

AMENDED (3)

No. _____

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

LINDA ANN WRIGHT -PETITIONER

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al, -RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

LINDA ANN WRIGHT

300 Elizabeth Drive, Apartment 3108

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15220

(412) 715-7733

IV. QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Was there a concerted effort, from 2007-Present to deny petitioner her Due Process, under the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution of the U.S.?
2. If the Petitioner is not an Attorney, and several Judges consider her lacking, should they have Authorized Counsel since she produced the facts?
3. Did the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, in the denial of Disqualification of Judges deny the Petitioner, Due Process and Redress in not having an investigation?
4. Was the Chief Judge serving as counsel for the Named Judges? Should she have recused herself, was she involved in the naming of the Federal Building, named after one of the Judges?
5. Was Judge Owens while serving in the Texas Supreme Court, aware of Case No. 15-00214, in USDC Texas Northern District, did it affect her Decision?
6. Did the Fifth Circuit Appellate Review Board in not calling for an investigation into the facts submitted by Appellant/ Petitioner Obstructed Justice and Rule Article V, 28 U..C § 358., therefor denying Due Process, Redress?
7. Was there a concerted effort by California, Texas, and the U.S. Courts, to deny Petitioner's Constitutional, Civil, Financial Rights as an American Citizen?
8. Were there Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 & 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)(4), by U.S. Courts, against Petitioner, in all Cases?
9. Were the Deaths of both of my Parents, while Illegally held in Nursing Homes, while the Petitioner had Power of Attorney for both, a Violation of 14 Amendment Equal Protection Clause (intimidation)?
10. Whether by withholding information Texas U.S. District Court, and U.S. CA5, e.g. Dockets 138-143, Violated Due Process Clauses, under 5th and 14th Amendments?
11. Did the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth and Ninth Circuits, Violate Due Process & Equal Protection Clauses to the U.S. Constitution, by allowing totally

errored Rulings, and or Orders stand, Violate 18 U.S.C. § 1503, 1510, 1512, & 1513; in Petitioners Cases?

12. Was there a Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1987, by Not one Judge Issued an Arrest Warrant, or Jail for the myriad of Laws broken and proven by evidence submitted by Petitioner?

13. Was there ever an Investigation into the Case No. 15-16288, CA9, Never made it up to the Supreme Court of the United States; I had paid for the Service, and Third Party for Mailing, why wasn't it done?

14. Whether the Denial of Veterans Status, and forma pauperis by the U.S. Supreme Court of the U.S., Case No. 16-9258, & 16M105, Denied the Petitioner, Due Process and Equal Protection, under the Constitution of the United States?

15. Was the taking of Petitioner's Property (Home & Truck), in CA. and Attempted theft in Texas, Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1951; and Obstruction of Justice? And 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (illegal search and seizure).

16. Were Cases Nos. 14-03008, and 15-00214, (Northern Districts of CA. & TX), working in concert with Cases Nos. 16-0318 (CA5) and 15-16288 (CA9), to Deny Petitioner Due Process and Equal Protection; therefore, Obstructing Justice?

17. Whether the deaths of both of my parents, was collateral damage, to achieve the goal of destroying the Petitioner's Will to proceed?

V.

LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner

Linda Ann Wright Pro Se

Representative

Linda Ann Wright

300 Elizabeth Drive #3108

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220

412-715-7733

1Lawrightone@ gmail.com

Respondents

United States of America, California,
Texas, et al.,

Alex Kozinski, Former 9th Cir. Chief Judge
Department of Veterans Affairs
Health and Human Services

Solicitor General of the United
States, Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Room 5616
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
202-514-220

United States of America-CA
San Francisco V.A.M.C.
Humboldt County, et al
St. Joseph Hospital, et al

U.S. Attorney David Anderson
450 Golden Gate Ave., 11th Flr.
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-436-7200; 415-436-7234

United States Attorney's Office-Texas

Erin Nealy Cox
500 S. Taylor St. # 300
Amarillo, Texas 79101
806-324-2356

State of Texas
Former D.A.D.S. Gregg Abbott
Former Governor Rick Perry
Ted Cruz
John Cornyn

Scott M. Graydon
Office of Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
512-463-2100
scot.graydon@oag.texas.gov

Allegiance Behavioral Health

J. David Lunningham

309 West 7th Street

1600 Oil & Gas Building

Fort Worth, Texas 76102

817-870-1717

dlunningham@watsoncaraway.com

jkornely@watsoncarway.com

City of Amarillo,

Amarillo Police Department

Amarillo Building Department

Gwen Gonzalez

City of Amarillo

Bryan Scott McWilliams

200 S.E. Third St.

Amarillo, Texas 79105

806-378-6067/ 378-9487 Fax

Bryan.mcwilliams@amarillo.gov

Lead Attorney to be Noticed

Claud H. Drinnen, III

Claud H. Drimmen, III, Jennifer
Allen

P.O. Box 1971, Room 303

Amarillo, Texas 79105-1971

806-378-3081

Claud.drimmen@ci.amarillo.tx.us

Kirkland Court Rehabilitation

Joyce Course

Nursing Staff (2013-Present)

Jacqueline S. Cooper

900 Jackson St. Suite 100

Lead Attorney

Timothy M. Dortch

Brown (New Administrator)
Kevin Wright, Tyrone Wright
John Dzik, MD

The Arbors
Nancy K. Delaney, Attorney
Kevin Wright

NW Texas Hospital
Kevin & Tyrone Wright

BSA Rehabilitation
Tyrone & Kevin Wright

Thomas E. Creek V.A. Medical Ctr.

