

Docket No. 19-6337

In the Supreme Court of the United States

\_\_\_\_\_  
♦  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MONICA BIRCH-MIN, Individually and as Executrix of the Estate of Aung Min  
and as Administrator Ad Prosequendum on behalf of the Estate of Aung Min,  
Petitioner Birch-Min,

*Petitioner,*


v.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY BOARD OF SOCIAL SERVICES; PLAINSBORO POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES; DOES 1 THROUGH 100  
INCLUSIVE,

*Respondents.*


\_\_\_\_\_  
♦  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETITION FOR REHEARING  
\_\_\_\_\_  
♦  
\_\_\_\_\_

Monica Birch-Min  
801 North Broad Street Suite 9E  
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07208  
Tel.: 609-423-4296  
Email: monicamin3@aol.com  
*Petitioner Pro se*





# International Tribunal for Natural Justice



Westminster,  
London

February 2, 2020

Attention: Registrar  
United States Supreme Court  
Docket Number: 19-6337

This letter is being written in support of an Application to the United States Supreme Court by Monica Min for judicial relief by way of Appeal.

Monica Min has applied to the International Tribunal for Natural Justice for a Judicial Inquiry into matters concerning judicial and administrative errors concerning the decisions made in relation to herself and her late husband. The material she has sent us has been examined by our chief justice who has ascertained there is merit in her appeal and that it would be appropriate for a Judicial Inquiry into all the circumstances.

This has been set down for our April sittings and we would request that the United States Supreme Court adjourn its appeal hearing until after that time.

Yours sincerely,

Misty Kelleher  
*Registrar*

**TO: the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court**

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

The petitioner respectfully requests a rehearing pursuant to S. Ct. Rule 44.2 and shows **intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented** and that the above-entitled cause and that the decision be modified, as hereinafter suggested, for the reasons and upon the grounds and points enumerated as following:

**Point I**

Petitioner claims newly discovered evidence which is substantial to the outcome of this litigation. 1) The intervention by the International Tribunal of Natural Justice Crimes Against Humanity has made a “**judicial inquiry**” to review the case documents and the official record therein. Petitioner shows that the above-mentioned court has communicated an official written communication was and already has been submitted to the Honorable United States Supreme Court. The letter states that Monica Min applied for a Judicial Inquiry into matters concerning judicial and administrative errors to herself and her late husband. The letter from the International Tribunal clearly states that “ the material she has sent us has been examined by our chief justice who has ascertained there is merit in her appeal and that it would be appropriate for a Judicial Inquiry into all the circumstances.”

The letter from the ITNJ further requests an adjournment of the US Supreme Court decisions until after The International Tribunal concludes its actions.

Needless to say, the above-mentioned tribunal will find that the respondents herein, and defendant in a latter action, did in fact, engaged in acts which violated the substantive rights to Aung Min, now deceased and his wife Monica Min; by constructively implementing guardian abuse by the stripping of dignity and constitutional rights. The falsification of the Plaintiff Mins medical histories forced medical treatment, violent illegal home invasions, vicious and malicious slander, and kidnapping evidence was presented in her USA Court claim and now on record with the International Tribunal investigation for Crimes Against Humanity.

## **Point II**

Petitioner argues that the courts involved in this proceeding and subsequent proceedings of the Third Circuit District Court District of New Jersey, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and any Court or Federal Administrative Agency of competent jurisdiction exercised undue control or influence over any controlling statute, in addition to, the controlling order decision Judge Ciuffani decision June 21, 2012 in the Chancery Court in and for the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey, which in fact is the controlling order, not the decision of the District Court Judge Brian.Martinotti. Petitioner argues that these discrepancies relating to the original jurisdiction and said controlling order. In fact, said judge stated in the order vacating the decision of incompetency and decision awarding guardianship to Middlesex County Board of Social Services and Middlesex County Adult Protective Services. Basically, the order to VACATE shows that the above-mentioned an appointment of guardianship by the said agencies was “out of jurisdiction” and

improperly motivated. Finally, this decision was based on a Seven (7) Point criteria and now the above-mentioned respondents have waived its objections to this case.

### **Point III**

The petitioner AUNG MIN was retroactively protected under several and particular treaties with the United Kingdom and the United States of America, or in the alternative any provision from the enactment at the Geneva Convention which prohibits forced medical treatment and the excess issuance of unusual medications foreign to a healthy person and against their will. A foreign National of the United Kingdom, and Great Brittan is not that of a United States subject. The District Court for New Jersey abused judicial discretion when issuing its opinion. In addition to the abuse of discretion in District Court had the remand occurred, the petitioners' original Motion for Summary Judgment would have been proper. Since, the onset of the original action new treaties have been enacted as of January 2019 and applicable to petitioners' civil rights action under 42 U.S.C.A. §1983.

### **Point IV**

Petitioner argues that District Court violated the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act since prima facia evidence shows that there were several irregular docket entries. Moreover, the District Court created an administrative closing of the District Court action constitute an improper closing of the case. Therefore, Criminal Fraud applies in this instant action and since, Hon. Brian Martinotti publicly misquoted the facts of the case; and therefore, intentionally modified the conclusion of facts and fact of findings. The District Court

Judge intentionally stated that the petitioner presented no tangible evidence to the court, although, petitioner relies on the “Controlling Order” alteration to the record and falsifying the record and the evidence constitutes constructive fraud.

Therefore, petitioner respectfully submits that a rehearing should be had and the decision revised as to both law and fact, believing that a re-examination of the record made by the court after rehearing, wherein counsel will be able to assist the court better to examine and understand the record certified, will result in a revision and reversal of the decision herein, and that a miscarriage of justice will occur if this case is not reversed.

### **ARGUMENT**

Petitioner MONICA BIRCH- MIN pro se, argues that rehearing should be granted since, petitioner can show that certain treaties have been enacted by the United States Department of State; that the Treaties are in Force. As a matter of fact, petitioner shows that improperly seized assets of AUNG MIN and other actions to the Plaintiff's both Monica and Aung Min were in violation of the laws.

#### **A. CLAIMS&DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

Treaty for the advancement of peace signed at Washington September 15, 1914, entered into force November 10, 1914, 38 Stat. §1853; TS602; 12 Bevans 370, 61 Stat. 2876; TIAS 1622; 12 Bevans 805; 15 UNTS 281, which would indicate that

the agencies of Middlesex County should have contacted the British Consulate before seizing Aung Min.


**B. TREATIES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Agreement regarding the sharing of forfeited or confiscated assets or their equivalent funds signed at Washington March 31, 2003 and entered into force March 31, 2003 as TIAS03-331.1.

For the foregoing reasons, it is urged that this petition be granted.

Dated: February 3, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,



Monica Birch-Min  
801 North Broad Street Suite 9E  
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07208  
Tel.: 609-423-4296  
Email: [monicamin3@aol.com](mailto:monicamin3@aol.com)  
*Petitioner Pro se*

**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

The undersigned certifies that this matter should be tried or heard in the court identified above for the reasons specified below:

This Certification is made under S. Ct. Rule 44(2), which states that “grounds shall be limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.”

I hereby certify that the foregoing petition is submitted in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: February 4, 2020

By: Monica Birch-Min  
Monica Birch-Min  
*Petitioner pro se*