


RE: Case No: S 266444

No. 19-8434

ORIGINAL

Rule 34



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CALIFORNIA

Audrey Jean Ukkerd — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Michael J. Siegel "et al " — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

AUDREY JEAN UKKERD

(Your Name)

4606 Ryan Court

(Address)

Rocklin, California, 95677

(City, State, Zip Code)

916,624,2558

(Phone Number)

III

RE: Case No: 5260444  
Audrey Ukkerd

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Why did Attorney Michael Siegel, state that, "The State Bar of California states that, in your complaint (Audrey J. Ukkerd), you assert that you hired G. Stephano on or around January 1, 2010, to represent you a Workers' Compensation matter?" You allege that G. Sam Stephano was affiliated with the Law Offices of Penney & Associates when you initially hired him and began working the Law Offices of Michael Siegel sometime in 2016?
2. Why didn't G. Sam Stephano share with Attoreny Siegel that he was employed with Penney's & Associates?
3. Why was my case prolonged after the Attorney Agreed upon QME Richard S. Lieberman, MD Psychiatry was Invalid Dated 2017?
4. Why didn't G. Sam Stephano schedule a Mandatory Settlement Conference?
5. Why did I have to file the Declarations fo Readiness Mandatory Settlement Conference and the Status Conference Dated 12/20/2018 and 06/20/2019?
6. Why didn't G. Sam Stephano supervise the adversarials from manufacturing my signature on the Order Approving Compromised and Release Settlement Papers Dated 06/20/2019?
7. Why was the Status Conference conducted by G. Sam Stephano without the Judge, Attorney Michael J. Siegel, and Members of te Workers' Compensation Appeals Board?
8. Why was the QME Lieberman, MD Psychiatry requested by G. Sam Stephano after Janak Mehtani, MD Ranked my Mental Health condition Total Disability 01/04/2010?
9. Did G. Sam Stephano know that Janak Mehtani, MD: Medical Dorector; Diplomate, American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, Distinguised Fellow American Psychiatry?
10. Why would I sign Compromise and Release Settlement Papers that stated that I have to pay for my Menatl Health Hospital Services?
11. Why didi G. Sam Stephano answer my Lgal qustions with untruths, false representation, false narrative
12. How can this Fraudulent Unethical Case against Michael J. Siegel and G. Sam Stephano are Binding ir the Court of Law?

RE: Case No. 5260444  
Audrey Uliard

**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:

1. Gianni Sam Stephano

2. CDCR-CSP Sacramento, Attn: Return o Work Office, PO BX 290005

3. CA DEPT. OF Corrections & Rehabilitation Case Settlements & Case Closures Unit  
Attn: Julie Dillion, Manager, PO BX 942883, Sacramento, Ca 94283-0001

Audrey Underd

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	24
CONCLUSION.....	25

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

Decision of the State of Appeal Rule 14.1

### APPENDIX B

Decision of State Trial Court Rule 14.1

### APPENDIX C

Decision of Supreme Court Denying Review Rule 14.1

### APPENDIX D

### APPENDIX E

### APPENDIX F

RE: Case No: S 260444  
Audrey Ukkerd

AUDREY JEAN UKKERD  
RE: Case NO: S 260444

TABLE OF CONTENTS

April 28, 2020

Motion for leave to Proceed <i>In FORMA PAUPAERIS</i> - Rule 39.....	I
Affidavit or Declaration.....	II
COVER PAGE—Rule 34.....	III
Question(s) Presented.....	IV
List of Parties.....	V
Table of Contents .....	VI
INDEX OF APPENDICES- Rule 14.1 (A, B, C) Pages 26 to 35 .....	VII
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED .....	VIII
IX Page 1 Opinions Below .....	1
X JURISDICTION.....	2
XI CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
XII STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 California Supreme Court Clerk's Office.....	5
RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 Clerk's Office Page 2 .....	6
RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 Clerk's Office Page 3 .....	7
RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 Clerk's Office Page 4.....	8
RE: ADJ 7395654 Audrey Ukkerd vs. CSP Sacramento .....	9
State of California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.....	10
State of California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.....	11
Penney & Associates Legal Corporation .....	12
Penney & Associates Legal Corporation – Notice of Separation .....	13
Notice of Dismissal of Attorney .....	14
The State Bar of California RE: Judge Gregory P. Cleveland.....	15
#142704 License Statuses: Present Inactive .....	
RE: Notice of Hearing Status Conference Dated 12/20/2018 .....	16
RE: Notice of Hearing Status Conference Dated 06/20/2019 .....	17
RE: Notice of Hearing Status Conference Dated 01/23/2020 .....	18
Compromise and Release Addendum to Paragraph 9 .....	19
In Superior Court of California – Placer .....	20
Janak Mehtani, M.D.....	21
Richard S. Lieberman, M.D .....	22
RE: Case NO: S 260444 QME Agreed upon Attorneys-Invalid .....	23
XIII REASON FOR GRANTING PETITION.....	24

