLECTION OF FEES, COSTS, FINES, CONFINEMENT, &
ANY (KIND) RESTITUTION, ARISING FROM GOVERNMENT CRIME,
FRAUD, DECEIT, COLLUSION, AS DEMONSTRATED, AB
INITIO, PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF ARREST WARRANTS, WITHIN
ALL PROCEEDINGS, PRE & POST CONVICTION OF 2016 CF 1833
& 2016 CF 5231 < SEE ALSO HABEAS PETITIONS 6:18.W.1016
ORL 37 DUE & 6:18.W.1017 ORL 18145 / LKH >.

"UNCONSTITUTIONALIZATION", HAS BEEN RECENTLY
DISCOVERED, ARISING FROM ASHELMAN V. POPE 769
& 2d 1360 9TH CIRCUIT 1985, WHERE THE COURT
FOUND, "A JUDGE'S CONSPIRING WITH ONE OF THE
PARTIES TO 'PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF
A JUDICIAL PROCEEDING', IS NOT A JUDICIAL
ACT, AND THUS EVEN THOUGH THE JUDGE'S
DISPOSITION OF THE PROCEEDING REMAINS A

JUDICIAL ACT, THE PRIOR AGREEMENT IS DETERMINED
THE ESSENTIAL CAUSE OF ANY DEPRIVATION OF
FEDERALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS "ACCORDING TO THE JUDGE
MAY BE LIABLE FOR DAMAGES"

THAN ON REHEARING,

"THE COURT HELD THAT A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN A JUDGE
AND A PROSECUTOR TO PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF A
JUDICIAL PROCEEDING, WITHIN CERTAIN LIMITS, NEVERTHELESS
DID NOT PIERCE THE IMMUNITY EXTENDED TO JUDGES &
PROSECUTORS. SPECIFIC TO APPELLANT'S CASE, THE DISTRICT COURT
DID NOT ERR IN REFUSING TO ALLOW APPELLANT TO AMEND
HIS PLEADINGS AS HE MADE NO ALLEGATIONS THAT APPELLANT'S
ULTIMATE ACTIONS WERE NOT JUDICIAL OR WERE PERFORMED
WITHOUT AUTHORITY", FINDING THAT THE JUDGE'S
ULTIMATE ACT, WAS JUDICIAL.

THE FINDINGS ON REHEARING WERE CLEARLY &
KNOWINGLY ERRONEOUS, PURSUANT TO THE FOREGOING
DESCRIBED CONDUCT, AS THE REHEARING PANEL ACTED
TO CONCEAL & OR SHIELD THE CONDUCT FROM EXPOSURE,
INFLUENCING JUDICIAL FINDINGS.

<SEE MARR V. CITY OF RIVERSIDE> HOLDING "JUDICIAL
IMMUNITY APPLIES EVEN IF THE JUDGE'S ACTIONS ARE
ERRONEOUS, MALICIOUS, OR IN EXCESS OF HIS OR HER
AUTHORITY"

<SEE ALSO "CULPINER V. RIDGE 2018 US DIST LEXIS
187497 2018"

BENJAMIN V. STEVENS 2018 US DIST LEXIS 12471 2018,
STARR V. ZILLY 337 F SUPP 2D 1079 9TH CIR 2018,

DUNLAP V. PRETRIAL SERVS 181 F2D APPX 673
9TH CIR 2006,

MEARS V. SINGLETON US DIST LEXIS 14622 10TH CIR 1996,

* BUTLER V. ATTENS - CLARKE COUNTY EX REL. O'LOONEY
5th F 3d 694 11TH CIRUIT 1995,

BRUMMETT V. GAMMA 946 F 2d 1178 11.14.91 5TH CIR,
BOYD V. BIGGERS 31 F 3d 279 8.20.94 5TH CIR,

* KIVISTO V. SOLFER 587 F2D APPX 572
9.17.2014 11TH CIRUIT 2014

* HART V. HODGES 587 F 3d 1888
11.17.2009 11TH CIRUIT 2009

* CAROLL V. GROSS 984 F 2d 392 393
11TH CIRUIT 1993

ASHKELMAN V. POPE 709 F2d 1360 9TH CIR 1985,
DEMONSTRATES CLEAR ERROR AS FOLLOWS.

