


19-6937 ORIGINAL

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



SCHERRIETO LITTLE — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

JANIS NAU, <sup>VS.</sup> AS ADMINISTRATOR OF ESTATE OF  
ARTHUR L. WATSON "AKA" — RESPONDENT(S)  
ALBERT ODOM

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SAN DIEGO COURT OF APPEAL-FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SCHERRIETO LITTLE  
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 397  
(Address)

SANTA MONICA, CA 90406  
(City, State, Zip Code)

951-240-2274  
(Phone Number)



NO.

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

SCHERRIETO LITTLE

COURT OF APPEAL NO.: D076062

PETITIONER

VS.

JANIS NAU, as Administrator of Estate of

ARTHUR L. WATSON "aka" ALBERT ODOM

(SUPERIOR COURT NO.37-200900150947-PR-LS-CTL)

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE SAN DIEGO, CA FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT,  
DIVISION ONE, COURT OF APPEAL

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

SCHERRIETO LITTLE

P.O. BOX 397

SANTA MONICA, CA 90406

951-240-2274

IN PRO PER

1. WHEN A VIOLATION OF CA RULE 8.4 (c) OCCUR, SHOULD THE HEIR'S OF AN ESTATE HAVE TO PAY FOR THE FRAUD, CORRUPTION, AND LIE'S THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED AGAINST THEM, BY THE ATTORNEY'S AND JUDGE'S, THAT ARE SUPPOSE TO BE WORKING FOR THEM, THIS IS A QUESTION FOR REVIEW?
2. DID THE PROBATE JUDGE ABUSE HIS POWER BY GRANTING ORDERS, THAT HE KNEW WERE FRAUDULENT, BY TESTIMONY THAT WAS PRESENTED IN TRIAL BY THE APPELLANT, AS WELL AS THE WITNESSES? CCP 657, 657.1,

**C.P.C. SECTION 96.5**

## LIST OF PARTIES

- ☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- ☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case 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:

## RELATED CASES

Superior Court NO. 37-200900150947-PR-LS-CTL

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
RAMIREZ V. STATE BAR (1980( 28 CAL 3d 402, 411 (169) CAL Rptr 206).....	7
RIPON V. SWEETIN (2002) 100 CAL APP. 4 <sup>TH</sup> 887, 900.....	8
KAISER V. MANSFIELD (1956) 141 CAL APP. 2D 428, 433-434.....	8
REBNEY V. WELLS FARGO BANK (1990) 220 CAL. APP. 30 1117.....	8
SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY DOCKETT NO.: ACJC 2017-229.....	6
IN re HUNTER, 823 So. 2d 325, 327 (La. 2002).....	6
STATUTES AND RULES	
CANON 1, CANON 2A, CANON 3.....	3,4,9
CA RULE 8.4 (c,d).....	i,9
CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH b (5).....	3,9
CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH D (2c).....	3,9
CCP 1094.5 (B,C).....	7,9
CCP 657, 657.1.....	i,3
CPC SECTION 96.5.....	i,9
OTHER	
EXHIBIT A	
EXHIBIT B	
EXHIBIT C	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4,5,6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	7,8,9
CONCLUSION.....	10

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX A</b>	SUPREME COURT OF CA –EXTENSION & DENIAL FOR RELIEF FROM DEFAULT	10/02/19
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	COURT OF APPEAL – ORDER OF DISMISSAL	08/02/19
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	S.D. PROBATE COURT – EX PARTE ORDER TO EXTEND LETTERS	12/14/18
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	S.D. PROBATE COURT – ORDER OF THIRD AND FINAL ACCOUNT	11/13/15
<b>APPENDIX E</b>		
<b>APPENDIX F</b>		

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the S.D. Probate Superior court appears at Appendix CAD to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 10-02-19.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).



## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

**THE U.S. CONSTITUTION BILL OF RIGHTS (UNDER THE SIXTH AMENDMENT) GUARANTEES THE RIGHT TO A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL, AND THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S DUE PROCESS CLAUSE EXTENDS THESE RIGHTS TO STATE COURTS AS WELL.**

**THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES INCLUDE THE ETHICAL CANONS, THAT APPLY TO JUDGES AND PROVIDES GUIDANCE ON THEIR PERFORMANCE OF THEIR OFFICIAL DUTIES. CANON 3, STATES THAT A JUDGE SHOULD PERFORM THE DUTIES OF THE OFFICE, FAIRLY, IMPARTIALLY AND DILLIGENTLY AND SHOULD NOT ENGAGE IN BEHAVIOR THAT IS HARASSING, ABUSIVE, PREJUDICED, OR BIASED. CCP 657, 657.1, CPC SECTION 96.5**

**BY THE JUDGE ABUSING HIS POWER BY IGNORING THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED BEFORE HIM AND BY TURNING HIS HEAD AND GOING ALONG WITH THE CONDUCT OF THE ATTORNEY'S. THE JUDGE IS OVERSTEPPING HIS CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY. THE JUDGE IS PLACING HIMSELF IN A POSITION OF A DEFAC TO GOVERNMENT AND LEGISLATING FROM THE BENCH. THE JUDGE IS SUBSTITUTING HIS PERSONAL VIEWS FOR THOSE OF ELECTED OFFICIALS. WHICH IS RULING WITHOUT REGARD TO THE ROLE IN THE JUDICIAL PROCESS. WHICH PUTS EVERYONE AT RISK, BECAUSE AN UNDERSTANDING OF A CLEARLY WRITTEN LAW, BECOMES IRRELEVANT WHEN IT COMES DOWN TO THE PERSONAL VIEWPOINT OF A JUDGE WHEN IT COMES TO ANY ACTION.**

**CA RULE 8.4 (c) (d) STATES THAT: IT IS PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FOR A LAWYER TO ENGAGE IN CONDUCT INVOLVING DISHONESTY, DECEIT, FRAUD, RECKLESS, INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION. OR ENGAGE IN CONDUCT THAT IS PREJUDICIAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

APPELLANT AND HER FATHER THE DECEASED OWNED A PIECE OF PROPERTY TOGETHER (EXHIBIT A) AND THIS PROPERTY WAS SOLD BASED ON FRAUD AND LIES, BY THESE CORRUPT LAWYER'S AND JUDGES. THIS FRAUD AND CORRUPTION HAS CONTINUED TO THIS DAY, AND THE TRIAL JUDGE IS WILLING TO GO ALONG WITH IT, IN FACT APPROVE OF IT. (EXHIBIT B, CANON 1, CANON 2A, CANON 3)

THE APPELLANT SCHERRIETO LITTLE WAS NOT ONLY THE CO-OWNER WITH THE DECEASED WHICH IS MY FATHER, BUT I AM ALSO AN HEIR TO THE ESTATE. MY FATHER LEFT HIS WISHES IN WRITING, WHICH IS ATTACHED AS (EXHIBIT A) AND HIS WISHES SHOULD HAVE BEEN HONORED. THIS PROPERTY SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN SOLD.

THIS APPEALS CASE IS ABOUT NOTHING BUT, FRAUD, CORRUPTION AND LIES, THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED BY THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR ATTORNEY'S, ALONG WITH JUDICIAL CORRUPTION. THE FACTS AND THE EVIDENCE SPEAKS FOR ITSELF. BUT, YET THE RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO BELIEVE OTHERWISE, BECAUSE THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THEY ARE USE TO. THE JUDGES IN THIS CASE HAVE CHOSEN TO GO ALONG WITH THE CORRUPTION, FRAUD AND LIES, BY TURNING THEIR HEADS. THIS PROBATE CASE HAS BEEN IN COURT FOR 10 YEARS AND I HAVE HEARD MORE LIES SINCE THIS PROBATE CASE HAS BEEN IN COURT THEN I HAVE IN ALL OF MY 57 YEARS OF LIVING.

THE RELEVANT FACTS, ON OR ABOUT NOVEMBER 13, 2015, A TRIAL WAS HELD. THE CONTESTED ISSUES WERE THE STATUS OF MARRIAGE, WHICH WAS ESTABLISHED ON NOVEMBER 4, 2014. THAT THE DECEDENT, WHICH IS MY FATHER, ARTHUR L. WATSON "aka" ALBERT ODOM, WAS NOT MARRIED AT THE TIME OF HIS DEATH TO MARTHA COURTNEY "aka" MARTHA WATSON. THAT SHE WAS NOT THE SURVIVING SPOUSE AS SHE CLAIMED TO BE. SHE BROUGHT TO COURT A FAKE MARRIAGE CERTIFICATE AND CLAIMED TO BE MY FATHER'S WIFE. I WAS ABLE TO PROVE IN COURT THAT SHE WAS NOT HIS WIFE. IN FACT, SHE TRIED SEVERAL TIMES TO COLLECT HIS SOCIAL SECURITY AND RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS HIS SPOUSE, AND THIS WAS DENIED EVERY TIME.