Dallas, Texas 75202
214-712-9500
Jackie.cooper@cooperscully.com

Micah.dorth@cooperscully.com

Joseph Mark Parsons
320 Polk St.
Suite 400
Amarillo, Texas 79101
jparsons@mayfield-lawfirm.com
Charles Edward Moss
cmoss@mayfield-lawfirm.com

Mitzi S. Mayfield
320 Polk St. Suite 600
Amarillo, Texas 79101
806-3499-479
mmayfied@rineymayfield.com

Michael H. Loftin
500 S. Taylor St. Suite 1200
P.O. Box 9158
Amarillo, Texas 79101
806-379-0311; 806-242-0534 Fax
mike.loftin@uwlaw.com

Chad Logan

Tyrone & Kevin Wright

6010 W. Amarillo Blvd.

Amarillo, Texas 79106

806-354-7856

Chad.logan@va.gov

Mobility Solutions Amarillo

. Selman for Mobility Solution

Dusty J. Stockard

P.O. Box 9660

Amarillo, Texas 79107

806-372-2202

dstockard@sbjlawfirm.com

Jeff Gearhart

Marcus Thorton

Tyrone Wright

L.C. Fuller

Kevin Wright

M. Andrew Stewart

P.O. Box 2585

Lubbock, Texas 79401

800-765-7491

astewart@mhba.com

Wells Fargo, USA

Kevin L. Wright

Tyrone Wright

John H. Wright's Account(Deceased)

Margaret M. Schneck, Wells Fargo-CA

Steven L. Hoard

P.O. Box 31656

Amarillo, Texas 79120-1656

806-372-5050

shoard@mhba.com

Michael Kaitcer

John H. Wright, Guardianship

Michael D. Kaitcer

301 Commerce St.

Suite 3500

Fort Worth, Texas 76102-

American Modern Insurance
Samantha Powers
Andrew P. Sclar

Amelia Fairbanks Burroughs
Michael Morrison
Janssen, Malloy, Needham, Morrison,
Reinholtsen, Crowley, & Griego.
Eureka Veterans Clinic

Mitchell, Brisso, Delaney & Vrieze
Nancy K. Delaney
John Vrieze
Saint Joseph Hospital, et al.,
Humboldt County, et al.,
Tax Collector John Bartholomew
Sheriff Department Humboldt County
Humboldt Waste Management.

Leonard & Lyde Law Firm
Maria Winters
Michael G. Gallert

817-878-0500
Nathaniel R. Lucey, Esq.
Ericksen Arbuthnot
152 N. 3rd Street, Suite 700
San Jose, CA 95112
408-286-0880, ext. 115
nlucey@ericksenarbuthnot.com

Amelia Fairbanks Burroughs
Michael Morrison (Lead Attorney)
730 Fifth St.
P.O. Drawer 1288
Eureka, CA 95501
aburroughs@jannssenlaw.com
spike@janssenlaw.com

Nancy K. Delaney
814 Seventh St.
P.O. Drawer 1008
Eureka, CA 95502
707-443-5643
ndelaney@mitcheilllawfirm.com

Nancy K. Delaney

Leonard & Lyde
1600 Humboldt Hill Road Suite 1
Chico, CA. 95928
530-345-3494

leonardandlyde@gmail.com

St. Clair Hospital

St. Clair Hospital

1000 Bower Hill Road

Pittsburgh, PA 15243

412-344-3408

RELATED CASES

☐ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

☒ All parties **do not** appear in the caption on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is subject of this petition is as follows: UNITED STATES, et al., State of California, et al., State of Texas, et al.

RELATED CASES

Wright, v. United States of America, California, Texas, et al., No. 16-cv-00214, United States District Court, Northern District of Texas. **ORDER, DENYING POST-JUDGMENT MOTION TO REOPEN.** 3 March 8, 2020. 28 U.S.C. § § 2241 and 2242.

Petition for Review by Linda Ann Wright, BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL, for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Judgment entered 22 November 2019.

Linda Ann Wright, Judicial Misconduct Complaint, Nos. 20-90002 through 20-90004, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, Judgment entered 10 October 2019.

-

Linda Wright, Department of Veterans Affairs, No. 310/NPCC/SH, Veterans Entitlements Letter, Judgment entered 29 July 2019. Not implemented.

-

Wright v. United States of America, Texas, California, et al., U.S. District Court Northern District of Texas. Case No. 15-00214, Judgment entered, 06 June 2016, Motion to Re-Open Case 20 February 2019.

