

No. 19-7405

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

FRANCIENNA GRANT,

PETITIONER

Vs.

MARSHALL L. WILLIAMS, ESQ. et al

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT

Case No. 081454

**MOTION FOR REHEARING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

**FRANCIENNA GRANT, PRO SE
4 ELLA AVENUE, CMCH, NJ 08210
609.408.7014**




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF Contents.....	-i-
Why Supreme Court Should Grant This Motion For Rehearing.....	1
Statement of the Case for Rehearing.....	1
Concise Argument Statement of the Facts at Issue Before the Supreme Court For Review.....	3
Conclusion.....	5
Rule 44 Certification.....	attached
March30,2020 order of denial.....	attached

**WHY THE SUPREME COURT SHOULD GRANT THIS MOTION FOR
REHEARING?**

I am Pro Se litigant currently Live in New Jersey as state in Lockdown due to Covid-19 and am unable to have access to external supporting assistance at the time of receiving the March 30, 2020 order for which I find pertinent legislative and trial court evidence exists to support why I should have been awarded damages which I cannot obtain due to the Covid-19 lockdown.

Statement of the Case for Rehearing

I am petitioning the court for Rehearing to provide the opportunity absent the restrictions and interference due to the nationwide devastation from the Novel Corona Virus, for the court to review the merits of my case supported by legislative, constitutional guarantees for a prevailing litigant.

We are under quarantine lockdown and I am, Pro Se and, unable to have access to the court and any legislative documents to support the constitutionality of refusal of damages incurred from a case filed and won by the same litigant.

I filed a suite of Legal Malpractice/negligence against an attorney who had represented me in an underlying case, having all the documentation and discovery, from the underlying case.

I sued the attorney for mishandling the case causing, Plaintiff Grant, significant damages. The same attorney refused to produce any documents and to participate in the discovery. This left me without any documents for the underlying case.

I filed a Motion to Compel in trial court to force the release of documents and evidence in the underlying case and for the defendant to comply with rules of discovery and to participate in discovery and to be deposed.

Trial Court Judge denied my right to receive any discovery and for me to exercise my rights of discovery. He rather ordered the case to move forward to trial in three days.

The same Trial Court Judge found the defendant to be negligent in the underlying case and entered a ruling against the defendant in my favor (Plaintiff Grant).

The trial court Judge who denied me the right to discovery process and the right to obtain the documents in the underlying case, denied me the right to any damages resulting from the Defendant (Williams) citing I did not prove the underlying case for which he denied me the right to prove by way of discovery.

The same trial court Judge denied me the right to any proof hearing.

The judicial process I was made to endure denied me a fair judicial process which is in opposition to my Constitution Rights and the ruling is a constitutional Void ruling, reversible by the United States Supreme Court.

**Concise Argument Statement of the Facts at Issue Before the
Supreme Court For Review**

The United States Supreme Court has precedence which renders all orders entered without providing a fair and equal judicial process and affording a litigant their rights in the court of law is void and not admissible.

The United States Constitution affords each citizen the right to a fair and judicial process in the court of law when a complaint is filed and has set in place the process upon which to ensure those rights are preserved.

I filed a complaint and was denied the right the Discovery process and was denied damages for not producing the discovery I filed motion to compel with trial court and was denied.

After I prevailed proving the defendants malpractice. I suffered damages and fulfilled the right to damages under the Strickland Standard and I was denied damages for not producing the discovery when I was denied my right to the discovery process.

I should be afforded the damages I suffered as a result of the Malpractice I exposed and prevailed in obtaining a court ruling.

The ruling denying the proven damages in the face of the discriminatory denial of a fair Judicial Process is text book Void ruling ripe for the United States Supreme Court to reverse as court USSC precedential rulings predicates.

I currently live in New Jersey and we are in Lockdown Due to a Corona Virus and as a result I am limited in obtaining access to documents and technical support needed at this time to perfect the rehearing and am filing this rehearing reasoning to the to preserve the full review of the issues that may not be complete due to the Lockdown.