"ARTICLE III OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION HOLDS
"THE JUDGES, BOTH OF THE SUPREME AND INFERIOR
COURTS, SHALL HOLD THEIR OFFICES DURING
GOOD BEHAVIOUR,"

A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN A JUDGE AND A PROSECUTOR
TO "PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF A JUDICIAL
PROCEEDING" IS NOT A JUDICIAL ACT, NOR IS
IT GOOD BEHAVIOUR. IT IS IMPRACHABLE MISCONDUCT.

AND IN ASTHELMAN, THE "IMPROPRIETY" WAS
"CLEAR" FROM THE RECORD ON REVIEW, AND THAT THE JUDGE
KNEW OF CIRCUMSTANCES CREATING AN APPEARANCE OF PARTIALITY"
(WILSON v. HEALTH SERVS. ACQUISITION CORP S.C.)
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 28 USC
455, A FEDERAL JUDGE "SHALL DISQUALIFY
HIMSELF IN ANY PROCEEDING IN WHICH HIS IMPARTIALITY
MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED."

THE "IMPROPRIETY" IN ASTHELMAN WAS PROVED
BY THE FAILURE OF THE JUDGE, ON HIS OWN MOTION,
TO DISQUALIFY HIMSELF, AS WAS HIS DUTY,
PURSUANT TO OATHS OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND
THE CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT TO "HOLD
OFFICE DURING GOOD BEHAVIOUR."

THE "ULTIMATE ACTS" WERE NOT JUDICIAL, AS
THE JUDGE ACTED OUT OF ALL JURISDICTION,
AS EARLY AS WHEN THE JUDGE MERELY CONSIDERED
PERFORMANCE OF THE "IMPROPRIETY", BRINGING INTO
QUESTION HIS IMPARTIALITY, DEMONSTRATING "PERSONAL
BIAS OR PREJUDICE" (SEE MARINO v. DEPT. OF
HOUSING SEC. 307 FED. APPX 867 OCT 28 2008)

WHERE THE COURT ACTED INCONSISTENTLY WITH THE
PROCESS OF LAW, THE JUDGMENTS ARE VOID.

"JUDICIAL IMMUNITY WILL NOT APPLY IF THE
JUDGES ACTIONS ARE NOW JUDICIAL, OR THE JUDGE
ACTED IN COMPLETE ABSENCE OF JURISDICTION"
(MIRANES v. WALD, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 112 S.C.
286 116 LHD 28 9 1991)

WHERE THE RETIRING COURT CONSPIRED TO

CONCEAL OR SHIELD THE CONDUCT FROM EXPOSURE,
THE FINDINGS WERE MADE IN COMPLETE ABSENCE
OF JURISDICTION. AS SUCH, SO SHALL THE
CASES BASED UPON LIKE DECISIONS BE MADE
IN COMPLETE ABSENCE OF JURISDICTION.

THE IMPROPRIETY OR FINDING OF SUCH, DEMONSTRATE
A REQUIREMENT OF THE JUDGE ACTING IN IMPROPRIETY
TO DISOWN HIMSELF, MERELY UPON CONSIDERATION
OF THE ACT, PROCEEDING CONDUCT SUBSEQUENT TO
THE CONSIDERATION, PERFORMED IN COMPLETE ABSENCE
OF JURISDICTION. SEE CITY OF MONMOUTH V. FLA. CIRCUIT
SPEAKERS, D.L. 2018 US DIST LEXIS 58963 APRIL 6 2018.

PRIOR TO, DURING, PRE & POST CONVICTION, NO
PROCEEDINGS RELATED TO 2016 CK 1833 & 2016 CK 5231 /
6:18 CV 1016 ORL 37 ARE & 6:18 CV 1017 ORL 1812 & 1814
DUE TO THE AFOREMENTIONED, SYSTEMATIC, ONGOING,
COURSE OF CONDUCT, PROCURED JUDGMENT WITHIN THE
COURTS JURISDICTION, EVERY ORDER, JUDGMENT, OR
DECISION ARE VOID, WHERE EVERY JUDGE AB INITIO,
CANNOT RADICAL IMPROPRIETY, DENYING MEANINGFUL
ACCESS TO THE COURTS, THE PROCEED, THE RIGHTS TO
PETITION THE COURTS FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, &
THE FORMAL PROTECTION GUARANTEES.