RE: Case No. 5260 444  
Audrey Wickard

XIV CONCLUSION .....25

XV PROOF OF SERVICE .....26

INDEX TO APPENDICES-- Rule 14.1

APPENDIX A	Decision of the State of Appeal.....	27
	The State Bar of California Office of General Counsel .....	28
	RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 Page 2 .....	29
	RE: Case NO: 19-0-19771 Page 3 .....	30
APPENDIX B	Decision of the State Trial Court .....	31
	The State Bar of California Office of Chief Trial Counsel Intake .....	32
	RE: Case NO: 19-0-18771 Page 2 .....	33
	Re; Case NO: 19-0-18771 Page 3 .....	34
APPENDIX C	Decision of Supreme Court Denying Review.....	35
	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA EN BANC .....	36

VII

see attached

Andrey Utkov

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED**

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
The State Bar of California 09/10/2019	28, 29, 30
The State Bar of California 12/03/2019	32, 33, 34
The Supreme Court of the United States 03/25/2020	36

**STATUTES AND RULES**

Rule 8.4 Misconduct
Rule 1.1 Competence
Rule 1.2 Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer
Rule 1.3 Diligence
Rule 1.4 Communications
Rule 1.6 Confidentiality of Information
Rule 4.1 Truthfulness

**OTHER**

Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Rules of Practice section 10582
---

RE: Case No: S 260444

Audrey Ukkerd

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 C to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at The Supreme Court of the United States; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA BAR court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at San Francisco Supreme Court of California; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.



RE: Case No. 3 260 444  
Audrey Ukicord

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ 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: \_\_\_\_\_, 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. \_\_\_\_\_.

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 03-25-2020.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 03-25-2020, 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. \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

RE: Case No. S260444  
Audrey Uickerd

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

**CLIENT-LAWYER RELATIONSHIP**

Rule 8.4 Misconduct

Rule 1.1 Competence

Rule 1.2 Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer

Rule 1.3 Diligence

Rule 1.4 Communications

Rule 1.6 Confidentiality of Information

Rule 4.1 Truthfulness

Workers Compensation Appeals Board Rules of Practice and Procedure section 10582

RE: Case No. 5260 444  
Audrey Ukkerd

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Court judgements based on fraud are not binding in a Court of Law. Discovery evidence clearly indicates that my case was handled by an unsanctioned attorney practicing law in the State of California: G. Sam Stephano "bungled" my workers' compensation cumulative trauma case either through fraud, malfeasance, or just sheer incompetence. Any licensed and competent attorney in the State Bar of California is required to have represented me with the fiduciary responsibility the required by profession.

Unfortunately, to my detriment, G. Sam Stephano was neither of those (competent nor licensed). He was practicing out of Jurisdiction (No State of California Bar Number); and solicited Present Status: Inactive Judge Gregory P. Cleveland (2011 to present) who signed all of my legal papers starting Dates 01/01/2011 to 01/23/2020; and the attached documents and evidence shows he committed fraud through submitted legal documentation and court filings concerning my case. The Status Conference Dated 01/23/2020 Kelly Hester present to represent G. Sam Stephano. Kelly Hester was the assigned Defense Attorney on my Workers' Compensation Cumulative Truama Case CDCR-CSP and SCIF vs. Plaintiff Audrey J. Ukkerd (Dated 12/19/2010 to 12/20/2019). G. Sam Stephano's behavior suggest that G. Sam Stephano and Kelly Hester are employed by CDCR-CSP; SCIF. Allegedly, G. Sam Stephano mannerisms had no intentions to win my Case. G. Sam Stephano had a purpose to sabotage and set me up to fail with malice and foresight during the nine years and nine months of legal abuse under the Administeration of Justice for all.

After: I reviewed the Settlement papers Dated 06/20/2020, and I discovered that my initials (AU) were on the left side of the paper and on the right side of my initials (AU) were the initials of the Defendant (KH) with a new list of named body parts. I was not instructed (nor did I) sign my initials on a DWC-CA form 10214"F"/2016 or the Compromised and Release Addendum to Paragraph Audrey Ukkerd vs. CDCR CSP-Sacramento: ADJ7395654 (Rev. 11/2008) (Page 7 or 9). Also, I did not sign the legal form WCMSA Claim no. 05554964. There was No legal title on the top or bottom of the paper that G. Sam Stephano instructed me to sign my initials (AU). I had no knowledge nor was I informed of the Compromised and Release Legal papers displaying G. Sam Stephano has the Attorney for the Applicant. In addition, G. Sam Stephano told The State Bar of California Office Chief Trial Counsel Deputy Peter Eng that he was not an attorney. The State Bar of California discovered that G. Sam Stephano was practicing out of jurisdiction and did not have a California Bar Number Dated 12/03/2019.

Attorney Michael J. Siegel: Siegel stated, that he was present at the Status Conference Dated 06/20/2019. I have proof that that is an untrue statement.

The legal tasks that G. Sam Stephano has performed as a Workers' Compensation Hearing Representative indicate a History of negligence, attorney malpractice, fraud, perjury, injustice, and unethical behavior. His actions have caused me physical and mental distress; and a moral injury. I will never be able to reintegrate back to a normal state of health. Nevertheless, all the circumstances and History related to my case would conclude that the case the Settlement was fraudulent and not a fair and honest Administration of Justice.

RE: Case No. S 260444  
Audrey Uickerd

**REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**


I did everything G. Sam Stephano asked me to do. I have the right to expect The Supreme Court of the United States to administer a fair and honest decision regarding my case provided a fair representation of facts was presented. Unfortunately, they (facts) were not.

RE: Case No. S260444

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date: 04/04/2020