

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

Ronald D. VETETO,
- vs - Petitioner,

DOCKET NUMBER
19-6510

THE CLERKS, JUDGES AND
JUSTICES OF THE ALABAMA
COURTS Respondents. (Nos.

RECEIVED

FEB 12 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

COMES NOW Ronald D. VETETO, the Petitioner, pro se herein, and petitions this Court for a Rehearing of the denial of his motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") and the dismissal of his "Petition for Writ of Certiorari" purported to be frivolous or malicious. S.C. Rules 39.8 & 44. VETETO is shocked and astounded because his Petition is neither frivolous nor malicious and perturbed by this Court's boilerplate and devious language concealing the specify reasons and failure/refusal to specify how and why his "Petition" was so egregiously misapprehended and erroneously decided. Ergo, VETETO is compelled to review the entire scope of possibilities.

First, the issues presented for review could not possibly have been either frivolous or malicious. They are: (1) Whether VETETO, an indigent pro se litigant, is constitutionally entitled to accede the Federal courts via access to the prison law library, WestLAW, and other legal research/reference resources to litigate his claims or to appointment of competent counsel to represent him. This Supreme Court has addressed this very issue several times and never deemed the issue "frivolous" or "malicious." (2) Whether the "3-strikes" penalty of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) is an affirmative defense that must be raised by the defendant(s) the same as the exhaustion of administrative remedies as decided by this Supreme

Court in Jones v. Bock. This is an important question of first impression in this Court and demands resolution.

(3) Whether the trial (district) court can require "heightened pleading" of allegations of the "3-strikes" exemption, the "imminent danger of serious physical injury" in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) and several cases decided by this Court. This Court has rejected "heightened pleading" requirements in §1983 Complaints sans fraud claims in several prior different fact instantiations. This, too, is a very important question of first impression in this Court.

(4) Whether Petitioner VETERO and other plaintiffs must assert and re-prove that they are under "imminent danger" each and every time they file an interlocutory and final appeal and a mandamus petition. This, also, is a question of first impression and importance in this Court.

(5) Whether a district court can dismiss a Rule 60(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., motion to amend his Complaint to comply with the court's heightened pleading requirement without consideration. This, too, is an important question of first impression in this Court that mandates review. How and why not one of these substantive issues presented for review is meritorious, non-frivolous and non-malicious? No other court below has found any of VETERO's issues to be frivolous or malicious because they were not. VETERO has come to expect such fraudulent and corrupt malfeasance from the judges of the Eleventh Circuit judiciary, but not the Supreme Court of the United States.

So, VETERO turns to any possible procedural deficiencies that this Court could deem to be frivolous or malicious. After close examination, VETERO can discern no procedural deficiencies, certainly none that could render the certiorari petition frivolous or malicious. Despite the Clerks and Judges attempts to obstruct and derail VETERO's appeals

and petitions via failing/refusing to notify him of their dispositive orders, VETETO managed to salvage them from these prejudicial actions by moving to recall the mandate.

Unless this Court can point specifically to the purported instances of frivolity or maliciousness, to deny VETETO an opportunity for certiorari review will violate VETETO's constitutional due process and equal protection under the law rights and the arbitrary and irrational denial of his IFP status and the dismissal of his meritorious certiorari petition is grossly unfair and unjust.
Date: January 31, 2020.

Submitted by:

Ronald D. Vetto

Ronald D. VETETO, pro se
AIS# 195182, B-37

St. CLAIR CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
1000 St. Clair Road
Springville, ALABAMA
35146-9790

"I declare under penalty of perjury that I have served copies of the foregoing petition on the Clerks of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Eleventh Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals and the U.S. District Court, Middle District of ALABAMA, this 31st day of January 2020.

Executed: January 31, 2020

Ronald D. Vetto