BECAUSE SHE WAS NOT HIS SPOUSE, THE COURT IS ABLE TO VERIFY THIS. MARTHA COURTNEY IS A PATHOLOGICAL LIAR AND SHE HAS BEEN FOR YEARS, SHE WILL SCHEME AND SCAM AND DO WHATEVER IT TAKES FOR MONEY. SHE WAS MY FATHER'S MISTRESS.

MY FATHER WAS MARRIED TO WILLIE MAE LAWSON (EXHIBIT C), WHO PRECEDED HIM IN DEATH AND HE NEVER REMARRIED AGAIN.

MY FATHER'S HEIR'S ARE QUESTIONABLE BASED UPON THE FACT, THAT HE HIMSELF STATED TO ME AND SOME OF MY SISTER'S, THAT SOME OF THESE CHILDREN WERE NOT HIS CHILDREN. THIS WAS NOT HEARSAY, THE DECEDENT, WHO IS MY FATHER, STATED THIS HIMSELF. THAT IS WHY A DNA TEST IS NECESSARY IN THIS CASE FOR THE HEIR'S WHO ARE CLAIMING TO BE HIS CHILDREN.

REGARDING THE ATTORNEY'S FEE'S, THESE ARE ALL BASED ON FRAUD AND LIES FOR WORK THAT THESE ATTORNEY'S NEVER DID, AND LIES AND FRAUD COMMITTED BY THESE ATTORNEY'S AND THE JUDGE IS WILLING TO GO ALONG WITH THEIR CORRUPT CONDUCT. THE ATTORNEY'S ARE TRYING TO TAKE MONEY FROM THE HEIR'S OF THE ESTATE TO PAY FOR THEIR FRAUD AND LIES, AND THEY ARE CLAIMING EXTRAORDINARY FEE'S FOR WORK THAT WAS NEVER DONE. THEY ARE TRYING TO SIPHON MONEY FROM THE ESTATE FOR PERSONAL GAIN AND SELF SERVING PURPOSES AND THE TRIAL COURT IS APPROVING OF THIS.

ATTORNEY SEBASTIAN D'AMICO IS ASKING THE TRIAL COURT TO PAY HIM \$20,000 FOR WORK THAT HE NEVER DID, IN FACT THE CIVIL TRIAL NOTEBOOK, WHICH HE IS CLAIMING THAT HE PREPARED, WAS PREPARED BY MYSELF, AND WHEN THE CIVIL TRIAL WAS FINISH, THE JUDGE GAVE THE NOTEBOOK BACK TO ME AND I STILL HAVE THE NOTEBOOK IN MY POSSESSION. SO ATTORNEY SEBASTIAN D'AMICO PRESENTED FALSE TESTIMONY REGARDING WORK THAT HE NEVER DID AND I INFORMED THE JUDGE OF THIS. I ALSO PRESENTED WITNESSES TO THIS FACT AS WELL, THAT I PERSONALLY PREPARED THE CIVIL TRIAL NOTEBOOK AND ANY OTHER LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT I HAVE SUBMITTED.