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
REFUSE JURISDICTION OF THE CASES ARISING FROM
2016 CK 1833 & 2016 CK 5231 / 6:18 CV 1016 ORL 37 ARE &
6:18 CV 1017 ORL 1812 & 1814, THEN THERE MAY BE
"NO COURT IN THE WORLD WITH JURISDICTION" TO
TRY THIS CASE, PROVING A VIOLATION OF THE
PLAINTIFFS CIVIL RIGHTS. SEE COLLEGE GROVE
VS. 170034 TIMBER CORPORATION 9TH CIR. 1981

Because of the foregoing described conduct of the conduct described within the habeas petitions 6:18-cv-1016-ORC-3721 & 6:18-cv-1017-ORC-1812/LRH, NO RULING ISSUED CAN REMAIN. <CONTRA SOLUWBERGER>

"A PARTY IS BOUND BY ALL RULINGS OF COURT PRIOR TO REUSAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. 455(b)(4), NOTWITHSTANDING THAT COURT'S FINANCIAL INTEREST IN NON PARTY PREDECESSOR TO PARTY FROM BEGINNING OF SUIT; WHILE PARTY MOVING FOR REUSAL KNOWN OF FACTS FROM 1ST HEARING, BUT NEITHER COURT NOR OTHER PARTIES DID." <SOLUWBERGER V. MOUNTAIN STATES TEL CO 1989 1C NM 706 F SUPD 776 1989>

NOTHING IN 6:18-cv-1016-ORC-3721 & 6:18-cv-1017-ORC-1812/LRH / 2016 CF 1833 & 2016 CF 5231, AS IN <AS HELLMAN>, OR THE CASES CITED, ARISING FROM THE "PROTECTED MISCONDUCT", REQUIRES A PARTY BEING BOUND BY ALL RULINGS OF COURT PRIOR TO REUSAL. HENCE, AS MOTIONS TO VACATE PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 60 & FL. R. CIV. P. 1.54 HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE TIMES FILED, ALLEGING "FRANSDON THE COURT" & "VOID JUDGMENTS", AND HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE TIMES DENIED, WHERE THE FEDERAL & STATE RULES ARE IDENTICAL, THE INTENTIONAL MISFILING & INTENTIONAL MISCONSTRUCTION, COULD HAVE ONLY BEEN PROCURED PURSUANT TO THE CONSPIRACY TO "PRE-DETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF A JUDICIAL PROCEEDING". IN THIS INSTANCE THE COURTS HAVE NO

AUTHORITY TO QUESTION NON-FINALITY

<SOLUWBERGER HABEAS PETITIONS 6:18-cv-1016-ORC-3721 & 6:18-cv-1017-ORC-1812/LRH> AND <ALL PLEADINGS WITHIN CASE FILES>
THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF FED. R. CIV. P. (60) IS TO MAKE AN EXCEPTION TO FINALITY"

<BUCK V. DAVIS 137 S. CT. 759 197 LHD 20 12017>
THE REUSANCE UPON GOVT CRIME, FRAUD, DECEIT, COLLUSION,

TO PRODUCE & MAINTAIN CONVICTIONS, UNAUTHORIZED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, LAWS, & TREATIES "POISONS PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIAL PROCESS"

← DAVIS V. AYALA, 576 US —, —, S. CT, 2187, 192 LEd 2d 523 HOLDING THAT "PRINCIPLE ON RACE TO IMPOSE A CRIMINAL SANCTION" POISONS PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIAL PROCESS" → "A CONCERN THAT SUPPORTS 60(b)(6) REVIEW." ← BOOK

* ~~See~~ ① PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS Dtd 5.29.19
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.31.19, SUPREME COURT STAMPED
6.07.19, + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS,

② PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS Dtd 5.28.19
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.28.19, SUPREME COURT STAMPED
6.05.19, + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS,

③ PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS Dtd 5.25.19
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED 5.28.19, SUPREME COURT PRESUME
6.05.19, + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS →

* NOTE: RECENT CONDUCT OF THE USCA11 CLERKING OFFICE
PURSUANT TO THE "CONSPIRACY TO PREDETERMINE
THE OUTCOME OF (A) JUDICIAL PROCEEDING(S)"
HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED BY AVERAGING THAT DOCUMENTS
ARE "RETURNED UNFILED", CONTRARY TO THE
FOLLOWING.

