No. 19-8284

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re:

Michael A. Young - PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

17-4011 Vernon Oliver Et. Al.

18-1775 Thomas Duncan Et. Al. "AN" "OTHERS" - RESPONDENT(S)

On "RULE 20" Petition for "WRIT" Mandamus and Prohibition to

U.S. Court of Appeals for "SECOND CIRCUIT"
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON "BY PASS" OF YOUR CASE)

Petition for Extraordinary "WRIT"

Michael A. Young
(Your Name)

Cheshire CI. 900 Highland Ave.
(Address)

Cheshire CT. 06410
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. After willfully invoking "SELF"-executing sections 3 and 4 of the 14th amendment becoming a "NAMED" defendant in 3:17-cv-20(AWT), did U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut "ERROR" in "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSALS" upon "JUDGEMENT" ordered for "ALL" defendants, in "DISCARD" of 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) "MANDATED" self-enforcing "RECUSAL" ???

2. Whether U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut intentional "STAGED" timely "CRYPTIC" rulings "ORDERED" are appropriately construed with "AS TO DO JUSTICE" requirement ???

3. Should petitioners requested preliminary "RELIEF" be "GRANTED" while case pending entitled "FINALITY" ???

4. Whether "EQUITABLE TOLLING" doctrine of the "STATUTE" of "LIMITATIONS" is applicable to case 3:18-cv-857(AWT) ???

5. If "NOT" should "THIS" continuing "VIOLATION" theory of "REALITY" doctrine, "OR" other "APPLICABLE" jurisdictional "SAVING" qualifications be "APPLIED" ???

6. Whether U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut "MISUSE, ABUSE," in this "CRYPTIC" D.Conn.L.Civ.R. "DISCARD" of "IMPARTIAL" judicial "REASONABLE INQUIRY" provisional "STANDING ORDER", under "BOTH" these civil "RICO" cause of "ACTIONS" pursuant 18 U.S.C. § 1961-68 "ENABLES" the courts jurisdictional "REQUIREMENT" ???

7. Whether "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court "ERRORED" on any "RULINGS" in "DISHONOR" of "TIMELY" binding contractual "COLORING OF LAW" agreements ???

8. Whether prior "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel members judicial "IMPROPRIETY" Constitute a "VIOLATION" of 28 U.S.C.§455(a),(b), and "OR" RENDER "ANY" or "ALL" Subsequent U.S. District "CHIEF" and "CIRCUIT COURTS" decisions "VOID" ???

9. Whether "ALL" extraordinary "EXISTING" cercumstances "RENDER" case consolidation and petitioner appointment of appropriate counsel with "RELEASE" pending entitled "FINALITY" ???

10. Whether "EMERGENCY" 28 U.S.C.§2106 supervisory "CORRECTIVE ACTION" should be additionally "ENFORCED" in "BOTH" these "CASES" under "OUR SUPREME" Court exersize "POWER" ???

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:

#17-4011

Petitioner: Michael A. Young #232802, Cheshire CI, 900 Highland Ave, Cheshire CT. 06410.

For the Respondents: #17-4011

Vernon Oliver:
Connecticut Attorney General, William Tong, 55 Elm Street, Hartford CT. 06106.

Matthew Emond: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
David Channing: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Edward Joy: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Christopher Duby: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Patrick White: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Joseph Brown: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Safia Syed: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Larry "THOMPSON": "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Carol Chapdelaine: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Shelia Prats: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
James Graham: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Janice Dagostino: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

III.

William Bright, Jr.: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
William Salvatore: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Samuel Sferrazza: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Mary Clark: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Alvin W. "THOMPSON":
U.S. Attorneys Office for District of Connecticut,
Connecticut Financial Center, 157 Church Street,
New Haven CT. 06510.

18-1775

Petitioner: Michael A. Young #232802, Cheshire CI, 900 Highland Ave,
Cheshire CT. 06410.

For the Respondents:

Thomas Duncan:
Connecticut Attorney General, William Tong, 55 Elm Street,
Hartford CT. 06106.

William Utermarck: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Timothy Begley: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Veronica Carpenter: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Benjamin R. Langevin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Jhon Barrows: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Michael Zella: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Kenneth J. Albert: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Tillman Cormier: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Jeffery Duda: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Richard Charland: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Jhon Doe #1-#4: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Rui Silva: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Frank Prochaska: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Mathew Gedansky: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Andrew Durham: "SAME" as "ABOVE
Annette Griffin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Shaffer Griffin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Brian Rioux: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Jessica Reed: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Susan Ulitch: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Edward Mullarkey: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Hunchu Kwak: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
John F. Newson: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Norman Pattis: The Pattis "LAW" Firm LLC, 1st Floor 383 Orange Street, New Haven CT, 06511.
Daniel Erwin: The Pattis "LAW" Firm LLC, 1st Floor 383 Orange Street, New Haven CT, 06511.
Laura Baldini: Law Offices of Laura "FLYNN" Baldini LLC, 2nd Floor P.O. Box 887, 74 Batterson Park Rd, Farmington CT, 06034.
Sheila Huddleston: Shipman | GOODWIN" LLP, 1 Constitution Plaza, Hartford CT, 06103.

OTHER RESPONDENTS:

Linda S. "FURGUSON": U.S. Attorneys Office for District of Connecticut, Connecticut Financial Center, 157 Church St, New Haven CT, 06510.
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe: U.S. Attorneys Office for the Southern District of New York, 1 Saint Andrews Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10007.