ATTORNEY STEFANI LENETT IS A BIG PATHOLOGICAL LIAR AND IS A COMPLETE FRAUD, SHE STATED TO THE PROBATE COURT THAT THE PROPERTY, THAT ME AND MY FATHER OWNED, NEEDED TO BE SOLD BECAUSE MY FATHER HAD DEBT, THIS WAS NOT TRUE AND I WAS ABLE TO PROVE THAT THIS WAS NOT TRUE. BECAUSE, I PERSONALLY HANDLED MY FATHER'S BUSINESS AFFAIR'S AND BROUGHT THIS TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PROBATE COURT, AND PROVED THAT HE DID NOT HAVE DEBT. THIS WAS JUST ANOTHER ONE OF HER MANY LIES. THEN HER STORY CHANGED FROM THE DECEASED HAD DEBT TO THE ROOF NEEDED TO BE REPAIRED, SO THE PROPERTY NEEDED TO BE SOLD. THIS WAS ALL LIES, HER LIES AND FRAUD HAVE CONTINUED THROUGHOUT THIS WHOLE PROBATE CASE, SHE ALSO MADE UP A LIE THAT I WAS KICKED OUT OF COURT BY THE JUDGE, I HAVE NEVER BEEN KICKED OUT OF ANY COURT IN MY ENTIRE LIFE, WHICH WAS ANOTHER LIE. SHE WAS TRYING TO INFLUENCE THE JUDGE, TO BE AGAINST ME IN A NEGATIVE WAY, BECAUSE I WAS TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT HER LIES AND UNFORTUNATELY, IT WORKED. INSTEAD OF THE JUDGE LISTENING TO THE TRUTH, HE DECIDED TO TURN HIS HEAD AND GO ALONG WITH THE LIES AND THAT IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY HE ABUSED HIS JUDICIAL POWER.

ATTORNEY MICHELLE SNYDER IS ASKING FOR ATTORNEY FEE'S THAT SHOULD BE PAID BY YOLANDA BRUMFIELD AND MARTHA COURTNEY, WHO SHE REPRESENTED. NOT THE ESTATE. MICHELLE SNYDER, REPRESENTED YOLANDA BRUMFIELD AND MARTHA COURTNEY, SHE ALSO WAS TRYING TO BE THE ATTORNEY FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE JANIS NAU, WHICH IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND SHE WAS IMMEDIATELY REMOVED, AFTER I OBJECTED TO THIS. THE PROBATE COURT HAS APPROVED OF TAKING MONEY FROM THE ESTATE TO PAY THIS ATTORNEY, WHEN SHE SHOULD BE PAID BY THE PEOPLE THAT SHE REPRESENTED, NOT THE ESTATE. AGAIN THIS IS FRAUD. MORE CORRUPTION. AND I OBJECTED TO THIS, AS WELL, BUT THE JUDGES, TURNED THEIR HEADS AND WENT ALONG WITH THIS. (SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY DOCKETT NO.: ACJC 2017-229, IN THE MATTER OF JUDGE JAMES W. PALMER, JR.) (IN re HUNTER, 823 So. 2d 325, 327, (La. 2002).

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL LEAVES THEIR WRITTEN WISHES THEY SHOULD BE HONORED AS STATED.

THE FRAUD AND LIES AND THE ABUSE OF POWER THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED IN THIS CASE BY THE ATTORNEY'S AND JUDGES IS A CAUSE FOR APPEAL. THE ATTORNEY ASKED FOR EXTRAORDINARY FEE'S, THERE IS NO EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES TO THIS PROBATE CASE, EXCEPT FOR THE FRAUD AND LIES THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED BY THESE CORRUPT ATTORNEY'S, ADMINISTRATOR'S AND JUDGES IN THIS PROBATE CASE. NOTHING IN THIS PROBATE CASE HAS BENEFITTED THE HEIR'S. IN FACT, IT HAS BEEN A DETRIMENT TO THE HEIR'S, DUE TO THE FRAUD AND LIES THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED BY THESE CORRUPT ATTORNEY'S AND JUDGES AND ADMINISTRATOR'S (CA RULE 8.4(c), CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH b (5), CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH d (2c) RAMIREZ vs. STATE BAR (1980) 28 cal 3D 402, 411 (169 CAL. Rptr 206).

FRAUD IS AGAINST THE LAW, ABUSE OF POWER IS AGAINST THE LAW, CORRUPTION IS AGAINST THE LAW, LYING TO COMMIT FRAUD IS AGAINST THE LAW. UNLESS THE UNITED STATES SUPREME IS WILLING TO SAY THAT THIS CONDUCT IS OK.

