

Case no. 19-6329

In The

Supreme Court of The United States

Jackie Lee Boyd — Petitioner
vs

Carol Monroe ET. AL — Respondent(s)

on petition for Panel Rehearing or
Rehearing En banc

List of Parties

(x) All parties appear in the caption of the
on the cover page.

(x) All parties do not appear in the
caption of the case or 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.

Carol monroe, Lana Brunette, Cowedolyn Fuller, Sara-
- cook, chad moore, All Represented by

Brianna M webb

Assistant Attorney General

Po Box 12548

Austin Texas 78711-2548

Grounds not previously Presented

Under the grounds of the 14th Amendment States

All persons born or naturalized in the United States

And Subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the
United States and of the States wherein they reside. no

State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge

The privileges or immunities of citizens of the United

States, nor shall any State deprive any person of Life

Liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor

Deny to any person within its Jurisdiction the equal

Protection of the laws. (1) A buse of process -

(2) A buse of Judicial discretion

Abstract: the term means a very concise digest or Summary That captures the essence of the original, an excerpt or set of excerpts the essential elements of the original. the district Court ordered the Attorney General office on February 9 2018 To Submit there martinez Report in said Report the Attorney-Generals office States in Exhibit - A alleging TDCJ employees Were deliberately indifferent to Petitioner's mental Health needs In violation of the Eighth Amendment Exhibit - A is the first Original Report Submitted by the Attorney General office On April 6, 2018 States defendants Carol Monroe warden Chad Moore Lt) Gwendolyn Fuller Lt) Sarah Cook Lt) Jointly Denied Petitioner access to said medication to wit being carbamazepine (Tegretol) in the instant original 1983 Complaint Petitioner Stated only defendants Fuller Lt) Moore Lt) Cook Lt) failed to escort Petitioner to the infirmary, which Exhibit - A clearly States is correct That defendants were deliberately indifferent in not escorting Petitioner to receive carbamazepine (Tegretol) Exhibit - A did not State on April 6 2018 employee nurse Brunnett was a Defendant in the instant original Martinez Report nor was she in the original 1983 complaint filed November 15, 2017. the Attorney General office Martinez Report was Abstract on 5/29/2018 to wit the district court Ruled on was now a medical deliberate indifferent issue, when In fact Exhibit - A States correctly Petitioner Sued Defendants Monroe warden Lt) Moore Lt) Fuller Lt) Cook, To wrongfully Summarizing medical to be now Deliberately indifferent, now to wit causing the district Court to Rule From essence of the original Martinez

Report stated on Exhibit-A on April 6, 2018 to a incorrect Summary Ruling on 5/29/2018 by the district court which now The Attorney General office commits abuse of process for an Improper purpose instituting a judicial proceeding otherwise using judicial process for an improper purpose essentially to otherwise use Justifiable Judicial procedure as a form of Extortion to gain some advantage or benefit unrelated to the legitimate objective of the judicial proceeding in that there may have been legally sufficient basis for instituting such a proceeding but the actual purpose to which the proceeding is now put is wrong. The district court then proceeded to Rule on An abuse of discretion an unsound illogical Ruling by its Discretion and decided the matter differently from the original Martinez Report Exhibit-A Submitted April 6, 2018 by the Attorney Generals office. The district courts abuse of discretion is now Unreasonable as to constitute its abuse of discretion, the phrase Does not imply wrong doing, it simply indicates that the Tribunal Committed an error. That is also improvident exercise of Discretion, to wit the district court did dismiss Petitioners 1983 Complaint Steaming from the inaccurate Martinez Report filed By the Attorney Generals filed 5/29/2018 and Ruled on by the District court also on 5/29/2018 Exhibit-B the report and Recommendation of the district court thus my 1983 complaint is Now unlawfully dismissed due a incorrect Martinez Report. On or About 7-24-2019 the 5th Cir at the end of its Ruling Exhibit-D Stated as Read. Boyd complains that the district court relied on Inaccurate information in dismissing his complaint. However

The court stated that it would not consider those statements that Boyd represented were erroneous, thus contrary to Boyd's assertion the district court did not rely on untrue information. Accordingly, the district court properly determined that Boyd failed to state a claim. It is clear by Exhibit A was correct as to the Martinez Report and Exhibit B was incorrect as an abstract summary from the original report filed April 6, 2018, which now the appeals court ruling is now also incorrect, on Exhibit D its ruling. On November 13, 2019, Exhibit C the waiver of the Attorney General's office stated it issued a dismissal as to the Martinez incorrect report thus it said they were aware the Martinez report was incorrect. Exhibit C shows all said and furthermore shows the court of their confession of their error that caused an incorrect ruling which caused an abuse of process, and clearly caused an unlawful ruling by the district court causing such an injury to the petitioner that can only be corrected as to reverse and remand for a fair ruling on my 1983 complaint. It is clear a wrongful abuse of discretion was done by the district court and abuse of process by the Attorney General's office has been proven by the preponderance of evidence hereof. Furthermore a private wrong has been the cause of injuries to the petitioner and is a basis for the tort wrong done to the petitioner. It is clear a wrongful abstraction was committed by the Attorney General's office with intent to misappropriate the

The Judicial proceedings Surely, and the district courts finding was an abuse of discretion a Tribunal committed error. Further more the term wrong in law terms means that A violation of failure to perform there legal duty ± Fringement the Petitioner's legal rights. Further more If a Judgement is modified as a reversed relief Requested should be awarded the Petitioner for the Tribunal committed error and injury to the petitioner would be the course of legal action towards Petitioner. Further more on November 13, 2019 Exhibit-C on The waiver of the Attorney Generals office issued a Dismissal of the p. Martinez Report to derail the courts Decision in petitioners favor to continue there abuse of process. it is clear by Exhibit-C could not be corrected when the unlawful Ruling was done which caused Petitioner's 1983 to be Ruled unlawfully by the district Court. the Martinez Report that was incorrect and gave The Attorney Generals Office and did cause a disadvantage of the Judicial process, it has been impossible to get a fair Ruling by the district court to the 5th Cir Ruling. Facts With Exhibits Show Petitioner from the Start was injured By the process and now is prejudice Towards my right To a Fair Ruling, Petitioner Rest.

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