

19-5896

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mitchell Dinnerstein – PETITIONER

VS.

BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE - RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Prepared Pro SA by
Mitchell Dinnerstein
18 Lawrence St
Jackson, NJ 08527
(732) 908-3226 ... Home
(732) 604-3972 ... Cell




TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

1	Cover page not numbered
1	First page 11/21/1017, 1:13-cv-5598 (NLH/KMW)
1-4	Petition for Rehearing Brief
A	Docket Search
A1-A2	Results of Docket Search
B	11/8/2019 Conference List
B1	Docket Entries 11/8/2019 Conference List
C	First page 11/21/2017, 1017, 1:13-cv-5598 (NHL/KMW)
D	USSC Clerks compliance order
D1	Rehearing Copy of cover page original Brief
D2 ... reply Brief to Colleges oppositions dated 10/18/19	certified Mail Recipes
D2	USSC mail tracking by USPS for Brief of 10/18/19
1	Certification of Council not numbered
1	Certificate of Compliance not numbered
1	Certificate of service not numbered
1	Rule 44 Grounds not numbered
1	Rule 44 Certificate not numbered

Dinnerstein v. Burlington Cnty. Coll.

Decided Nov 21, 2017

HILLMAN, District Judge

OPINION

APPEARANCES: MITCHELL DINNERSTEIN
18 LAWRENCE STREET
JACKSON, NJ 08527

Appearing pro se CARMEN SAGINARIO, JR.
KELLY ESTEVAM ADLER
CAPEHART & SCATCHARD, P.A.
8000 MIDLAND DRIVE
SUITE 300S
MOUNT LAUREL, NJ 08054

On behalf of Defendant HILLMAN, District
Judge

This case concerns the termination of Plaintiff Mitchell Dinnerstein's employment with Defendant Rowan College at Burlington County College ("the College"),¹ allegedly on the basis of his Jewish faith. Plaintiff asserts a claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Defendant moves for ² summary judgment, to deny Plaintiff additional discovery and time to respond to Defendant's summary judgment motion, and for sanctions against Plaintiff. The Court will grant summary judgment in favor of Defendant, finding no need for additional discovery, but will, reluctantly and despite the extraordinary circumstances present here, deny the motion for sanctions.

¹ Burlington County College is now known as Rowan College at Burlington County College.

I.

The Court takes the following facts from Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, to which Plaintiff filed no response.² Plaintiff was hired by the College on July 15, 2007 as a Maintenance Mechanic-Electrician. Plaintiff was an employee within the Physical Plant Department, which is the ³ College's construction and maintenance department.

² Defendant notes that Plaintiff failed to comply with Local Civil Rule 56.1(a), which provides, in pertinent part:

On motions for summary judgment, the movant shall furnish a statement which sets forth material facts as to which there does not exist a genuine issue The opponent of summary judgment shall furnish, with its opposition papers, a responsive statement of material facts, addressing each paragraph of the movant's statement, indicating agreement or disagreement . . . [A]ny material fact not disputed shall be deemed undisputed for purposes of the summary judgment motion.

As a result of this violation, Defendant argues the material facts set forth in Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Material Facts must be deemed undisputed in deciding this motion. Plaintiff has clearly violated an important local rule of procedure which greatly facilitates the

I request a rehearing on my Petition for Certiorari.

In my Brief dated 10/18/2019 and titled, "Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Brief in opposition to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari." When I looked it up on the Dockets search (A, A1, A2,) that brief was there. But when I looked at the 11/8/2019 conference list (B) and then clicked on my case to see the "Docket Entries" that brief on page (B1) was not listed. I mailed it on time (A1) Received "Oct, 24, 2019...Reply of petitioner Mitchell Dinnerstein (Distributed)." But when I called the clerk's office on Nov, 6, 2019 about the Brief dated 10/18/2019 because it was on no docket search at that time. The Clerk's office said they did not receive the brief dated 10/18/2019. I E-mailed it to a clerk that day a full two days before the hearing and it appeared on the docket search later that day. My concern is there that the Justices did not get to see the Brief of 10/18/2019 in question. If you look at (D,D1) it is the USSC clerk's office sending back my Brief for rehearing for me not stating Grounds for the rehearing. I think the reason for this is my attempted to be diplomatic and respectful to the court and not just stating in clear language my position. It is not out of disrespect I am stating my case in the following manner. That is not my intent I have been left with no alternative.

If you look at D2 it is copy of the, certified Mail Receipts, the returned signed recipe card from the colleges law firm for the Brief of 10/18/2019. The e-mail address and phone number on the bottom is the person in the clerk's Office who I e-mailed the Brief of 10/18/2019 to and later that day he put on Line. If you look at (D3) it is the tracking conformation the USSC Clerks office received the Brief of 10/18/2019 on October, 24, 2019.