Atasha Joesph: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Robert A. Katzmann: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Raena Raggi: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Peter W. Hall: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Richard J. Sullivan: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Pierre N. Leval: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Guido Calabresi: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Debra Ann Livingston: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

13 "VOLUMES" with 978 pages **INDEX TO APPENDICES**

APPENDIX I: "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel courts 17-4011 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" an "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX J: "MY" binding "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" 18-1775 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreement !!!

APPENDIX K: "MY" 18-1775 motion for consolidation of cases !!!

APPENDIX L: "MY" 17-4011 motion for consolidation with Appointment of Counsel !!!

APPENDIX M: "MY FIRST" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX N: "MY SECOND" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX O#1: "MY TIMELY" 3:16-cv-1720(SRU) motion for Discovery and "ORDER" of "AQUITTAL" or "JUDGMENT" set aside and "NEW TRIAL" filing !!!

APPENDIX O#2: Above "EXHIBITS" A-G !!!

APPENDIX O#3: "MY OTHER" intelligent motions with U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:16-cv-1720, 1744, 1798 (AWT) "RULINGS" in "DENIAL" an "ORDERS" of "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSALS" !!!

APPENDIX O#4: U.S. District Court of Connecticut 3:16-cv-1720, 1744, 1798 (AWT) Judgements "VOID" !!!

APPENDIX P: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:17-cv-20(AWT) initial "REVIEW" ORDER !!!

APPENDIX Q: Case 3:17-cv-20(AWT) "CORRUPTicut [D.D.C.] CM/ECF "NOTICES" !!!

APPENDIX R: "MY" intelligent "RULE 60" with other "RELIEF" 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX S: "MY EMERGENCY" joining motion for "RELIEF" 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

VII.

APPENDIX T: "MY TIMELY" amended 3:17-cv-20(AWT) complaint filing !!!

APPENDIX U#1-U#7: Above "EXHIBITS" #1-#50 !!!

APPENDIX V: "MY PROPER" appointment of counsel 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filings !!!

APPENDIX W: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:17-cv-20(AWT) "RULINGS" in "DENIAL" an "ORDER" of "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX X#1: "MY THIRD" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:18-cv-857(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX X#2: Above "EXHIBITS" #1-#7 !!!

APPENDIX Y: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:18-cv-857(AWT) initial "REVIEW" order in "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX Z: U.S. District Court of Connecticut 3:18-cv-857(AWT) judgement "VOID" !!!

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

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

[X] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix B and I to the petition and is

[ ] reported at _____; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[X] 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

[X] For cases from **federal courts**:

18-1775 The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 11-14-18.

[ ] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

17-4011 [X] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: August 16, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

[ ] 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. § 1651(a) in "AID" of appellate jurisdiction as "EXCEPTIONAL" circumstances "WARRANT" the "EXERSISE" of 28 U.S.C. § 2106 "SUPREME" authorized "POWER", and adequate "RELEIF" can "NOT" be "OBTAINED" in "ANY" other "FORM" from "ANY OTHER COURT" !!!

[ ] 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

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

"FEDERAL"

"FIRST"... Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!! "OH"..."AN"...The "FOURTH"... Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
"SIXTH"... Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
"EIGHTH"... Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
"FOURTEENTH"... Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!

"STATE"

Connecticut Constitution Artical 1 § 8 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Artical 1 § 20 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Artical 5 § 1 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Artical 20 § 1 !!!

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

"FEDERAL"

Civil "RICO" 18 USC § 1961-1968
28 USC § 455(a),(b)
28 USC § 1915A(a),(b)
28 USC § 1915(e)(1)
28 USC § 1331
28 USC § 1651(a)
28 U.S.C. § 1343(1),(2),(3),(4),(b)(1),(b)(2)
28 U.S.C. § 2106
42 U.S.C. § 1983-85

UNIFORM COMERCIAL CODE

(1) UCC 1-105(a) (2) UCC 1-201(36)
(3) UCC 2-207 (4) UCC 2-209(a)

"STATE"

Connecticut General Statutes § 52-466(b)
Connecticut General Statutes § 52-470(a)
Connecticut General Statutes § 52-493

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This "JOINT THIRD" petition is "MY ENABLED" singular "OFF SHOOT" to the "TWO" prior "GOOD FAITH" U.S. "SUPREME" attempts, "BY PASSED" here at No. 18-8223 | 18-8765 submitted under "TIMELY" certiorari judicial discretion... "SO"... Once "AGAIN" prior questionable "IMPARTIALITY" of "SECOND CIRCUIT" court "PANEL" members "RULINGS" have "NOT ONLY" become "SUSPECT" to "REVIEW" under "RULE 10" (a) provisions... "BUT"... Clear Judicial applicability "RIGHTS NOW" pursuant this U.S. "SUPREME" Court "RULE 20.1" provisional "ENTITLEMENTS" in "AID" of appellate jurisdiction are "AUTHORIZED" in accordance 28 U.S.C. §1651 (a) subsequent "ENABLER"... "MORE IMPORTANTLY"... Court personnel "ACTIONS" have so "FAR" departed from the "ACCEPTED" and "USUAL" course of judicial proceedings as to "CALL" for "EXERSIZE" of "OUR" U.S. "SUPREME" constitutional "AUTHORIZED" 28 U.S.C. §2106 "POWER". [APPENDIX A-L]... "AN"... Further support thereof as follows!!!

