

19-7009

No. _____

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

DEC 07 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Daniel Rosario González — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

United States of America — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Daniel Rosario González
(Your Name)

Apartment 218 Building 20, Brisas de Bayamón
(Address)

Bayamón, Puerto Rico 00961
(City, State, Zip Code)

(939)231-0941
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHETHER A DISTRICT COURT WHICH HAD NO JURISDICTION OVER A CASE
DISMISS IT WITH PREJUDICE AND,
WHETHER AN APPEAL COURT AFFIRM THAT DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE
WHEN IT WAS SHOWN THAT THE DISTRICT COURT LACKED JURISDICTION.

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

3:09-CV-02200
DDP2016-0566
SJ2017CV1404
3:16CV-02824
3:17CV-02143

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Document 80

APPENDIX B Document 81

APPENDIX C Judgment

APPENDIX D Order of Court

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
First Bank of P.R. v. Inmob, Nac., Inc., ^{Sup^r}	913
Rankin v. Howard, (1980) 633 F.2d 844, cert den.	
Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S. Ct. 2220, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed.2d 326	
Piper v. Pearson, <i>id.</i> , 2 Gray 120	
Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)	
Freire Ayala v. Vista Rent, 169 DPR 418 (2006)	
Ex parte McCordie, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 506, STATUTES AND RULES 514 (1968)	
Regla 10.8(c) de Procedimiento Civil 32 L.P.R.A. Ap. Vj	

OTHER

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 is unpublished.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 _____ 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 _____ 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.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was September 9, 2019.

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: October 2, 2019, 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 _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

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

La falta de diligenciamiento del emplazamiento (personal o por edictos), priva al tribunal de jurisdicción sobre la persona e invalida cualquier sentencia en su contra. First Bank of P.R. v. Inmob, Nac., Inc., supra, pág. 913.

When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost. Rankin v. Howard, (1980) 633 F.2d 844, cert den. Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.

Unfortunately, judges sometimes exceed their jurisdiction in a particular case. But an act done in complete absence of all jurisdiction cannot be a judicial act. Piper v. Pearson, id., 2 Gray 120. It is no more than an act of a private citizen, pretending to have judicial power which does not exist at all.

When a federal court acts without jurisdiction, it does more than commit an error - it exercises authority that it does not possess.

When a federal court lacks constitutional or statutory jurisdiction, it has no power or authority to do anything.

"Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction." Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872).

"...una vez el tribunal determina que no tiene jurisdicción lo que procede es la desestimación del caso. Véase, Regla 10.8(c) de Procedimiento Civil, 32 L.P.R.A Ap. V; Freire Ayala v. Vista Rent, 169 DPR 418 (2006).

"without jurisdiction the court cannot proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is power to declare the law, and when it ceases to exist, the only function remaining to the court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause." Ex parte McCardle, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 506, 514 (1968)".

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On May 17, 2018 Honorable Senior Judge Daniel R. Dominguez dismissed with prejudice under dockets 80 and 81 cases 16-2824 and 17-2143 over which he never acquired jurisdiction as the record shows that plaintiff never served process on Defendant United States.

On September 9, 2019 the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit entered JUDGMENT affirming the lower court's decision.

On October 9, 2019 the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit denied plaintiff-appellant petition for rehearing.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The First Circuit's affirmation of a dismissal with prejudice of a lower court that never acquired jurisdiction over a case as the defendant was never served process constitutes error of law and open violation to plaintiff-appellant constitutional right to the due process of law.

Honorable Senior Judge Daniel R. Dominguez was well aware that he was bound by statute to dismiss the cases without prejudice as defendant was never served process, hence he lacked jurisdiction.

The Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was well aware that defendant was never served process which in turn means that the lower court never acquired jurisdiction to dismiss with prejudice the cases hence, the First Circuit's decision had to be to order the lower court to dismiss without prejudice, not to affirm.

Should the United States Supreme Court Justices fail to intervene in this matter would allow Honorable Senior Judge Daniel R. Dominguez and the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit to circumvent plaintiff-appellant constitutional right to the due process of law and give way to further constitutional violations on other United States citizens in similar situations.

This matter is of upmost national importance because it shows the deliberate abuse of discretion and error of law of Honorable Senior Judge Daniel R. Dominguez and the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2019