

I

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE UNITED STATES

Re: LEWIS BROWN

v: UNITED STATES

No. 19-6189

"Petition for Rehearing"

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT Petitioner Lewis Brown is currently housed in the Special Housing Unit Section (Solitary Confinement) of McRAE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE for the past 21 days. So please excuse my means of communicating by pen, with the Court. CURRENTLY I HAVE NO MEANS TO ACCESS COMPUTERS, TYPEWRITERS NOR WORD PROCESSORS.

I THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PATIENCE.

EXHIBITS ARE ALREADY IN THE COURT

THANK YOU

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE UNITED STATES

Re: Lewis Brown

✓

UNITED STATES

NO. 19-6189

Petition for REHEARING of
WRIT of CERTIORARI

PETITIONER LEWIS BROWN, PRO SE AND
UNSKILLED IN MATTERS OF LAW, SEeks REHEARING
of PETITION IN THE ABOVE CAPTION STYLED
CASE THAT WAS RULED ON NOV 12 2019
THE COURT ENTERED AN ORDER, DENYING
WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

PETITIONER SEEKS REHEARING IN THIS MATTER
BECAUSE PETITIONER'S ISSUE IS COMPLETELY IN LINE
WITH THE PRECEDENTS OF THIS COURT.

INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL &
CONTROLLING EFFECT IS

"IN RE MURCHISON, 340 U.S. 133 75 S. CT.
623, 99 L ED 942 (1955) NO MAN CAN
BE A JUDGE IN HIS OWN CASE."

THIS is a bedrock principle of this Supreme Court of the United States of America. This Court has not stayed, leaned nor departed from such principle which is enshrined in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, but has affirmed its holding on multiple occasions.

IN NEW YORK ET REL. ELLIOT SPITZER
ATT. GENERAL of N.Y. ET AL, PETITIONER V
MICROSOFT CORPORATION 536 U.S. 1301, 121 S.Ct. 25,
THE SUPREME COURT STATED: SECTION 455(a)
CONTAINS THE MORE GENERAL declaration THAT A
JUDGE, "SHALL disqualify himself in any proceeding
in which his impartiality might be questioned."
AS THIS COURT HAS STATED, what matters under
455(a) "is not the reality of bias or prejudice,
but its appearance." THIS inquiry is an objective
one, made from the perspective of a reasonable
observer who is informed of all the facts
and circumstances." See *Ibid*: IN RE DAVID
BURNHAM LAMBERT, INC 84 F.2d 1307, 1309
(2d Cir 1988).

PETITIONER hereforth seeks THIS COURT'S
RECONSIDERATION of THIS issue, AS PETITIONER is
confident, THAT should an observer be informed
of all the facts and circumstances, one will

NOT ONLY RECOGNIZE THE VIOLATION OF THE Rule of Law of THIS UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, IN THE MICHIGAN SUPRA, BUT ALSO RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT SUCH VIOLATION IS ALSO CLASSIFIED AS STRUCTURAL ERROR, See, ARIZONA V. GULMINATI, 499 U.S. 278 306-12 (1991).

- (A) IN THE INSTANT MOTION, PETITIONER CLEARLY OUTLINED THE FACT THAT DISTRICT COURT JUDGE POLSTER OPENLY ADMITTED THAT HE IS AWARE OF THE FACT THAT HE WAS AND IS AN ADVERSE PARTY OPPONENT IN PETITIONER'S MOTION TITLED "FRAUD ON THE COURT, RECUAL 42(a)(1) CONTEMPT" MOTION EXPLICITLY SEEKING POLSTER'S RECUAL.

IN AN ACT OF JUDICIAL DEFIANCE OF THE Rule of LAW, POLSTER WILFULLY, DELIBERATELY CONFLATED PETITIONER'S ISSUE, BY STATING, "PETITIONER DEMANDED HE CONDUCT A CRIMINAL CONTEMPT INQUIRY INTO HIMSELF. IN SUCH ERRONEOUS REMARKS, JUDGE POLSTER SHOWS HIS ABUSE OF DISCRETION.

THE VERY TITLE OF THE MOTION IS "RECUAL"

- (B) IN THE ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION, JUDGE POLSTER OPENLY ADMITTED THAT HE IS clearly SUBJECT OF ATTACK OF THE CONTEMPT MOTION ("clearly directed AT ME")

IN HIS BLATANT Refusal to Recuse, Judge Polster openly admitted He is aware of the fact that He is THE ASUBJECT of THE 42 (A)(1) Motion (Contempt Recusal) yet THE Judge defied ALL THE FUNDAMENTAL Bedrock Principles of THIS COURT THAT ARE ENSHRINED in THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION GUARANTEEING Protection of THE Due Process clause.

For THE above mentioned, AND THESE foregoing REASONS, Petitioner Respectfully AND Humbly REQUEST THAT THAT Supreme Court of THE United States of AMERICA, Reconsider its Decision, Denying Petitioner's writ of Certiorari, AS NOT ONLY WOULD THIS Court be going AGAINST its bedrock Principles in "IN RE MURKINSON, SUPRA, 'NO MAN CAN be a Judge in HIS OWN CASE,' but ALSO SUCH Decision would ONLY serve to EMPOWER AND ENBOLDEN future tries of Facts, to violate THE rights of less fortunate individuals such AS Petitioner, because they foresee such violations will be swept under THE rug.

A FAILURE to Hold THE District Judge ARON DAN POLSTER ACCOUNTABLE for such BLATANT Defiance of THE Rule of Law will undoubtedly

EMPOWER OTHER TRIERS of FACTS IN ALL AREAS AND WALKS of the LAW, TO TAKE ADVANTAGE of POWERLESS AND LESS FORTUNATE INDIVIDUALS SUCH AS Petitioner.

Petitioner's URGENT Plea is THAT THIS COURT GRANT Petitioner THE DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES THAT Petitioner is HERE seeking, WHICH HAVE BEEN TRAMPLED by THE DISTRICT JUDGE ALONG WITH THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT of Appeals.

Conclusion

THIS Petition for WRIT of CERTIORARI should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted

Lewis Brown

L. Brown

11/15/19

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

RE: Lewis Brown v. UNITED STATES

U.S.C.A. 6 NO: 18-3464

No: 19-6189

"Petition for Rehearing"

I Petitioner Lewis Brown hereby
certify Pursuant to 18 USC 1746
THAT THE Petition for Rehearing is
PRESENTED in good faith and not for
delay.

Lewis Brown

52293-060

L. Brown

12/18/19

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

RE: Lewis Brown V. UNITED STATES
USCAB NO. 18-3464

No. 19-6189

"Petition for Rehearing"

I PETITIONER Lewis Brown hereby
CERTIFY PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 1746
THAT THE GROUNDS OF THIS "Petition for
REHEARING" ARE LIMITED TO INTERVENING
CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING
EFFECT OR OTHER SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT
PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED.

Lewis Brown

52293-060

L. Brown

12/18/19

"IN RE MURCHISON, 340 US 133, 75 S. Ct. 623
99 L. Ed. 442 (1955)."

"NO MAN CAN BE A JUDGE IN HIS OWN CASE."

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