Please look at (C) It is the first page of the District Court Judges Option. I did not have this Copy until I was preparing for the Supreme Court Case. If you look at it, it says "On behalf of the Defendant Hillman, District Judge." That means, A Federal Districted Judge sitting on a civil rights case also defended the Defendant who had legal counsel already. And then put the petitioner who was Pro SA, that being me, on trial in which the Judge was also Prosecutor of me the victim. He also locked me out of the proceedings. That is not in dispute. I have looked up other federal cases and have found none where this has happened. It may have but this Judge put his name right there as acting on behalf of the Defendant. This

goes against every tradition of common law and American due process I have ever heard of.

By not granting my petition for Certiorari I fear this Court has opened the door for a deviant form of judicial corruption beneath the honor of the federal or state judiciarys. The American People have a right to an impartial Judiciary. Did the District Judge get paid for acting on the Defendants behalf? Or was it Just, the Districted Judge execution of the western civilization norm that Jews should be punished because they are Jewish, whether they did anything or not. I believe that was the case in part. But mostly it was his attempt to show to people in power who could advance his career that he will break all rules and law to protect them and their interests. The Judge wanted to show his willingness to conform to the, Machiavellian, narcissistic, absolutist, form of government that is taking root in America. I believe it will bring this country down if not kept in checked by the protections granted to all Americans in the Constitution. That is why we are supposed to have Judicial review.

Was someone in Washington offended that I said the origins of anti-Semitism has its modern day roots in Christianity? It dose. You have to go no farther than the national congressional prayer breakfast. It is not put on by congress, it is put on by a secret organization now called the family. It used to be called, The Fellowship Foundation but people knew about it so the real organization now is the family. Its stated goal is to connect christens in power, put christens in power and keep christens in power. It has its own dogma in which it is on the side of the lions, who ate christens, not the Christens. It is an organization that uses the appearance of Christianity to promote an absolutes forms of government in the United States and the world. A theocracy that is really, worshiping power and money. If this Court really believe in religious freedom as expressed in the first Amendment and the enlightenment principles this country was founded on and which are laid out in our constitution you should hear this case.

The same way Burlington County College was destroyed by scapegoating Jews and others to get the people to fall in line and act against their own interests will keep happening over and over eating away at this country like a cancer.

By this court not herring this case it is saying it is proper for a federal Judge to put himself up for sale and laying the groundwork for covering up attracts on Jews, all Americans and guests in our country.

I don't understand the hubris that would allow a Judge to have his name listed as the defense council. What does that say about his hate, about his feeling of superiority, his felling of being above the law?

I wish I could understand rationality, reasonableness or any kind of foundation in Justice for denying my petition for Certiorari. I can't, I only hope mistakes were made and this court did not get the information it needed to grant my Petition for Certiorari and will now. My entire life christens and others have been taking away from me. It is as if they can't stand to see me have any kind of success or joy so they continuously, devalue, slander, and harass me. When they are stopped they just get together and change the rules. Then gang up on me again. That's what happened in this case. If you say the people who did it are Jewish. In most cases it's untrue. The German solder on the recruiting poster for the SS during, World War Two had a Jewish father. During the war he was not Jewish and after the war he was. Some People will go along with anything to get ahead.

28 U.S. Code 453. Oath of Justices and Judges

”, I _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without resect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and preform all the duties incumbent upon me as _____ under the Constitution and laws of the Unites States. So help me God.

I have tried to be respectful while laying out the facts in this case as clear as I can. I hope I have done so. I have tried to fined president that reflects what the district Judge did in this case to support my argument. I don't think it exists. I am going to do something I believe is lacking in today's culture and legal procedure. I am just going to tell the truth as I see it.

By The district Judge, acting (C) “On behalf of the defendant HILLMAN District Judge” and all his other ways of taking away my right to Due proses.

By doing that, he broke his Judicial Oath. In doing so he committed, judicial misconduct and should be impeached. The third circuit Appellate Court did not have in evidence that the District Judge represented the College. The Supreme Courts of the United States does have the proof that the district Judge Committed Judicial misconduct. The Supreme Court now knows that the vital fact of the misconduct (the Judge representing the College) only became available to me during the proses of Certiorari. By the Supreme Court refusing to acknowledge those simple facts. They have not only denied me of my civil rights again. But reflected on the entire American Judicial System as being nothing but the law being for sale to the highest bidder. And Judges covering for each other without giving one thought to justice. I personally did believe in the Judicial System because I liked the Judges I met when I worked for GSA. But now I do not.

