


19-8284
No. _____

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 "BYPASS" OF YOUR CASE)

Petition For Extraordinary "WRIT"

Michael A. Young
(Your Name)

Cheshire CT. 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-30(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 "RECURSAL" ???
- a. 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" circumstances "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 exercise "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 CT, 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 Dagestino: "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 CT, 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"

IV.

Shaffer Griffin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Brian Rioux: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Jessica Reed: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Susan Vlitch: "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. FURGVSON: 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, NY, 10007.

Atasha Joesph: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Robert A. Katzmann: "SAME" as "ABOVE"
Reena 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

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2.
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4.
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	10.
CONCLUSION.....	14.

13 "VOLUMES" with 978 pages INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: "MY" letter of "REQUEST" dated 12-19-18 then "MANDATE" dated 12-21-18 issued by "CHIEF" Clerk of "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court !!!

APPENDIX B: "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel courts 18-1775 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" an "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX C: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" to "RECALL" and "STAY" of "MANDATE", appointment of counsel, and "ORDER" of "RELEASE" !!!

APPENDIX D: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "MANDATE" !!!

APPENDIX E: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "MISCHARACTERIZE" reconsideration in "DENIAL" !!!

APPENDIX F: "MY" 17-4011 motion for "RECALL" and "STAY" of "MANDATE" with appointment of counsel an "ORDER" of "RELEASE" !!!

APPENDIX G: "MY" binding "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel Courts 17-4011 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreements !!!

APPENDIX H: "MY" binding "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" 17-4011 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreement !!!

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 "AQUITAL" 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) Judgments "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) "CORRUPT" [D.O.C.] (M) EC "NOTICES" !!!

APPENDIX R: "MY" intelligent "RULE 6D" with other "RELIEF" 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

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

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

APPENDIX U: "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: "MY THIRD" Civ. "RICO" case statement 3:18-cv-857(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX X^a: 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

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Baily v. Glover 88 U.S. (21 Wall) 342, 349-50 (1874)	8
Cadav. Baxter Healthcare Corporation 920 F.2d 446	8
"GILBERTSON" at 501 U.S. 350, 363, (1991)	8
"EQUITABLE TOLLING" Congressional "INTENT" Analysis 64 Wash L. Rev. 681, 689	8
"YOUNG" v. Herring 917 F.2d 858	12
"YOUNG" v. Pickett 917 F.2d 869	12
"YOUNG" v. Biggers 917 F.2d 873	12
Simmons v. Lockart 856 F.2d 1144	12
Haines v. Kerner 404 U.S. 519	12
Cooper v. Pate 378 U.S. 546	12
Dioguardi v. Durning 139 F.2d 774	12
Bayron v. Trudeau 702 F.2d 43	13
"Rook" v. "Rook" 233 Va. 92, 353 S.E.2d 756	14
STATUTES AND RULES	
Civil "RICO" 18 U.S.C. § 1961-68 "ACT"	4-9
28 U.S.C. § 455(a), (b)	7-9
28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), (b) / 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1)	5, 6 / 12
28 U.S.C. § 2106 / 28 U.S.C. § 1331 / 28 U.S.C. § 1343(1), (2), (3), (4), (b)(1), (b)(2)	4-14
42 U.S.C. § 1983-85	4, 7, 8
D. Conn. L. Civ. "STANDING" E-File "ORDER"	5
D. Conn. L. Civ. "STANDING" protective "ORDER"	5
F.R.C.P. 15(c)(1)(B), (2)	6
F.R.C.P. 60	5
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 1-105(a)	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 1-201(36)	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 2-207	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 2-209(a)	9-14
OTHER	
Statute of "LIMITATIONS" period	7
"FRAUDULENT" concealment "DOCTRINE"	8
Other "EQUITABLE TOLLING" applicable "DOCTRINE"	8

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 Bon I 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:

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 ☒ 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 "EXERCISE" of 28 U.S.C. § 2106 "SUPREME" authorized "POWER", and adequate "RELIEF" 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 Article 1 § 8 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Article 1 § 20 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Article 5 § 1 !!!
Connecticut Constitution Article 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)

"STATE"

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 COMMERCIAL CODE

(1) UCC 1-105(a) (2) UCC 1-201(36)

(3) UCC 2-207 (4) UCC 2-209(a)

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. § 11651 (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 "EXERISIZE" 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... "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 "CORRUPTICUT" U.S. District "DEPUTY" Clerk "FURGUSON". [APPENDIX O^{#1} - O^{#3}]... "SO"... These "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "NON"-applicable E.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(a-wt) "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" as U.S.C. 31915A (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 "CORRUPT" cut [D.O.C] CMECF 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 on "HER" unethical "MOCK" of "BOTH" attempted "MURDER" and "ILLEGAL" GA#19 at "ROCKVILLE" arraignment dates. [APPENDIX Q]. "YA", Immediately followed by "MY SPECIAL SECRET" intelligence at [Doc.12-14], filed in "MY COMPETENT" compliant "MANDATORY" relief under "RULE 60" exercise with "MY OTHER" intelligent "PROPER" response, although pre-organize "AGENT" [D.O.C.] "THOMPSON" on 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 Connecticut's "SECOND" 6-22-13 "STATE POLICE" attempted "MURDER PLOT", clearly "FOUND" in 18-1775 (5) "NOT SIX" (6), "YUP", It's 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 [Dec. 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 will fully 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 Sferenza CORRUPT pre-organize ACTIONS see pending here No. 18-731 at [APPENDIX H]. YUP Same