2.A "JUST BRIEFLY"... This "INDEPENDENT" 42 U.S.C. §1983-85 "ACTION" commenced on 1-4-17 mistated upon 3:17-cv-20 (AWT) entry, "BUT" was "COMPETENTLY" initiated at [Doc. 1] under applicable Civil "RICO" 18 U.S.C. §1961-68 "ACT", with "MY FURTHER" provisional compliance "DEEMED" at [Doc. 4] "RICO" case "STATEMENT" filing. [APPENDIX M, N]... Nevertheless, is "ALL" liberal construed "ORIGINAL" jurisdictional "SUBJECT MATTER" appropriately "RELEVANT" to "RECOVERY" and "REDRESS", yes, set forth by 28 U.S.C. §1343 | 1331 Connecticut U.S. district "CHIEF" (AWT) obligatory "ACTION"!!!

2.B "IMPORTANT NOTE": Subsequently, "DESPITE" this established "MANDATE" of clear judicial "RECUSAL" from 2-22-17 "ORDERS" written with "LIE" of "DECEIT" upon "PREJUDICIAL" 3:16-cv-1720 (AWT) "DISCARD" of "NON-DUPLICATE" [Doc. 1] entry... "YA"... Where Connecticut U.S. District "CHIEF" Judge "DENIED" [Doc. 8-13] at [Doc. 14] with simultaneous 3:16-cv-1744, 1798 (AWT) "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSALS" in "HIS BAD FAITH" after "ETHICAL" business hours "PARTY" with "CORRUPT" icut U.S. District "DEPUTY" Clerk "FURGUSON". [APPENDIX O#1 - O#3]... "SO"... These "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "NON"-applicable F.R.C.P. 54 judgements "SUA SPONTE" in "FAVOR" of "STATE" were "ALL" through 3-10-17 "FILE" an "ENTRY" in "BAD FAITH" of "SECOND" pre-organize "UNETHICAL" business hours "SECRET PARTY" by U.S. District "DEPUTY" Clerk "FURGUSON". [APPENDIX O#4]!!!

3. Anyways, after "SEVERAL" months of this "BIAS" U.S. District 3:17-cv-20(AWT) "CHIEF" (I.R.O) "DELAY", here in "MOCK" on May 10th 2017 is "YET" another "MIMIC" date of Connecticut "STATE POLICE" attempted "MURDER PLOT", initiated by continued "SECRET HEAD NOD" gesture used in "COVER UP" for 17-4037 "ILLEGAL" arrest/conviction clarified in 18-1775 "NOT SIX" but (5)... "SO"... Here in "STAGE SET" 28 U.S.C. §1915A(a), (b), "MISUSE" an "ABUSE" with fundamental F.R.C.P. 8 an "OTHER" provisional "DISCARD" at [Doc. 10] is "MORE" of "DELAY" in tribunal "GAME" issued "FORUM". [APPENDIX P]... Also pre-organize May 10th 2017 in "CORRUPTicut [D.O.C] CM/ECF notice "MIMIC" is 12-9-17 "DISCOVERY" due "DATE" with "DISPOSITIVE" motions "DUE" by 1-8-18, intentional written deception "NOT" included upon effective "DENIAL" of efficient "RELIEF" at [Doc. 10] filing. Then "STAGE SET" 5-11-17 "MIMIC" at [Doc. 11] with 5-10-17 "EMERGENCY" motion a meaningless "GRANT" filing "ENTRY" by U.S. "DEPUTY" District Clerk "FERGUSON", an "HER" unethical "MOCK" of "BOTH" attempted "MURDER" and "ILLEGAL" GA# 19 at "ROCKVILLE" arrainment dates. [APPENDIX Q]... "YA"... Immediately followed by "MY SPECIAL SECRET" intelligence at [Doc. 12-14], filed in "MY COMPETENT" compliant "MANDTORY" relief under "RULE 60" exersize with "MY OTHER" intelligent "PROPER" response, although pre-organize "AGENT" [D.O.C.] "THOMPSON" an the Dept. of "CORRUPT" others "DENIED" an impeded in "LIE" and "DECEIT" these "TIMELY" submitted filings. [APPENDIX R, S] !!!

4. "NOW"... Even though "MY" ongoing "GOOD FAITH" business practices were intentionally thorted "AGAIN" by "AGENT" [D.O.C.] "THOMPSON" and "OTHERS" in "VIOLATION" of "JANET C. HALL" standing "E-FILE" 6-22-16 "MIMIC" date "MOCK" an "STANDING" protective "ORDERS" entered at [Doc. 5, 6]... "NOTE": Clearly another "SECRET" standing "CRYPTIC CODE" written in "MOCK" of Connecticuts "SECOND" 6-22-13 "STATE POLICE" attempted "MURDER PLOT", clarity "FOUND" in 18-1775 (5) "NOT SIX" (6)... "YUP"... Is just another "TELLING" intrusive "SECRET SIGNAL" use in "DENIAL" of "MY EQUAL" protection in "LAW" an "RIGHTS" to "FAIR" expeditious "RELIEF" from "COVER UP" of 17-4044 "ILLEGAL" arrest/conviction !!!

5. "BACK" to "TRACK" where on 6-12-17 "ENTERED" at [Doc.15] was "MY GOOD FAITH" efforts in fundamental compliance of "AMENDED" complaint "TIMELY" filing. Where upon "ALL" tribunal "BLIND EYE" an "DEAF EAR" syndrome "CHIEF" Judge "ALVIN W. "THOMPSON" willfully "CHOSE" State "CO" CONSPIRATOR" Status, an "NAMED" as "CONSPIRING" defendant pursuant F.R.C.P. 15(C)(1)(B),(2) by "HIS" own "ORDERED" amendment filing. [APPENDIX I,J]..."MORE SHOWN" verified constitutional "PROOF" corroborating "MERITS" of "MY" outline December 2016 Samuel Sferrazza "CORRUPT" pre-organize "ACTIONS" see pending here No. 18-7321 at [APPENDIX H.]..."YUP"...Same "PATTERN" of "CRIMINAL" misconduct by "RECENT" state "HABEAS CAST", an Melisa "MILLER" in "COLLUSION" with "DEFENDANT" William Salvator Esq. "REPLACEMENT" Character "DEPUTY CHIEF" Clerk "GINA MANCINI PICKET" Esq. at "BEDROCK GA #19"!!!