-

In RE: Linda Ann Wright, No. 16-9258, United States Supreme Court, Request for Extension of Time..., DENIED, 15 November 2017, DENIED Veteran Status, Case Considered Closed.

-

In RE: Linda Ann Wright, Case No. 16M105, Request *Forma Pauperis*. Judgment entered, 02 October 2017.

-

Linda Ann Wright v. Does 100; USA, et al, No. 16-10318, United States Court of Appeals, for the Fifth Circuit, MANDATE 27 June 2016.

-

Linda Wright v. USA, et al, No. 15-16288, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Judgment entered MANDATE 31 December 2016.

-

Wright v. United States of America, et al., No. 15-00214, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas Judgment entered June 13, 2016.

-

IN RE LINDA ANN WRIGHT, Case Sent to United States Supreme Court (Disrupted by Unknown Parties). *See Case Number 15-00214*, U.S. District Court Northern District-Texas, **Dkt. No. 125**.

-
Wright v. United States of America et al., No. 14-03008, U.S. District Court, California, Northern District, Sua Sponte, Entered; Judgment entered June 24, 2015. While my Mother was being Abused to Death; My Father Locked in Nursing Home in Texas (2013-2019 Death).

-
Wright v. United States of America, et al., **NOTICE OF IMPENDING REASSIGNMENT TO A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.**

-
IN RE LINDA ANN WRIGHT, On Petition For Writ Of Mandamus To The United States Court Of Appeals For the Ninth Circuit. **No. 11-9406, United States Supreme Court**, Judgment entered 1 October 2012.

Wright v. American Express, et al., No. 11-17647, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Judgment entered February 08, 2012. **MANDATE . ISSUED: 12/29/2011.**

-
American Express, et al v Linda Ann Wright, No. 11-04492, U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Judgment entered June 20, 2012.

Linda Ann Wright v. American Express, et al., **REMOVED Case No. DR110578**, Superior Court California-Humboldt, Judgment entered (Docket # 20), **REPLY (re 14 Motion to Dismiss *Wrights's CP 12(b)(6)*) filed by American Express Bank, FSB. Moore, Harvey) Filed on 11/1/2011) (Entered: 11/01/2011).**

-
IN RE LINDA ANN WRIGHT, No. 11-9406, United States Supreme Court, PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, Judgment entered October 1, 2012.

-
Notice from U.S. SUPREME COURT, In forma pauperis status No. 10-9095, DENIED 25 April 2011.

-

Notice from United States Supreme Court, petition for writ of certiorari has been DENIED. No. 10-9095, Judgment entered 10 June 2011.

Linda Wright v. Petra Kuhfahl, et al, No. 10-16345, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Judgment entered 24 August 2010. "...Appeal so insubstantial as not to require further argument." MANDATE ISSUED. Judgment entered 11 November 2010.

Wright v. Kuhfahl, et al, No. 09-05752, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California-San Francisco. Judgment entered 04 June 2009.

Wright v. Kuhfahl, et al, No. 09-05752, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California-San Francisco. Order 12 January 2010 DENYING Motion for Recusal. 12 January 2010.

Linda Ann Wright, Board of Veterans Appeals, Case No. Docket 03-00 182A, Board of Veterans Appeals, Judgment entered December 27, 2005, REMAND

VI. TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	4, 20
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	<i>Passim</i>
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	6-20
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	20
CONCLUSION.....	20

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1. **ORDER DENYING POST JUDGMENT MOTION TO REOPEN**, Case No. 2:15-CV-214-Z, March 3, 2020. After keeping my Father in a Nursing home, and trying to take our property since 2013, in his death. *See Dkts.141-143*.
2. ORDER AFFIRMING DECISION No. 05-20-90002-05-20-90004, APPELLATE REVIEW PANEL Nov. 22, 2019.
3. Petition for Review Filed by Linda Ann Wright, to the Judicial Counsel of the Fifth Circuit, Judicial Misconduct Complaint.
4. ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT, Chief Priscilla R. Owens, Case Nos.05-20-90002 through 05-20-90004, October, 6 2019.
5. Linda Ann Wright, Filed a Judicial Misconduct Complaint, 27 September, 2019, with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. My Father had died after being kept, illegally Since 2013. Filed **Emergency Relocation** & had Filed to Re-Open Case No. 15-cv-00214; 20 February 2019. *See No. 1 Appendix A*. Court allowed his body to be shipped to CA. *See Dkts 138-143*.
6. Department of Veterans Affairs, from San Francisco, sent Pétitioner Linda A. Wright, a Bill from St. Joseph Hospital, to Cover-up, that they held me there Illegally, Operated on my Carotid Artery. Ambulance Bill: *See Dates of Service*. Second Bill not St. Joseph's (Name Change).
7. Social Security Administration, from Richmond CA, sent this statement to my Apartment in Pittsburgh, PA., they were the ones who were Co-Conspirators in my Mother, being locked away and killed, while her Bank Accounts were emptied.
8. Photo Named Judges: Judge Sidney A. Fitzwater, Clerk of Court Karen Mitchell, Chief Judge Barbara M.G. Lynn, Honorable Judge Robinson, Named the Federal Building after her; my Father was kept Illegally from 2013-2019, Death.
9. IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, Case No.16-10318. Linda Ann Wright Plaintiff-Appellant v.

