

NO. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ELLOYD JOHNSON, PETITIONER,

VS.

PAUL BANNER / THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
RESPONDENT.

CERTIFICATE

PETITIONER MOVES IN COMPLIANCE WITH SUPREME COURT RULE 44 REHEARING IN ORDER NOT TO DELAY OR HARASS THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POSITION ON DECIDING THE OUTCOME OF THE REHEARING DECISION.

PETITIONER PRESENT THIS PETITION IN GOOD FAITH RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE . . . CERTIFICATION PERSPECTIVE WHERE S.C. RULE 44 PURPOSE IS NEEDED TO SATISFY THE GOOD-FAITH PLEA.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

ANY PETITION FOR REHEARING OF AN ORDER DENYING A EXTRAORDINARY WRIT SHALL BE FILED WITHIN 25 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THE ORDER WHERE IN THIS CASE SUCH DATE IS MAY 4, 2020. WHERE TIME FOR FILING WILL NOT BE EXTENDED.

NOTEABLE GROUND


THE COURT'S DENIAL OF PETITIONER EXTRAORDINARY WRIT ENTRY WHERE IT STATES "WALT OF...
MANDAMUS AND /OR PROHIBITION" IS QUESTIONABLE WHEN PETITIONER'S... LEGAL ENTRY...
LITIGATION SETS AT " BOTH IN THE ALTERNATIVE " THAT PETITIONER IS SEEKING ??
THE COURT'S " AND /OR " IS NOT LITIGATED IN SUPREME COURT RULE 20.3, OR ANY OTHER NUMBER
1-THRU-5 UNDER S.C. RULE 20.

CONTROL EFFECT GROUND

THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWER TO LIMIT PETITIONER TO INTERVENE WITH THE SURROUNDING
EVENTS WHERE WRITTEN RESPONSE OF THE EXCUSABLE BASIS IN ORDER TO DENY PETITION IS NOT
PRESENTED.
THE LIMITED TO INTERVENE BY PETITIONER "MUDDY THE WATERS" OF GOOD FAITH AND NOT TO...
DELAY PERSPECTIVE.

CONCLUSION

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS SET OUT IN THIS "CERTIFICATE" SUPPORTED BY PETITION TO
SATISFY THE DIRECT FORM UNDER S.C. 44.6. TOGETHER WITH CERTIFICATION AND ...
PRESENTED IN GOOD-FAITH AND NOT FOR DELAY TO GRANT RELIEF SOUGHT SOA SPONTE,


PETITIONER - PAUPER - RELATOR