6. "YA"... Moving on to "MY FAIR" business counsel appointment practice at [Doc.16] "REQUEST", once "AGAIN" was submitted by "E-FILE" delay in another [D.O.C] "LIE" and "DECEIT" manipulative of "ACCURATE RECORD", so followed by "MY" [Doc.17] "MAIL" Submission. [APPENDIX V.]... Nevertheless after "SEVERAL" more "MONTHS" of Connecticut "BIAS" U.S. District "CHIEF" (AWT) "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "REITERATION" in "DELAY", with "NO DISCOVERY" nor "DISPOSITIVE" motion filing their was "YET" another "MIMIC" of "STAGE SET" as so "NOT TO DO JUSTICE"..."HERE"... In "MISUSE", ABUSE", an "DISCARD" of "SEVERAL" fundamental provisional "RULES" of "FEDERAL" practice a "MORE DELAY" of "GAME" at [Doc.18] in "PROMOTION" of..."NOT PREVENTION" of "THIS" manifest "INJUSTICE". [APPENDIX W.]"!!

7. "NOW"... Even though this (AWT) "LIE" in "DECEIT" manipulating an "ACCURATE RECORD" enabled "STAGE SET" [D.O.C.] "CORRUPT" ict "AGENTS" immediate protective "ORDER" relief of Civil "LIABILITY" it does "NOT" in "ANY WAY" excuse "ANY" of their "CORRUPT" corporate "COLLUSION"..."YES"... Delibrate institutional "VIOLATIONS" of "STANDING" protective "ORDERS" at [Doc.5,6]... at "LEAST TWICE" was "CLEAR" intentional "FELONY ACTS" with "CRIMINAL" liability set forth under "FEDERAL" U.S. District Courts "MANDATE" in "MY CAUSE" of "ACTION" here..."SPECIAL NOTE": This organize [Doc.18] "RULING" an "ORDER" issued simultaneous upon "PREMATURE" 3:16-cv-1720,1744,1798 (AWT) case "DISMISSALS", was pre-organize "CRYPTIC" D.Conn.L.Civ.R "DISCARD" of "IMPARTIAL" judicial "REASONABLE INQUIRY" provisional "STANDING ORDER",

made "TIMELY" applicable at [Doc.1,4]...in "THIS" Civil "RICO" 18 U.S.C.§1961-1967 "CAUSE OF ACTION"...Indisputably "MISCHARACTERIZE" under 3:16-cv-20(AWT) U.S. District "FEDERAL" Court "CHIEF" of Connecticut and "HIS CAST" of unethical "CHARACTERS" in this "STATE" of ongoing criminal "CORRUPT" organize "ENTERPRIZE"!!!

8. "MORE"..."SO"...With "NO" reasonable "TIMELY" civil summons ever "ISSUED" for "ANY" defendants "SERVICE", was avoidance "ACTION" with "CORRUPT" intent to clearly "ELIMINATE" Connecticut U.S. District Court "FAIR" business practices in "RESPONSE" to "MY TIMELY" applicable "RICO" claims. Where this 11-13-17 "RULING" in "BAD FAITH" [Doc.18] "NON"-applicable F.R.C.P. 54 judgement "VOID" was "ORDERED" by "CHIEF" (AWT) "SUA SPONTE" in "FAVOR" of "ALL" defendants including "HIMSELF"..."YES"... Was indisputable "CORRUPT" organization "ACT" in deliberate "DISCARD" of "SUA SPONTE" constitutional "ALVIN W. THOMPSON" obligational "DUTY", an exersize "BEYOND" limited "SCOPE" delegated by "OUR PROPER" judicial "RECUSAL" set forth in "MANDATE" of 28 U.S.C.§455(a),(b) "FEDERAL ACTION"..."SO"...Even with "CRYPTIC" [Doc.18] CM/ECF notice "REFUSAL", an "ELIMINATION" by clear "COLLUSION" in "CORRUPTicut [D.O.C.] "VIOLATION" of U.S. "FEDERAL" District [Doc.5,6] "REQUIREMENTS", this "ACCURATE" record "STIL" exist of "BAD FAITH" [Doc.18] "ENTRY" by U.S. DEPUTY Clerk "FURGUSON" at 7:55pm in "HER SELF" again "AFTER" the "ETHICAL" business hours "SECRET PARTY". [APPENDIX W]..."AN"..."LASTLY"...Unfortunately, "MISSING" from "MY RECORD" so obviously "NOT" in technical compliance with "RULES" governing "PROPER" machanics of "SERVICE", is "WHEN"??? that "VOID" judgement in "BAD FAITH" file entry "PARTY", an "SECRETLY" hidden by "WHOM"???" "LOGGED" this "CORRUPT" exersize upon the Connecticut U.S. "FEDERAL" District Courts "DOCKET"!!!