Defendants & Does 1-100; U.S.A., CA, Texas et al., “No Jurisdiction...” Texas ND Case No. 15-cv-00214; IT IS SO ORDERED, 2016 Jun 27.

10. U.S. District Court Northern District-Amarillo, Case No. 15-00214-J, **FINAL JUDGMENT**, Judge Dismisses all Defendants in CA., and Texas, except Tyrone and Kevin Wright, who are Defendants, that Illegally kept John H. Wright, in Nursing Home with U.S.A., et al., Mary Lou Robinson, U.S.D.C., Judge.

11. **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR INVESTIGATION, Dkt. 125 & 127.** Plaintiff had filed a motion, to investigate the **undelivered Documents, to The Supreme Court of the U.S., concerning (Case No.14-03008-CRB, USDC-N.D.-CA)**, Motion **DENIED**, March 17, 2016. Mary Lou Robinson.

12. U.S. Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit, ORDER, Case No. 15-16288, **AFFIRMED**; Decision Case No. 14-03008, **38 U.S.C. § 511, (KNOWING I HAD PRECEDENCE), & SUA SPONTE, AFFIRMED. “INSUBSTANTIAL...” Decision Filed 08 Dec.2015, See 15-00214. ND-TX.; MANDATE, Dec. 31, 2015.**

13. In the Supreme Court of the United States, IN RE LINDA ANN WRIGHT, Petitioner. On Petition For Writ of Mandamus (**Reference Only**) Case No. 11-9406.

14. U.S. Court of Appeals, Case No. 11-17647, **MANDATE**, Dec. 29, 2011, ORDER, Feb. 08, 2012. U.S. District Court ND-CA, 11-04492.

15. American Express, v. Linda Wright, a.k.a Linda A. Wright, Case No. C 11-04492. U.S. District Court, ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, June 20, 2012. William Alsup, U.S. District Court Judge. Allowed American Express to Declare Petitioner as a Criminal Defendant.

16. Linda Ann Wright, v. American Express, et al., Notice of Appeal, Case No. 11-04492, **Introduction of Facts: Violations 1st, 4th, 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; 42 U.S.C. § 1983, & § 1987. See Order on Transfer, Dkt. 45. DENIED. William Alsup, U.S. District Court Judge.**

17. Linda Ann Wright, v. Nancy Craig; et al., U.S. Court of Appeals, Case No. 10-16345, ORDERS, Filed Nov. 09, 2010, and Aug. 24, 2010. **AFFIRMED.**

18. Linda Ann Wright, v. Petra Kuhfahl, et al., U.S. District Court, ND-CA., Case No. 09-5752. **Illegally REMOVED Case. ORDER GRANTING UNITED STATES' MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER...**, IT IS SO ORDERED, Dated: June 3, 2010 Sandra Brown Armstrong, United States District Judge. See **Dkts: 1-12**, Case was already set, for Defendants.

19. Department of Veterans Affairs, Arnold Russo, has been able to withhold my rightfully Earned V.A. Compensation since 2009, with the help of U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Supreme Court of the United States, DENIALS, 3 pages: Dated: Feb. 23, 2011, Apr. 25, 2011, June 6, 2011.

VI. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<i>Easley v. Cromartie</i> , 532 U.S. 234, 242 (2011) clearly erred	<i>Passim</i>
<i>Monell v. Department of Social Services</i> , 436 U.S. 658 (1978).....	<i>Passim</i>
<i>Tilton v. Richardson</i> , 6 F. 3d at 686... 1985.....	<i>Passim</i>
<i>United States v. Aguilar</i> , 515 U.S. 593 (1995) OBS. JUST	<i>Passim</i>
<i>McKell v. Washington Mutual Ins.</i> 142 Cal. App. 4 th 1457, 1490 (2006)	
Unjust Enrichment.....	<i>Passim</i>

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS/
PETITION FOR HABEOUS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that an extraordinary writ issue to review judgments below.

OPINIONS BELOW

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

The opinion of the United States Court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition is APPELLATE REVIEW PANEL FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
[X] reported at Published 5th Cir Court of Appeals; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

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

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is ORDER, JUDICIAL COUNCIL FOR THE FIFTH CIR.
[X] reported at Published, Fifth Cir. Court of Appeals; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

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

The ruling of THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.
[X] reported at The Supreme Court of The United States 16-9258.
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

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

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is ORDER IN THE FIFTH CIRCUIT No. 16-10318.
[X] reported at Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is U.S. District Court, **FINAL JUDGMENT**, Case No. 15-00214.

☒ reported at U.S. District Court, N.D-Amarillo, Case No. 15-00214 to

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIR. Case No. 15-16288, ORDER, MANDATE.

☒ reported at Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals; or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is U.S. District Court, Sua Sponte ORDER, Case No. 14-03008.