~~See Fed. R. App. P. 45 + Advisory Committee on Rule 25~~

"UNLESS THE COURT ORDERS OR INSTRUCTS OTHERWISE, THE CLERK MUST NOT PERMIT AN ORIGINAL RECORD OR PAPER TO BE TAKEN FROM THE CLERK'S OFFICE." ~~Fed. R. App. P. 45 (d).~~

(Am)

"SEVERAL CIRCUITS HAVE LOCAL RULES THAT AUTHORIZE THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK TO REFUSE TO ACCEPT FOR FILING PAPERS THAT ARE NOT IN THE FORM REQUIRED BY THESE RULES OR BY LOCAL RULES. THIS IS NOT A SUITABLE ROLE FOR THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK AND THE PRACTICE EXPOSES LITIGANTS TO THE HEARDS OF THE BARS. FOR THESE REASONS, SUCH RULES ARE PROSCRIBED BY THIS RULE."

"THE COMMITTEE WISHES TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE PROVISION PROHIBITING A CLERK FROM REFUSING A DOCUMENT DOES NOT MEAN THAT A CLERK'S OFFICE MAY NO LONGER SCREEN DOCUMENTS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY COMPLY WITH THE RULES. A COURT MAY DELEGATE TO THE CLERK AUTHORITY TO INFORM A PARTY IS WILLING TO CORRECT THE DOCUMENT, TO DETERMINE A DATE BY WHICH THE CORRECTED DOCUMENT MUST BE RESUBMITTED. IF A PARTY REFUSES TO TAKE THE STEPS RECOMMENDED BY THE CLERK, OR IF IN THE CLERK'S JUDGMENT THE PARTY FAILS TO CORRECT THEN NON COMPLIANCE THE CLERK MUST REFER THE MATTER TO THE COURT FOR A RULING."

~~THE CLERK IS WITHOUT AUTHORITY TO "RETURN UNFILED"~~
~~See Advisory Committee on Rule 25~~

~~See also~~ ^① Prepare To + Motion To Expedite / Place On Priority Docket
(T) 6.30.19, PRISON OFFICIAL STAMPED
7.02.19, ALSO FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT,
+ APPENDIX / EXHIBITS,

AS TO ① PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS Dtd 5-29-19
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED) 5-31-19, SUPREME COURT
STAMPED) 6-07-19, + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS,

② PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI Dtd 5-25-
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED) 5-28-19, SUPREME COURT
STAMPED) 6-05-19, + APPENDIX / EXHIBITS,

③ PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI Dtd 5-25-
FILED IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, PRISON
OFFICIAL STAMPED) 5-28-19, PRESUMED
6-05-19 +, APPENDIX / EXHIBITS. ➔

* NOTE 2, WITHIN, ② PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI Dtd 5-25-
AS CITED ABOVE, AND ③ PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Dtd 5-25-19, AS CITED ABOVE, IT APPEARS
THAT THE "MERITS" MAY HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED
WITHOUT THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, WHERE THE USCA11'S
ADDRESS OF MERITS, IN TURN WAS SUBSEQUENTLY
USED TO DENY THE MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS AS THE COURT "INTENTIONALLY
MISCONSTRUED THE SUBSTANCE" PURSUANT
TO THE "ONGOING, SYSTEMATIC COURSE OF
CONDUCT, CONSPIRING TO PREDETERMINE
THE OUTCOME OF (A) JUDICIAL PROCEEDING(S)
← SEE ② AND ③ ABOVE ➔,

HO WANKER,

IN RELATION TO A C.O.A., PURSUANT TO (BUCK V. DAVIS 137 S. CT. 759 197 LEd 2d 1 2017),
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT FOUND,

"BECAUSE A REVIEWING COURT INVERTED THE STATUTORY ORDER OF OPERATIONS BY DECIDING THE MERITS OF AN APPEAL AND THEN DENYING THE C.O.A. BASED ON ASSUMPTION OF THE APPEAL MERITS, IT PLACED TOO HEAVY A BURDEN ON THE PRISONER AT THE C.O.A. STAGE"

THIS "RATIONAL" MUST BE APPLICABLE AT THE REVIEW STAGE OF A "MOTION TO PROCEED" INFORM PRISONERS.

CONCLUSION

IN CLERKS, JUDGES, PROSECUTORS, ATTORNEYS, POLICE, SHERIFFS, AND ALL OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, INVOLVED IN ANY WAY RELATED TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM MUST BE PROHIBITED FROM THIS CONDUCT, THE "CONSPIRACY TO PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF (A) JUDICIAL PROCEEDING(S)", AND EVERY ORDER, JUDGMENT, DECREE IN EVERY STATE, DISTRICT, & CIRCUIT COURT MUST BE VACATED W/OUT ISSUANCE WITHOUT JURISDICTION AS PROCURED BY THAT VERY CONSPIRACY IN RELATION TO 2016 OF 1833 / 6:18-W-1016-ORC-37412 & 2016 OF 5031 / 6:18-W-1017-ORC-18102 / LCH. FURTHER SANCTIONS AGAINST ALL OF THE FOREGOING PARTIES MUST ISSUE IN PREVENTION OF THIS CONDUCT IN THE FUTURE, PROMOTING THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY < LIL LIL BELL >.