18-1775 (5) "NOT SIX" (6)

9. "SUBSEQUENTLY"...Within the "THREE (3) YEAR" statute of "LIMITATIONS" period after "ALL" of state court "DISMISSALS" cited herein on 5-22-18 this "OFF SHOOT" 42 U.S.C.§1983-85 "ACTION" commenced..."YES"...Once "AGAIN" on 5-24-18 mistated upon 3:18-cv-857 (AWT) entry, "BUT" initiated at [Doc.1] under applicable Civil

"RICO" 18 U.S.C. §1961-68 "CAUSE OF ACTION" with "MY COMPETENTLY" compliant "RICO" case "STATEMENT" filing. [APPENDIX X.#1-X.#2]... Whereupon 6-4-18 "MORE" Connecticut "FEDERAL BIAS" U.S. District "CHIEF" (AWT) "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "REITERATION" of "LIE" an "DECEIT" in "MISUSE," "ABUSE," and "DISCARD" of fundamental provisional "RULES" of "FEDERAL" practice, in "PROMOTION" of "NOT PREVENTION" of "THIS" manifest "INJUSTICE" at [Doc. 7] issued "FORUM" [APPENDIX Y.]!!!

10. "MORE IMPORTANTLY"... This "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSAL" with "PRJUDICE" by "CHIEF" of Connecticut inappropriate "TIME BAR" (AWT) "ORDER" is "CLEARLY" inapplicable, therefore "BOTH" these civil "ACTIONS" can and "MUST" proceed. As "HERE" when "FRAUD" has been concealed, "OR" is of "SUCH" a character as to "CONCEAL" itself, the statute does "NOT" begin to "RUN" until the "FRAUD" is discovered by, or becomes "KNOWN" to the "PARTY" suing. Baily v. Glover 88 U.S. (21 wall) 342, 349-50 (1874)... "MORE"... "SO"... Despite this "ANCIENT" (AWT) "MAXIM" of "LAW" that "NO ONE" "M.A.Y." take advantage of "HIS OWN WRONG"... Obviously "MY CLEARLY" applicable "EQUITABLE TOLLING" jurisdictional "SAVING" qualifications "HERE" as set forth by Cada v. Baxter Healthcare Corporation 920 F.2d 446... "AN"... Appropriately "MORE" constitutional "EXTENTION" by "OUR" precedent "SUPREME" Courts "DOCTRINE" precedented at "GILBERTSON" 501 U.S. 350, 363, 111 S.Ct. 2773, 115 L.Ed.2d 321 (1991)... "YUP"... "MY OTHER"... Applicable examples "HERE" are where a plaintiffs disability, such as "MY" imprisonment "OR" infancy, prevents "HIM" from "ACTING" within the "TIME" limitation, "OR" as "HERE" where external event "SUCH" as "THIS" pre-organize "FORCED WAR", has in "FACT" closed the "DOOR" to "ACCESS" any "COURTS RELIEF". see Comment, "EQUITABLE" "TOLLING" of statatutory Benefit Time "LIMITATIONS": A congressional "INTENT" "Analysis" 64 Wash L. Rev. 681, 683 (1989) !!!

11. "YUP"... Resulting in "SAME" pre-organize "PATTERN" of "NO" defendant "SERVICE" and "BAD FAITH" [Doc. 11] "NON-applicable F.R.C.P. 54 judgement "VOID" in "FAVOR" of "ALL" perpetrators, with "YET" another "NON"-monitor file "ENTRY" by U.S. "DEPUTY"

Clerk "FURGUSON" at 7:57pm in "HER SELF" again "AFTER" the "ETHICAL" business "WEEKS" 7-14-18 "SECRET" Saturday "SCAM PARTY". [APPENDIX Z.] !!!

12. "AN"... LASTLY"... Here "BOTH" these independent 17-4011 | 18-1775 (5) "NOT" SIX" (6) civil "ACTIONS" once "AGAIN" ended with "PREMATURE" case "DISMISALS" in "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court "DISHONOR" of binding "COLOR OF LAW" contractual "AGREEMENTS" in "SERIOUS" structural "VIOLATIONS" of "MY" appropriate "UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE" applicable citations. [APPENDIX G, H, J] !!!

13. "BRIEF SPECIAL NOTE"... In "YET" another dirivative "OFF SHOOT" to "MY GOOD" "FAITH" attempted U.S. "SUPREME" Court "RELIEF". see: [No. 18-8765 Immediate "RULE 44" Petition "BY PASS" pages 7-9 at #18, #21, #24]... Where upon that [ATTACH #21] unauthorized "RULE OF EVIL" Clerk "RETURN", outside of the "LIMITED" constitutional "SCOPE" of "SUPREME" clerks "RULE 1.1" provisional compliance of "DUTIES" set forth by "RULE 17.4"... "YES"... Immediately "MY REFILE" along "LEGAL" binding "JEFF ATKINS" | JACOB LEVITAN | "SCOTT HARIS" contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreements dated 7-15-19 followed... "AN" This "TIME" obstructed in "VIOLATION" with "NO" Clerk "IMMUNITY" attached "RIGHTS", yes, apparently "NO PROPER" ethical placement on "DOCKET" clearly "MISSING" in "COMBAT" with "NO MYSTERY" recovery in "RETURN"... "AN"... For "MY" most "RECENT" in "GOOD FAITH" attempted "ENTITLEMENT"... see 3:20-cv-00194 (MPS) at [Doc. #1, #11, #12]... "YA"... I'm "STHIL" awaiting "CORRECTIVE ACTION" to be "TAKEN"!!!

Declaration Under 18 U.S.C § 1621 | 28 U.S.C § 1746.