☒ reported at Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the Supreme Court of The U.S, appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☒ reported at Supreme Court of the United States _____;or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the of the U.S. Court of Appeals, appears at Appendix A _____ to the petition and is

☒ reported at U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Cir. Case No. 11-17647 _____;or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the U.S. District Court, ND-CA appears at Appendix A _____ to the petition and is

☒ reported at U.S. District Court, ND-CA, Case No. 11-04492 _____;or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the U.S., appears at Appendix A _____ to the petition and is

☒ reported at Supreme Court of the U.S., Case No. 10-9095 _____;or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Cir. appears at Appendix A _____ to the petition and is

☒ reported at U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Cir. Case No. 10-16345 _____;or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **federal courts:**

The opinion of the U.S. District Court, ND-CA appears at Appendix A; to the petition and is

☒ reported at U.S. District Court, ND-CA-Oak., Case No. 09-05752.

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or

☐ is unpublished.

☒ For Cases from **federal courts:**

The opinion of the Board of Veterans Appeals U.S., appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☒ reported at U.S. Board of Veterans Appeals, Case No. 03-00182A; or

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)

☒ For cases from **state court:**

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Illegally REMOVED. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix N/A_____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by therefor denied on the following date: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears art Appendix N.A.

☐ An Extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including, N/A (date) on N/A on (date) in Application No. A.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTES PROVISIONS INVOLVED

<i>Article III</i> of The U.S. Constitution.....	4, 20
<i>First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution</i>	<i>Passim</i>
<i>Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution</i>	6
<i>Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution</i>	<i>Passim</i>
<i>Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution</i>	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 1961 R.I.C.O.,As Applied,	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 241 & U.S.C. 18 § 242, Color of Law.....	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 371 Defraud U.S.A.	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 1951 Property.....	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 1503, 1510, 1512 and 1513, Obstruction of Justice.....	<i>Passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 1651, § 2241, or § 2254.Extraordinary Writ.....	<i>Passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 144. Bias or prejudice of judge.....	<i>Passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 358, Chief Judge, Panel Review.....	6
28 U.S.C. § 453.Oaths of Justices and Judges.....	<i>Passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1)(2)(3)(ii)	<i>Passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 651, Procedure Petition for an Extraordinary Writ.....	Cover
28 U.S.C. § 2241.....	Cover

42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	<i>Passim</i>
42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)(4) Conspiracy: Action to Vindicate	<i>Passim</i>
42 U.S.C. § Prosecution of Certain Crimes.....	<i>Passim</i>
Rule 20. Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ.....	1
Rule 35. Death Substitution, and Revivor;	14
Rule 39. Proceedings <i>In Forma Pauperis</i>	As needed
Rule 40. Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases	14
Rule 42. Interest and Damages	14
FRAP 26(a)(f)	
FRCP 60(c)	
FRAP 5 th Cir.	
Article IV, 11.(a)(b)(c)(A,B,)(d)(1,2)(f) Review of Complaint by Chief Judge	
Article V, 12. Investigation and Report by Special Committee	
Article VI. 18. Petition for Review of Chief-Judge Disposition.....	

XII. Statement of the Case

RELIEF BEING SOUGHT

1. Pain and suffering for 21 years, of a flawed court system that denied my Military Service and Veteran Status, which allowed for the same Respondents to Lock me in a Nursing Home; Kill my Parents (In Nursing Homes, Hospitals), almost cause my death on several attempts; taking my home and Truck, in CA., attempting to take my property in Texas, at the same time. *See Forma Pauperis.*

U.S.A. et al., State of California, State of Texas, While holding my father illegally, proceeds to name a Federal Courthouse after her. \$5,000,000.00.

2. Disbarments of several Attorneys and or Judges who participated in these Criminal activities by Respondents; These Respondents were always operating Under the Color of Law, in all my Cases. Restitution for 21 Years of abuses.

3. Because some judges in my Cases Violated their Oaths of Office, *Fair Tribunal*, and worked in concert to deny the Petitioner her way of life.

4. Surgeries, Medical Treatment outside the U.S.A., et al (HHS, Veterans Affairs) influence; ***Immediate Release of Money and Property taken Illegally***, so that I can pay for all my needs, medical and financial. Back Pay from 1978-2009, from V.A.

5. Decide on all Case Reviewed. All Our Medical Records have been Compromised, by Respondents. \$1,000,000.00, for each year, for the 21 years.

6. Wrongful Death Charges Filed against Parties in U.S.A., et al, the deaths of Mae Bell Wright, John Henry Wright, & in the case of my Death: Linda Ann Wright, \$2,000,000.00, for Wrongful Death ea.

7. My Constitutional Rights, Civil, Human, & Financial, continues to be Violated, Cost the Deaths of Both Parents, and damage to The Rule of Law.

Pay Money owed to me by Corporations,

USA, et al., States CA and Texas, are complicit in this assault. In 2017, after being denied Veteran Status by the Supreme Court of the U.S.; Respondents were given permission to continue the destruction on my and my Family's lives. Mother dead 2017; I almost ¹died, 2018; Father died 2019, all ***Illegally kept in Nursing Homes***, by Respondents. \$1,000,000.00, per year of abuse.