I was never supposed to know Judge Hillman represented the College I was suing. But a company that lists legal documents was giving away a week for free as a promotion. I lost the original option and when on the site and found this one. That's why I only had it when I was in the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court is supposed to hear cases like this. If it doesn't why is it there? Is it the illusion of Justice to keep the cannon fodder, the unkempt masses in line? Then divided them among gerrymandered lines of hate so they will not rise up and force the government to live up to the ideals of our founders. If you are to uphold your oaths you are supposed to hear this case and the Justices who voted against it should be impeached.

For those reasons my petition for Certiorari should be granted.

Very respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mitchell Blanstein".

(C)

Dinnerstein v. Burlington Cnty. Coll.

Decided Nov 21. 2017

HILLMAN, District Judge

OPINION

APPEARANCES: MITCHELL DINNERSTEIN
18 LAWRENCE STREET
JACKSON, NJ 08527

Appearing pro se CARMEN SAGINARIO, JR.
KELLY ESTEVAM ADLER
CAPEHART & SCATCHARD, P.A.
8000 MIDLAND DRIVE
SUITE 300S
MOUNT LAUREL, NJ 08054

On behalf of Defendant HILLMAN, District
Judge

This case concerns the termination of Plaintiff Mitchell Dinnerstein's employment with Defendant Rowan College at Burlington County College ("the College"),¹ allegedly on the basis of his Jewish faith. Plaintiff asserts a claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
2 Defendant moves for *2 summary judgment, to deny Plaintiff additional discovery and time to respond to Defendant's summary judgment motion, and for sanctions against Plaintiff. The Court will grant summary judgment in favor of Defendant, finding no need for additional discovery, but will, reluctantly and despite the extraordinary circumstances present here, deny the motion for sanctions.

¹ Burlington County College is now known as Rowan College at Burlington County College.

I.

The Court takes the following facts from Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, to which Plaintiff filed no response.² Plaintiff was hired by the College on July 15, 2007 as a Maintenance Mechanic-Electrician. Plaintiff was an employee within the Physical Plant Department, which is the *3 College's construction and maintenance department.

² Defendant notes that Plaintiff failed to comply with Local Civil Rule 56.1(a), which provides, in pertinent part:

On motions for summary judgment, the movant shall furnish a statement which sets forth material facts as to which there does not exist a genuine issue The opponent of summary judgment shall furnish, with its opposition papers, a responsive statement of material facts, addressing each paragraph of the movant's statement, indicating agreement or disagreement [A]ny material fact not disputed shall be deemed undisputed for purposes of the summary judgment motion.

As a result of this violation, Defendant argues the material facts set forth in Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Material Facts must be deemed undisputed in deciding this motion. Plaintiff has clearly violated an important local rule of procedure which greatly facilitates the

(D)

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

November 27, 2019


Mitchell Dinnerstein
18 Lawrence St.
Jackson, NJ 08527

RE: Dinnerstein v. Burlington County College
No: 19-5896

Dear Mr. Dinnerstein:

The petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case was postmarked November 16, 2019 and received November 26, 2019 and is herewith returned for failure to comply with Rule 44 of the Rules of this Court. The petition must briefly and distinctly state its grounds and must be accompanied by a certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 15 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 44.6.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By: 
Clara Houghteling
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

19-5896

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mitchell Dinnerstein – PETITIONER

VS.

BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE - RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATION OF COUNCEL Pro SA

I do not have council, this is not for delay and I am presenting it in good faith.

Prepared Pro SA by
Mitchell Dinnerstein
18 Lawrence St
Jackson, NJ 08527
(732) 908-3226 ... Home
(732) 604-3972 ... Cell

Respectfully yours,

Mitchell Dinnerstein

12/4/2019

No. 19-5896

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mitchell Dinnerstein – PETITIONER

VS.

BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE - RESPONDENT

Petition for rehearing
Rule 44 Compliance

The grounds for this Petition are,

Important documents in the Supreme Courts record where not listed as being review by the Justices to reach there ditions. And also the question of their not even having access to those documents does exists.

Violations of U.S. Code 453 Oath of Justices and Judges, being violated and then not recognized by the highest court in the land and its negative effect it will have on the legal system as a whole.

The lack of any judicial review guidelines when a District Judge Acts as defense Council in a civil rights trial against a Pro Sa defendant for a Government agency which already has Legal Counsel.

12/4/2019

Mitchell Dinnerstein

No. 19-5896

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mitchell Dinnerstein – PETITIONER

VS.

BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE - RESPONDENT

Petition for rehearing
Rule 44 Compliance

Certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial not previously presented.

I had only become aware that the District Court Judge in this case acted as Defense Council in the trial he was presiding over when I was preparing my Brief for Caesarea.

The missing documents that should have been on the 11/8/2019 conference Docket Entries was beyond my control.

I believe there is no Judicial review regarding anything like this happening in the past because it is so contradictory to common Law that the presidential guidelines have to be set by this court at this time.

12/4/2019

Mitchell Dinnerstein

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**