PATTERN of CRIMINAL misconduct by RECENT state HABERAS CAST, an Melissa MILLER in COLLUSION with DEFENDANT William Salvatore Esq. REPLACEMENT character

DEPUTY CHIEF clerk GINA MANCINI PICKET Esq. at BEDROCK GA #19!!! 6. VA Moving on to MY FAIR business counsel appointment practice at [Dec. 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 (AUT) 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 (AUT) LIE in DECEIT manipulating an ACCURATE RECORD

enabled STAGE SET [D.O.C.] CORRUPT AGENTS immediate protective ORDER relief of Civil LIABILITY it does NOT in ANY WAY excuse ANY of their CORRUPT

corporate COLLUSION. YES. Deliberate 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, 1798 (AUT) case DISMISSALS was pre-organize CRYPTIC D. Conn. L. Civ. R. DISCARD of

IMPARTIAL judicial REASONABLE INQUIRY PROVISIONAL STANDING ORDER, 6.

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 "ENTERPRISE"!!!

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 "CORRUPT" [D.O.C.] "VIOLATION" of U.S. "FEDERAL" District [Doc. 5, 6] "REQUIREMENTS", this "ACCURATE" record "STILL" 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" mechanics 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-X*3]... where upon 6-4-18 "MORE"
Connecticut "FEDERAL BARS" 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 "PRUDICE" 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. Bailey v. Glover
88 U.S. (21 Wall) 342, 349-50 (1874)... "MORE... SO... Despite this "ANCIENT"
(AWT) "MAXIM" of "LAW" that "NO ONE" "MAY" take advantage of "HIS OWN WRONG"
Obviously "MY CLEARLY" applicable "EQUITABLE TOLLING" jurisdictional "SAVING"
qualifications "HERE" as set forth by Cadav. Baxter Healthcare Corporation
920 F.2d 446... "AN... Appropriately "MORE" constitutional "EXTENSION" by
OUR precedent "SUPREME" Courts "DOCTRINE" predated at "GILBERTSON"
501 U.S. 350, 363, 115 S.Ct. 2773, 115 L.Ed.2d 321 (1991)... "YUP... MY OTHER... Applicable"
examples "HERE" are where a plaintiff's 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 statutory 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 7:57 pm in "HER SELF" again "AFTER" the "ETHICAL" business
"WEEKS" 7-14-18 "SECRET" Saturday "SCAM PARTY" [APPENDIX 2.] !!!

12. AN. LASTLY. Here BOTH these independent 17-40118-1775 (5) "NOT SIX (6)"
civil "ACTIONS" once "AGAIN" ended with "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSALS" 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, I] !!!

13. BRIEF SPECIAL NOTE. In "YET" another derivative "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 #31] unauthorized "RULE OF EVIL" Clerk "RETURN" outside of

the "LIMITED" constitutional "SCOPE" of "SUPREME" Clerk "RULE 1.1"

provisional compliance of "DUTIES" set forth by "RULE 17.4" "YES" "I immediately

"MY REFIL" 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 3:30-cv-00194 (MP5)

at [Doc. #1, #11, #12]... "YA" "I'm STILL" awaiting "CORRECTIVE ACTION" to be "TAKEN" !!!

Declaration Under 18 U.S.C. § 101a | 18 U.S.C. § 174b

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 and "CAN ONLY" be "REBUTED" by "SAME" in "RESPONSE" thereon. 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 8, 2020 placed in the institutions
"LEGAL" mail system...

Executed at Cheshire CT on April 8, 2020.

by Michael A. Young "PRIVATEER"
"Factual Investigator"

17-4011 / # 18-1775

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TO: COURT OF LAST RESORT...

1. 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 SPEAK 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 adjudicated 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 STILL 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!!!

18. 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 PANEL decisions ALL were ORDERED in DICARD of MY FOUR (4) TIMELY

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

4. "MOST IMPORTANT RETERRATION". 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 1114 also in accord 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 (AW) at [Doc. 1] FOUND at 18-1775, BY PASS here 18-8765 STILL awaiting PROPER preliminary ACTION TAKEN in accord with 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. FRAP 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 inappropriate 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

12.

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.3d 443, Fries v. Barnes 618 F.3d 988, "YES... Only ONE of numerous \$10,000.00 dollar "VIOLATIONS" due RIGHTS NOW with "NO FURTHER NOTICE" or in "SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" efforts to immediately "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. R. "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 "MAY" 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 Hutchinson 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. Denckla 357 U.S. 235... Additionally because, although jurisdiction "MAY" have been "SECURED" over "PARTY" purporting to represent MY PERSON that representation was fundamentally "INADEQUATE". Unless MY PARTY made an appearance to contest the exercise of jurisdiction over MY PERSON, Duffee 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 mechanics of "SERVICE". Central Operating Co. v. Utility Workers of America 491 F.2d 245 !!! As such is the "CASE" in "THIS" 17-4011 proceeding... "AN" 18-1775 as well !!!

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" usurpation 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" exercise. 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 and collateral "FRAUD" entered by "COURT" that did "NOT" have "COMPETENT" jurisdiction over neither "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" a "Fidavit" process, certified under penalty of "PERJURY" that the information in this petition is "TRUE" and "ACCURATE" to the "BEST" of "MY" knowledgeable intelligence and "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 and 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