APPELLATE REVIEW PANEL RE: APPEAL OF CHIEF JUDGE'S ORDER,
ORDER AFFIRMED, November 21, 2019, Violating Due Process 5 & 14

-
Review of Complaint by Chief Judge, 5th Cir. FILED 27 September 2019, No. 05-20-90002 through 05-20-90004, Chief Owens, Started her Term, 1 October 2019, ORDER 10 October 2019, Dismissing Complaint. Chief Owens History was of Texas, she was in the Texas Supreme Court, her knowledge of my Case was one sided, and it showed in her Decision. Was she involved in Federal Building?

U.S. District Court Northern District of Texas-Amarillo

Case No. 15-cv-00214, Wright v. United States of America, California et al, Texas et al. Case in other court: Fifth Cir. USCA5 Case No. 16-10318. I Filed a **Motion to Re-open** the Case on 20 February 2019, Docket No. 138. **Federal Building?**

-
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 15-16288,
U.S. District Court Northern District of California-San Francisco, Case No. 14-cv-03008-CRB, This Case was headed for the United States Supreme Court, and the Party that I had Paid \$400.00, to Mail to SCOTUS; in Texas, didn't send the Mail, asked the court Case No. 15-00214, TXND to investigate Dkt. 125, 127, **DENIED**.

8.

¹ Found on the floor of my home, suffering from Black Mold, Mildew; that I asked Justice Kennedy to consider.

In February 2018, I woke up in a Nursing Home, after what was diagnosed as a Stroke. I could not speak, walk, comprehend where I was. I started regaining my knowledge of my situation. St. Joseph Hospital, Whom had been a Defendants/ Respondents since 2009, had taken over my ²Treatment; or lack thereof.

While Recovering, I learned that my Home, and Truck were taken by Other Respondents, in the U.S.A. et al, State of California, Humboldt County, Coast Central Credit Union, [Texas tried to take my property] Does 1-100. After my Recovery, I left CA., **never returned** to Home of 20 years. I moved to Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, to finally get the treatment that had been denied me. REDRESS.

Upon finding a place to live, I acquainted myself with the Veterans Hospital, here in Pittsburgh. I started with getting a total examination and discovered that I had not been treated for major ³Illnesses. In comes ⁴U.S.A. et al, Corrupting my Treatment, which had been denied me for over 20 years. *See Supreme Court Cases Nos. 16-9258, 11-9406, & 10-9095. also See Docket numbers 121, 138, 139, 140, 142, & 143, Case Number 15-00214 U.S.D.C. TXND. 18 U.S.C. § 371.U.S.A.*

² Saint Joseph Hospital had botched my Hysterectomy, in 2007, and has been part of the Conspiracies.

³ 5 Colon Polyps **Removed**, Tooth Decaying, USA, SFVAMC, infiltrated my Pittsburgh VA Medical Records

⁴ Respondents in SCOTUS Case No. 10-9095; working with HHC, SFVAMC, State of CA. Humboldt County, ...

et al., Health and Human Services, Medicare, the Veterans Affairs Department, States of Texas and California and Does 1-100; had me hidden away in several St. Joseph Hospital's sub-standard Nursing Homes; and preformed an ⁵**Illegal Surgery on my Carotid Artery**. Only after Family and Friends did a Police Health and Welfare check on me; did they move me to a new Nursing Home: Granada, in Eureka, CA. My Father and I were both held illegally in Nursing Homes. *See Docket numbers 139-143, Case Number 15-00214, TXND.*

My Mother was Illegally Held in a Nursing Home until she was killed; Dr. Kolomey in California, preformed a Liver Biopsy on her while she was on excessive Blood thinners. Then after all this, and being under Doctors and Hospital care, for Decades, they said that she had Liver Cancer, she Died 15 January 2017.

We will never know, because while going through Court, Case No. 14-03008-CRB, CAND, Judge Charles Breyer, with all the information that I submitted fighting for our lives; Did a Sua Sponte Dismissing my Case With Prejudice, 06/24/2015, **JUDGMENT**; 06/24/2015. USCA9 06/26/2015 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**, Case No. 15-16288. 12/07/2015, **ORDER**, AFFIRMED 12/17/2015.

MANDATE, USCA9. [Here the Petitioner had a Mother, being **abused to Death**,

⁵ Working with the VA here in Pittsburgh and SFVAMC, St. Clair Hospital in PA., St. Joseph Hospital sent me a Bill, after Illegally changing info on Bill, Dates that they had possession of me *Illegally*.

my Father abused, kept **illegally in a 'Nursing Home]**.

ORDER FILED DEC 08 2015, MOLLY C. DWYER, Before: LEAVY, TALLMAN, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

“The amended complaint, which describes unrelated events that span over forty years and includes claims against more than one hundred defendants is largely and lacks the factual specificity necessary ...”

“Further, the Veterans’ Judicial Review Act bars judicial review of appellant’s claims that relate to benefits decisions by the United States Department of Veterans (VA”). [See 38 U.S.C. § 511(a); *Veterans for common Sense v. Shinseki*, 678 F.3d 1013, 1023-25 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that Veterans’ Judicial Review Act “precludes jurisdiction over a claim if it requires the district court to review ‘VA decisions that relate to benefits decision.’”). For that reason, the district court properly found that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the claims....”]