I Michael A. Young declare in "TRUTH" affidavit process, certified under penalty of "PERJURY" that "ALL" information in this petition is "TRUE" and "ACCURATE" to the "BEST" of "MY" knowledge & intelligence an "CAN ONLY" be "REBUTED" by "SAME" in "RESPONSE" thereto... The undersigned further declares under Congress encouraged "SERVICE" as "ENABLED" Attorney General "PRIVATEER" that "HE" is the petitioner in this forgoing "ACTION"... "AN"... The forgoing petition was mailed first-class postage prepaid on April 18th, 2020 placed in the institutions "LEGAL" mail system...

Executed at Cheshire C.I. Cheshire CT on April 8th, 2020...

by MY "Factual Innocence"!!!
Michael A. Young "PRIVATEER"

17-4011 | #18-1775

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TO: "COURT OF LAST RESORT"...

1A "MY SUPREME JUSTICES"... Starting "RIGHTS NOW" with "MORE" of "MY SPECIAL" updated "SECRET" intelligence "NOTE"... Without articulating "ALL" the intentional "PATTERN" of corporated in "HOUSE" "CORRUPTION" in ongoing "MISCONDUCTED" entity "COLLUSION", as the "COURTS" and [D.O.C] "MY CAPTORS" indisputable records "SPEEK" for "THEMSELVES"... Instead sticking to the "SOLE" issue invoking "THIS" subsequent "WRIT" of "MANDAMUS" to "CERTIORARI" filings in "ABOVE" mention "CASES", so as "FOUND" at [Doc. 72] in 17-4044 it is "NOT DUPLICATE" of 9-11-18 "ENTRY" at [Doc. 69] as "DEPICTED" in "RECORD" of "LIE" an "DECEIT"... "AN"... With "MY" actual "DUPLICATE" [Doc. 77] "EMERGENCY" "911" filing "RETURNED" at [Doc. 76] "YOU ALL SEE" at manipulated [Doc. 74] "RULING" a judicated on "ONLY" [Doc. 69]... Then "SAME" exact "PATTERN" of "CORRUPTION" in 17-4037 | 17-4040 was "ENTERED", then "MY FEELING" the "NEED" to "REITERATE" here "IS"... Along this "MISCONDUCTED" joint-entity "COLUSION" of corporate "CORRUPTION" in pre-organize "TACTICAL" non-interdepartmental mail "MANEUVER", with U.S. POSTAL SERVICE" signal 8-18-18 "MARK" used in "SECRET CODE" for intentional "DENIAL" of "MY MEANINGFUL" court "ACCESS RIGHTS"... The indisputable "FOCUS" here "IS" on this "FOURTH" 17-4011 "NO SHOW" 8-16-18 "ORDER" [Doc. 40], then 8-24-18 "REITERATED" with [Doc. 41] "NO SHOW ORDER", and "BOTH" STHIL" missing in "COMBAT" along with "MY OTHER" "FAIR" procedural request... "YET"... Another "DECEITFUL" calculated joint-entity "ACT" to "ELIMINATION" of "ANY" possible "BENEFIT" of "MY EQUAL" protection "RIGHTS" to "RELIEF", in deliberate "DENIAL" of "TIMELY" inmate "LEGAL" mail filing with "SERIOUS" fundamental "VIOLATION" of "MY MEANINGFUL" court "ACCESS RIGHTS"!!!...

1B "SO"... "HERE"... Pre-organize with 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 depicted "MY 51st BIRTHDAY" based on "INCORRECT" prior/current case information, was "ALL" inappropriate June 21st 2018 motion "DENIALS" with "PREMATURE" appeal "DISMISSALS"... With "THIS" 17-4011 case "ATASHA JOESPH" assigned "NEW CASE" manager "ENTERED" in "COLLUSION" for a "CORRUPT" 6-26-18 "NOTICE" of "DEFECT" written in "LIE" of "DECEIT" intentionally submitted to manipulate the "ACCURATE RECORD"... "MORE FRAUD FOUND"... Written in "TACTICAL" submitted "LIE" of "DECEIT" in 17-4037 at [Doc. 59]... 17-4040 at [Doc. 46]... 17-4044 at [Doc. 47]... As "THAT" courts "PANNEL" decisions "ALL" were "ORDERED" in "DICARD" of "MY FOUR" (4) "TIMELY"

Submitted "CHINESE BOX" filings "FOUND" in "THIS" 17-4011 "CASE" at [Doc. 32, 34, 38, ??, ??, ??]... Absolutely "ALL" these "ORDERS" filed in undisputable "VIOLATION" of "LEGAL" binding contractual "COLORING LAW" agreement with "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" by this "TACTICAL" manuever made in "HIS" concession of "SUB SILENTO" acceptance... "YES"... "MY HONORABLE" in "GOOD FAITH" and enforceable "RIGHTS NOW" of multiple "SCHEDULE" 7.b "VIOLATIONS" in "THIS" 17-4011 "CASE", numerous $10,000.00 Dollor amounts "NOW" due with "NO FURTHER NOTICE", or in "SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" efforts immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" be "TAKEN" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY"!!!...