APPENDIX (A)

"SUGGESTIVE ORDER /
PROPOSED ORDER"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

VINOD RAGHUBAR

PLAINTIFF / PETITIONER / AFFIDAVANT

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
DEFENDANT / RESPONDENT / ANSWER

7.14.19

6:18 W. 1016 ORL-3742
6:18 W. 1017 ORL-18448,
LAH

18-12947
18-13458
18-13822
18-14232
18-14577
18-14578
19-10641
19-10642
19-11520
19-11525
19-11855

UNKNOWN CASE #
FOR MANDAMUS
PETITION STD 4.14.19

SUGGESTIVE / PROPOSED ORDER

THIS MATTER COMES BEFORE THE COURT ON PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION & ALL MATTERS BROUGHT BEFORE THE US DISTRICT & US COURT OF APPEALS. PLAINTIFF ADVISES THAT PLAINTIFF'S FILINGS CITES AND INCORPORATES THE SAME TYPE OF ALLEGATION, "A CONSPIRACY TO PREDETERMINE THE OUTCOME OF (A) JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS", AS IN ASHELMAN V. POPE 709 F.2D 1360 9th CIRCUIT 1983, FROM WHICH RECENT PRECEDENT REQUIRES THE UNDERSIGNED REUSAL, PURSUANT TO "OVERLOOKED" FUNDAMENTAL LAW.

"A FEDERAL JUDGE MUST 'DISQUALIFY HERSELF IN ANY PROCEEDING IN WHICH HER IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED' 28 USC 455(a). ANY DOUBT 'MUST BE RESOLVED' IN FAVOR OF REUSAL". THE

PURPOSE OF 465 IS "TO PROMOTE CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY BY AVOIDING EVEN THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY WHENEVER POSSIBLE" < LITTEBARK V. HEALTH SERVS. ACQUISITION CORP. 486 US 847, 865, 108 S. CT. 2194, 100 LEd 2d 855 1988 >; SEE ALSO UNITED STATES V. CARCENA, 188 F 3d 1081 1283 11th CIR 1999 > < REQUIRING RECUSAL WHEN THE OBJECTIVE CIRCUMSTANCES CREATE AN APPEARANCE OF PARTIALITY > RECUSAL IS APPROPRIATE WHEN "AN OBJECTIVE, DISINTERESTED, LAY OBSERVER FULLY INFORMED OF THE FACTS UNDERLYING THE GROUNDS ON WHICH RECUSAL WAS SOUGHT WOULD ENTERTAIN A SIGNIFICANT DOUBT ABOUT THE JUDGE'S IMPARTIALITY." < PARKER V. CONNOR STEEL CO. 855 F2d 1570, 1574 11th CIR 1988 >. ANY DOUBTS MUST RESOLVE IN FAVOR OF THE MOVING PARTY. < SEE MURRAY V. SCOTI 253 F 3d 1308, 1310 11th CIR 2001 >

AGAINST THIS LEGAL BACKDROP, THE UNDERSIGNED FINDS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, WHERE IT IS WELL TAKEN THAT A JUDGE MERELY CONSIDERING IMPROPRIETY IS SUFFICIENT FOR THAT JUDGE TO RECUSE HERSELF ON HER OWN MOTION, TO AVOID EVEN THE APPEARANCE OF PARTIALITY, BECAUSE OF THE SERIOUS NATURE OF THE DEFENDANT'S ERRORS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE MATTERS, LAW, & RULE OVERLOOKED, MISAPPREHENDED, & / OR MISCONSTRUCTED BY THE COURT(S), THE UNDERSIGNED MUST RECUSE FROM THIS CASE(S).

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS NOW ORDERED SO

1. THE UNDERSIGNED IS RECUSED FROM THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE.
2. THE CLERK OF THE COURT IS DIRECTED TO REASSIGN THE CASE TO ANOTHER UNITED STATES DISTRICT / COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE.

DONE AND ORDERED IN ORLANDO FL / ATLANTA GEORGIA THIS 14th DAY OF JULY 2019

10/07/17

(2017)