“ Accordingly, appellees’ motions for summary affirmance of the court’s judgment are granted **because the questions raised by appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument.**” “**The pending motion for appointment of counsel I denied as moot.** AFFIRMED.”

Malice/ Oppression, Deprivation of Rights Under the Color of Law, Medical Records Fraud, Military Sexual Trauma, Mother’s Treatment, then Death.

18 U.S.C. § 144. Judge Alex Kozinski, Former Chief 9th Circuit Court of Appeals;

42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)(4), Conspiracy; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 18 U.S.C. § 1503, 18

⁶ Where he died in 2019, and his Remains **shipped to CA**, I had Power of Attorney for both Parents, who died under Control of Respondents, Willfully! Had asked SCOTUS, CA9, TO REPEAL 38 U.S.C. § 511(a), DENIED.

U.S.C. § 1510, 1512, 1513, Obstruction of Justice; *See* Case No. 11-17647, In the Supreme Court of the United States. I had the Case **REMOVED**, because, the State of CA., Humboldt County and American Express, required QUESTIONS PRESENTED: six Pages of Questions, concerning the 9th Cir. in one Case. American Express had Filed a Fraudulent Case in Humboldt County, stating that I had a Criminal Record; with **Equifax**, carried my Loan under a **Fraudulent** Account. I Filed a Response with facts of Misconduct, 83 & 89 pages **Dkts 8, 19, 29**. Judge William Alsup, Carried me as a **Defendant**. *See* Case No. 11-04492-WHA, CAND-San Francisco, where American Express could **Change their Corporations Name to FSB BANK. Violating** 28 U.S.C. 455(a)(b)(1)(2)(3)(ii); 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 18 U.S.C. 371; Violating Due Process, 5th and 14th Amendments, Equal Protection, and *Fair Tribunal*. **Dkt. 45**.

Case No. 09-05752-SBA

Judge Sandra Brown Armstrong

CA9 Case No. 16345; SCOTUS Case No. 10-9095

This Case was Originally **DR090936**, FILED in Superior Court California-Humboldt County, This Case was Illegally **REMOVED**, Humboldt County, St. Joseph Hospital, Former Governor/ Attorney General,

Edmund Brown Jr., San Francisco Veterans Medical Center, Nancy K. Delaney, Janssen Malloy, Needham, Attorney Michael Morrison/ Morrison Reinholtsen, Crowley, & Griego, *See* List of Parties: SCOTUS Case No. 11-17647.

Dockets Numbers: 1,5,6,7,8, 9,10,11, 12, &14. This Case started in United States District Court Northern District Court-Oakland. In Dockets 1-12, was set as Violations of my First, Fifth, Fourteenth Amendment Rights to the United States Constitution. REDRESS, I was not able to get Dockets 10, 11, and 12, Removed, because these were ⁷Fraudulent Declarations. ⁸Recusal DENIED, Electronic Case Filings, DENIED; This Case was **REMOVED, through** Fraud, Deception; Violating the First, 5th and 14th Amendments to the U,S, Constitution, Freedom of Speech, Due Process, Equal Protection, and *Fair Tribunal*.

ORDER by Judge Saundra Brown Armstrong

Subject Matter Jurisdiction, **REMANDING** back to Humboldt County, *See* U.S. Postal Receipt, that I sent to Edmund Brown Jr., Next Day Judge Brown Armstrong ORDER Closes Case. Dkt 83, Date 06/04/10. Denied REDRESS. From this Point on, my Family's lives and my life, was in **danger**, and with the deaths of both my Parents, and the several attempts on my Life; my Finances, the threat of taking my Home and Truck; Veteran Board of Veterans Appeals. *See*

13.

⁷ As well the Judge's ORDER, stating "Subject Matter Jurisdiction, that I had not exhausted." DKT 83

⁸ Judge Brown Armstrong was a Former Police Officer, Politician in Oakland where I was Falsely Arrested.

Appendix 31, SCOTUS Case no. 10-9095, **REMANDED**, 27 December, 2005.

Notice of Appeal to CA9, **Dkt. 91, Motion for Leave to appeal in *forma pauperis*. Docket 93, ORDER by Judge Brown Armstrong DENYING 91**. At this point, The Judge, had DENIED the Plaintiff Pro Se, Electronic Filing, which required Postage, ink, Printing Services, and U.S. Postal and Fed-Ex Charges; and I was limited in the output of information transmitted, through Electronic Filing. At all times I was a 100%, Disabled Service-Connected Veteran. This Case also allowed for the Veterans Affairs to Deny my Benefit, and Surgeries. The Slanderous Statement by Petra Kuhfahl has stayed in my Files for 21 years.