CONCLUSION

The Covid-19 quarantine is hindering and having a negative effect on my being able to have my issues cleanly presented before this court due to the mass effect of the Pandemic fore which rehearing for the provisions of damages and the legislative and constitutional guarantees for a prevailing Pro Se litigant reheard.

Succinctly, The trial Court Erred; I filed and won a Malpractice case against an attorney who refused to produce documents needed to prove an underlying case he represented me in. I suffered significant damages. Motion to Compel documents was filed and denied by trial court Judge. The case was fast tracked to trial. I was denied damages and the right to a proof hearing. I was in essence stripped of all of my rights to fair judicial process.

It is neither equitable nor fair for the trial court to deny me my rights to obtain the documents to prove an underlying case, only to then deny me the right to damages and a proof hearing sighting that the Plaintiff failed to Prove the underlying case.

In matters of clear bias the United States Supreme Court should have no issue to reverse the Void Ruling denying proven damages owed a prevailing litigant.

The result was this plaintiff being denied her right to obtaining a just judicial process and subsequent ruling of damages for a case she already won. This, a denial of; 42 U.S. Code 1983 deprivation. And created rulings which are void under these United States Supreme courts standards. This making the ruling ripe for rehearing .with subsequent reversal and awarding of damages.

I Certify that the foregoing are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Submitted by,

Dated April 23, 2020



Francienna Grant Pro Se

Petitioner/Plaintiff/Appellant


RULE 44 CERTIFICATION

I Francienna Grant am the Pro Se litigant in this matter before the Court and I certify that I am filing this Petition/Motion for Rehearing in good faith and am not filing it as a means for delay.

The grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial, controlling effect and other substantial grounds not previously presented;

- 1) The unexpected quarantine and lock down resulting from the Corona Virus was unexpected and had an effect on my response.
- 2) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant her Constitutional right to the Discovery process and unbiased Judicial process.
- 3) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant her Constitutional right to damages incurred in a case she prevailed in and incurred damages.
- 4) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant (Pro Se Litigant) her Constitutional right as noted in #2 and #3 void judgement and how the denial is in opposition to established United States Supreme Courts Precedence.


5) Are Pro Se Litigants not permitted 42 U.S. Code 1983 rights, a fair Judicial Process and are they not permitted Damages after Prevailing in a Legal Proceeding?

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink. The signature is written over a horizontal line. To the right of the signature, the date "5/21/20" is written vertically.

Francienna B. Grant

RULE 44 CERTIFICATION

I Francienna Grant am the Pro Se litigant in this matter before the Court and I certify that I am filing this Petition/Motion for Rehearing in good faith and am not filing it as a means for delay.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Francienna Grant', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with large loops and flourishes.

4/23/20

Francienna B. Grant

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

March 30, 2020

Ms. Francienna Grant
4 Ella Avenue
Cape May Court, NJ 08210


~~Re: Francienna B. Grant~~
v. Marshall L. Williams
No. 19-7405

Dear Ms. Grant:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott S. Harris", written in a cursive style.

Scott S. Harris, Clerk


RULE 44 CERTIFICATION

I Francienna Grant am the Pro Se litigant in this matter before the Court and I certify that I am filing this Petition/Motion for Rehearing in good faith and am not filing it as a means for delay.

The grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial, controlling effect and other substantial grounds not previously presented;

- 1) The unexpected quarantine and lock down resulting from the Corona Virus was unexpected and had an effect on my response.
- 2) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant her Constitutional right to the Discovery process and unbiased Judicial process.
- 3) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant her Constitutional right to damages incurred in a case she prevailed in and incurred damages.
- 4) The court did not previously adjudicate the substantial grounds of the trial court denying this Plaintiff Francienna Grant (Pro Se Litigant) her Constitutional right as noted in #2 and #3 void judgement and how the denial is in opposition to established United States Supreme Courts Precedence.

5) Are Pro Se Litigants not permitted 42 U.S. Code 1983 rights, a fair Judicial Process and are they not permitted Damages after Prevailing in a Legal Proceeding?


Francienna B. Grant