2. Regarding "MY TIMELY" submitted ancient "CHINESE SECRET" filings, here upon "MY CURE" of "ALL" pre-organize "FOUR" (4) inappropriate "LABLE" of "DEFECTS" issued in "TACTICAL" unethical "CORRUPTION"... "MOST IMPORTANT NOTE"... Is about the "IMPOSSABLE" task of a "RESUBMIT" document when in "FACT" the original documents have "NEVER" been "RETURNED" back with "ANY" of these "FOUR" (4) "NOTICE" of "DEFECTIVE" filing written in "LIE" of "DECEIT" intentionally manipulating "FOUR" (4) "ACCURATE RECORDS"... "YA"... It is unclear to "ME" while "THIS" 17-4011 cases other "THREE" (3) "TIMELY" filed 6-14-18, 6-18-18, then 6-21-18 "BEST CHINA" submitted an "STHIL" are "LEGALLY" binding, "WHY"??? in "FACT" a "RE-SUBMITION" is even "REQUIRED"... "BUT"... As always in "MY FOREVER" format conducting "GOOD FAITH" business "EFFORTS" as "NOT" to "RESULT" in "ANY" court "STRIKEN" documents, "NOW" on 7-5-18 "SUBMITTED" missing "STHIL", "MY FOURTH" (4) "TIMELY" filed motion for "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" already conceded to "COLORING LAW" agreement, once "AGAIN" in "MY HONORABLE" summary procedural "PROPER FORUM"!!!...

3. Furthermore, "THAT" panel "COURTS" preliminary appointment of counsel "DENIAL" with "NO" articulation conflicts with "THIS" and "OTHER" circuit courts decisions set forth by Greenov. Daley 414 F.3d 645 and in Parham v. Johnson 126 F.2d 455... as "HERE" in "MY CASE" where case has "MERIT" and most "FACTORS" have been "MET", courts should "MAKE" every "ATTEMPT" to "OBTAIN" counsel. Even "MORE" applicable "SECOND" "CIRCUIT" court "CRITERIA" as "FOUND" in "MY CASE" where litigant is "UNABLE" to "EMPLOY" counsel set forth by Hodge v. Police Officers 802 F.2d 58... "YUP"... As "SHOWN" by "MY CAPTORS" [D.O.C.] conducting "SECRET" outgoing "LEGAL" correspondence "ELIMINATION" an "MY" being "DENIED" directory assistance to adequately obtain "Foundation for" "JUSTICE" attorney Jeffery Deskovic "LEGAL" phone

communication assistance..."NOW"...Unexcusably "BOTH" in "SERIOUS" structural "ERROR", an "ROAD BLOCK" of "ANY" meaningful court access in "SEVERE" fundamental "VIOLATION" of "MY" unalienable "EQUAL PROTECTION" an "ACCESS RIGHTS" !!!

4. "MOST IMPORTANT REITERATION"...Is on this "PROPER" case consolidation "REQUEST" in that "PANEL" courts "IMPROPER" order of "DENIAL", of course "AGAIN" with "NO PROPER" cited articulation "ISSUED" in "SERIOUS" conflict with "YOUNG" v. Herring 917 F.2d 858... "FOUND" consolidated at "YOUNG" v. Pickett 917 F.2d 869 (footnote #2)..."YUP"..."MY FIVE(5) CASES" are "ALL" the "SAME" constitutionally "VERIFIED" demonstration "FOUND" set forth in "YOUNG" v. Biggers 917 F.2d 873...Then "EVIDENTLY" hearing upon "REMAND" set forth by Simmons v. Lockart 856 F.2d 1144 also in accords with "SAME" prejudicial "CAUSE" as "FOUND" in "ALL" FIVE "(5)" "MY" forgoing "ENTITLED" cases..."AN"...Pursuant to 28 USC § 1915(e)(1) "ENABLES" counsel "PROPER" appointment..."YES"...Immediate "JUSTICE" for "ALL" in the "INTEREST" of judicial "ECONOMY" with "EFFECTIVE" expeditious an administration of "PROPER" business in "THIS COURT"..."AN"...With "MORE" appropriate case consolidation See 3:18-cv-857 (AWT) at [Doc. 1] "FOUND" at 18-1775, "BY PASS" here 18-8765 "STILL" awaiting "PROPER" preliminary "ACTION TAKEN" in accords "THIS SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY" !!!

5. "NOW"...In "SERIOUS" fundamental structural "ERROR" with "NO" Loc. F.R.A.P 31.2(a)(1)(A) "SCHEDULING" opportunity "SECOND CIRCUIT" court "PREMATURE" appeal "DISMISSAL" is in "ALL" prejudicial "VIOLATION" of "THIS" and "OTHER" circuits uniformity decisions because "it" "LACKS" an arguable "BASIS" either in "LAW" or "FACT"...As inappropriately "ORDERED" in conflict with "BEDROCK" principles of "WELL" establish "RULES", that the complaint of a "PRO SE" litigant should be liberally construed in "HIS FAVOR", see Haines v. Kerner 404 U.S. 519...That "HIS" allegations "MUST" be "TAKEN" as "TRUE" in considering whether a "CLAIM" is stated. Cooper v. Pate 378 U.S. 546..."AN"...The complaint should "NOT" be "DISMISSED" for "FAILURE" to "STATE" a "CLAIM" unless it appears "BEYOND DOUBT" plaintiff can prove "NO SET" of "FACTS" in "SUPPORT" of "HIS" "CLAIM" which would "ENTITLE" "HIM" to "RELIEF" as depicted by "THIS" "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court in Dioguardi v. Durning 139 F.2d 774...In "LIGHT" of these principles..."MORE"..."SO"..."THAT COURT" has repeatedly "CLEARLY" cautioned

against "SUA SPONTE" dismissals of "PRO SE" civil "RIGHTS" complaints "PRIOR" to the court "REQUIRING" the defendant to "ANSWER". See Bayron v. Trudeau 702 F.2d 43... Fries v. Barnes 618 F.2d 988... "YES"... Only "ONE" of numerous $10,000.00 Dollor "VIOLATIONS" due "RIGHTS NOW" with "NO FURTHER NOTICE" or in "SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" efforts immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" be "TAKEN" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY"!!!