- A. THE STANDARD OF REVIEW      THE TRIAL COURT ERRED FIRST BY THE TRIAL JUDGE, TURNING HIS HEAD AND CHOOSING TO GO ALONG WITH THE ATTORNEY'S FRAUDULENT CONDUCT. THE TRIAL COURT ERRONEOUSLY IGNORED THE EVIDENCE THAT THE ATTORNEY SEBASTIAN D'AMICO AND STEFANI LENETT PRESENTED FALSE TESTIMONY IN COURT AND THE APPELLANT HAD CLEAR EVIDENCE AND WITNESSES TO TESTIFY TO THIS. (CCP.1094.5 (B,C)

**B. THE ELEMENTS OF THE ACTION** THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REVIEW RULINGS ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE FOR ABUSE OF DISCRETION (RIPON V, SWEETIN (2002) 100 CAL APP. 4<sup>TH</sup> 887, 900). THE TRIAL COURT'S ABUSE OF POWER IS A REVERSIBLE ERROR. THE MATERIAL FACTS WERE CLEARLY PRESENTED AT THE HEARING, THERE WERE WITNESSES, THERE IS A WRITTEN AGREEMENT/CONTRACT BETWEEN THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF AND THE DECEASED WITH SIGNATURES FROM BOTH PARTIES, THE DECEASED AS WELL AS THE APPELLANT. THE EVIDENCE WAS SUFFICIENT TO SUSTAIN A FINDING IN FAVOR OF THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF. (KAISER v. MANSFIELD (1956) 141 CAL APP. 2D 428, 433-434). THE DENIAL IN FAVOR OF THE APPELLANT CAN BE REVIEWED FOR ERROR, EITHER BY (1) DETERMINING WHETHER PREJUDICE TO THE APPELLANT WAS EVIDENT AT THE TIME OF RULING, OR (2) WHETHER, IN RETROSPECT, THE APPELLANT WAS PREJUDICED BY THE RULING, THIS PREVENTED A FAIR HEARING. (REBNEY v. WELLS FARGO BANK (1990) 220 CAL. APP. 30 1117).

**C. ALSO THE APPELLANT DID NOT RECEIVE A PROPER NOTICE REGARDING THE HEARING DATED DECEMBER 14, 2018. AGAIN, THE ATTORNEY STEFANI LENETT PRESENTED FALSE EVIDENCE, SHE STATED THAT SHE WAS NOT ABLE TO CONTACT ME ( THE APPELLANT), MY EMAIL HAS NOT CHANGED AND THE ATTORNEY HAS HAD MY EMAIL, SINCE SHE WAS APPOINTED AS THE ATTORNEY OF THIS PROBATE CASE. THE REASON SHE DID NOT WANT TO CONTACT ME IS BECAUSE SHE KNEW THAT I WOULD OBJECT TO THE FRAUD THAT SHE HAS BEEN COMMITTING. THE ATTORNEY APPEARED IN PROBATE COURT IN JUNE OF 2018, TRYING TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT NOTIFYING ANY OF THE HEIR'S AND THE JUDGE TOLD HER THAT SHE NEEDED TO NOTIFY THE HEIR'S OF THE ESTATE. THIS NEVER HAPPENED.**

## **THE LAW**

**THE LAW PROVIDES THAT A PARTY MAY OBTAIN A REVIEW OF THE FAIR HEARING DECISION UNDER PROVISIONS OF SECTION 1094.5, OF THE CIVIL CODE OF PROCEDURE. THE OPINIONS ON DECISIONS OF THE JUDGES CHARACTERIZING THEIR PERCEPTION OF WHAT THE ISSUES WERE IS DEVOID OF ANY DISCUSSION OF THE LEGAL BASIS FOR THEIR CONCLUSIONS. THEY ARE WITHOUT MAJOR OR MINOR PREMISES.**

**THERE APPEARS TO BE NO GOOD REASON FOR NOT APPLYING TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE HEIR'S OF AN ESTATE SHOULD HAVE TO PAY FOR THE CORRUPT ATTORNEY'S AND JUDGES CORRUPTION AND FRAUD AND ABUSE OF POWER FROM THE ESTATE.**


**CANON 1, CANON 2A, CANON 3, STATES THE JUDICIAL ETHICS RULE OF CONDUCT BY JUDGES.**

**CA RULE 8.4 (c), CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH B (5), CA RULE 8.4 PARAGRAPH D (2c), STATES THE ETHICS RULES OF CONDUCT FOR ATTORNEY'S.**

### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Schmitz", written over a horizontal line.

Date: 10-21-2019