"MY" "INDEPENDANT" 17-4011 | 18-1775 ACTION TO JUDGMENT "VOID"

6. "EXPLICITLY"... A "STATE COURT" judgment as in 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 that is "VOID" may be "ATTACKED" pursuant "FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS" procedure... Then if or as here "WHEN" 28 USC§2254 "FAILS", by "WAY" Fed. Civ. P. "RULE" 60 motion, as "AGAIN" was "DONE" in "ALL" "THREE" (3) "ENTITLED" matters, or "AGAIN" as "DONE" in "THIS" 17-4011 "CASE" by an independent "SUIT" in "EQUITY", if for some "REASON" the "RULE 60" motion would "NOT PROVIDE" adequate "RELIEF"... At any rate a judgment "RENDERED" by "ANY COURT" that "LACKS" jurisdiction is universally characterized as "VOID" and traditional doctrine had been that "SUCH" a "JUDGMENT" is a "LEGAL" nullity... "BUT"... In modern decisions the problem is recognized as being "MORE" complicated, there "M.A.Y." be situations in which a court "LACKING" jurisdiction has rendered a judgment that should nevertheless be given effect. It is "IMPORTANT" to distinguish between jurisdiction over the "PERSON" and jurisdiction over the "SUBJECT MATTER"!!!

7. "HERE"... Regarding "MY" above "THREE" (3) "STATE COURT" judgments jurisdiction over "MY PERSON" is "LACKING" because the process employed did "NOT GIVE" adequate "NOTICE" before being "RENDERED". Walker v. City of Huctchinson 352 U.S. 112... also U.S. v. Brand Jewelers, Inc. 318 F. supp. 1293... and because court "LACKED" the "REQUIRED" contacts with the case. Hanson v. Dencla 357 U.S. 235... Additionally because, although jurisdiction "M.A.Y." have been "SECURED" over "PARTY" purporting to represent "MY PERSON" that representation was fundamentally "INADEQUATE"... Unless "MY PARTY" made an appearance to contest the exersize of jurisdiction over "MY PERSON". Durfee v. Duke 375 U.S. 106... "OH"... "YES"... The "JUDGMENT" is "VOID" on "DUE PROCESS" grounds in "ALL" these circumstances. Many decisions also "HOLD" a

judgment "VOID" where "PARTY" obtains actual "NOTICE" from a court that had sufficient contacts with the case but the "PROCESS" as in these "THREE" (3) "CASES" was "NOT" in technical compliance with the "RULES" governing machanics of "SERVICE". Centeral Operating Co. v. Utility Workers of America 491 F.2d 245 !!! As such is the "CASE" in "THIS" 17-4011 proceding... "AN" 18-1775 aswell !!!

8. "MOREOVER"... As set forth by the "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court of Appeals there is "ONLY" an immaterial procedural difference between the "RELIEF" sought pursuant "RULE 60" to be "TAKEN". see Hadden v. Rumsey Prods. 196 F.2d 92... A "JUDGMENT" is "VOID" as in "THIS" 17-4011 "ACTION" when circumstances of "COURTS ACTION" amounts to a "PLAIN" unsurpation of "POWER" constituting a "VIOLATION" of "DUE PROCESS". U.S. v. Boch Oldsmobile Inc. 909 F.2d 657... "AN"... "LASTLY"... Once "AGAIN" as in 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 where "RULE 60" is "PROPERLY" invoked on "BASIS" of underlying "JUDGMENT" is "VOID", the "RELIEF" is "NOT" a discretionary "MATTER", it is a "MANDATORY" exersize. Omer v. Shalala 30 F.3d 1307 (quoting) V.T.A. Inc. v. Airco Inc. 597 F.2d 220... These "JUDGMENTS" are "VOID" because "ALL HAVE BEEN" procured by extrinsic an collateral "FRAUD" entered by "COURT" that did "NOT" have "COMPETENT" jurisdiction over niether "SUBJECT MATTER" or "MY PERSON" see "ROOK v. ROOK" 233 Va. 92, 353 S.E.2d. 756 !!!

Wherefore under "MY COMPETENTLY" articulated "GOOD CAUSE" explicitly "SHOWN", in "GOOD FAITH" here under "FAIR" business practices of "THIS COURT" petitioner expressly request Constitutional "AUTHORITY" of "SUPREME" Court to "TAKE" immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" and "GRANT" this extraordinary "WRIT" of "MANDAMUS", with Appointment of Counsel, an "ORDER" immediate "EMERGENCY" release pending "FINALITY" in "ALL" the "ENTITLED" matters !!!

Respectfully Submitted
by "MY" "Factual Innocence" !!!
Michael A. Young Petitioner
DATE: 4-8-2020

Declaration Under 18 U.S.C. § 1621 | 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I Michael A. Young declare in "TRUTH" affidavit process, certified under penalty of "PERJURY" that the information in this petition is "TRUE" and "ACCURATE" to the "BEST" of "MY" knowledgable intelligence an "CAN ONLY" be "REBUTED" by the "SAME" in "RESPONSE" thereto. Filed under "SUPREME" Court "RULE" 29.2 "procedure for the benefit of "TIMELY" filing... The undersigned further declares that "HE" is the petitioner in this "ACTION" and "HIS" forgoing petition was mailed first-class postage prepaid on April 8th, 2020 an placed in the institutions "LEGAL" mail system.

Executed at MacDougal CI. Suffield CT. on April 8th, 2020...

by "MY" "Factual Innocence" !!!
Michael A. Young Petitioner