\$400.00, later in comes the Ninth Circuit Case No. 10-16345, Thomas R. Green, Who presented the Fraudulent information with U.S. Attorney Joseph Russoniello, Colleen L. Welch, Sierra Pacific (VA, Western Region Chief) Edmund Brown Jr. Attorney General (then became Governor), Arnold Russo, VA; See List of Parties: SCOTUS Case No. 10-9095, & 11-17647, also QUESTIONS PRESENTED

No. 11-9406

In The Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE LINDA ANN WRIGHT,

16-10318, Case No. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

THE EFFECT OF THESE DECISIONS

The above reference was DENIED, as well as Case Number 10-9095, in the Supreme Court of the U.S., since the denials, I have made numerous contributions

of Material Facts; only to be dismissed. I was illegally locked in a Nursing Home, ran by a Respondent: St. Joseph Hospital, from 15 January, 2018 through 13 February, 2018. I was sent a Bill, with actual dates hidden; U.S.A., et al, SFVAMC, Humboldt County, were involved; *See **their Attorneys***. I was abused by the Respondents; Denied Due Process and Redress in every Case since 2008.

While in the Nursing Home, my ⁹Home and Truck were Illegally taken by the U.S.A. et al., Tax Collector, was taken while I was hidden away Violated 42 U.S.C. § 1985, and 18 U.S.C. § 1951, has continued to be violated by U.S.A. et al., the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was Violated by the posting of the fraudulent bill stating that I owed Back Taxes; Tax Exempt Status since 1988.

Edmund Brown Jr. & Veterans Affairs Illegally withheld My Compensation.
See: Case No. 2:15-cv-00214, U.S.D.C. Northern District-Amarillo, **Dkts.138-143**, *Easley v. Cromartie*, 532 U.S. 234, 242 (2011) Clearly erred; *Tilton v. Richardson*, 6 F. 3d at 686...; 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)(4), Conspiracy...; 18 U.S.C. § 371. Defrauding The U.S.; 18 U.S.C. § 1503, 1510, 1512. Obstruction of Justice.

15.

⁹ CA DMV had threatened to take my Truck, the Tax Collector, my Home, I had complained about this in 2009.

Request Rule 35. Death Substitution. This assault has spanned over several decades, and in case of my death needs to finally be adjudicated and placed in History of Precedence. First the Petitioner needs for immediate Restitution of Money owed from Corporations, and Others *See Petition for forma pauperis*, Petitioner has proven the Debt owed. My Home Illegally taken, finances Blocked.

Request Rule 40. Veterans, Seaman, and Military Cases. This is Request is required because, U.S.A. et al., including: CA5, & CA9 has blocked payment of these Legitimate Claims, for over several decades. My body is in Distress, due to Neglect for all these Decades. It took me until 2019, to clear up Veterans Statement, that had been **fraudulently manipulated since 2009**, Edmund Brown Jr. and Arnold Russo, Sheila Cullen & U.S.A.; et al.,-Respondents.

Reason for Granting the Petition

In 2017, the Petitioner submitted Case No. 16-9258, to the Supreme Court, In Re Linda Ann Wright, -Petitioner. Petition for Writ of Mandamus was casually Dismissed by Justice Anthony Kennedy, while Denying Petitioner Veteran Status. Requiring The Petitioner, to pay over \$7,000.00, to Cockle Printing; when U.S.A., et al., had been blocking all Money coming into Petitioner (Poll Tax).

My Mother had been killed in a Lone Tree Nursing Home with the assistance of

Sutter Delta Hospital-CA, USA, et al.,(2017). Court Case No. 14-03008-CRB, N.D.-CA., **192, Dkt. Entries**, Fighting for my Life and my Mother's. With all the Material Facts submitted, by Plaintiff/ Petitioner; **not one Defendant/ Respondent, has ever Testified under Oath, since (2008)**. Judge Breyer issues a Sua Sponte Order with Judgment **Dkts. 184, 185, (06-24-2015)**, while my Father was Illegally Locked in a **Kirkland Court Nursing Home-Texas, (2013),(Death 2019)**. Filed an Appeal with U.S. Court of Appeals-CA9, Case No. **15-16288**, some how the Paperwork that I submitted and paid for did not make it up to Supreme of the U.S., asked for an Investigation, Denied.

I Filed a Claim in Texas, Case No. 15-00214, U.S.D.C.N.D.-TX, **(1 July 2015)**, trying so save both of my Parents Lives (Power of Attorneys for Both), and mine. During this time, the Petitioner Filed Motions in U.S.D.C.-Texas, to save my Mother's Life, I stayed in her Hospital Room for 3 weeks, 5 hours from my home. My Finances drained. I left and Mother was, supposed to be Transported to my Home; U.S.A. et al., Blocked her move. She was Operated on with a Biopsy, while she was on Blood thinners, by Dr. Irina Kolomey, at Sutter Delta Hospital, against my Demand. She had already gone through Surgery that Maimed her, at a Defunct Hospital Doctor's Hospital-San Pablo, CA, by Dr. Weiland & Dr. Sharon .S. Drager. I was owed Money from Several entities, Have been Blocked since 2003.

See Supreme Court of the U.S., Case No. 16-9258, and 16M105 & Petition *Forma Pauperis*. My Father Locked in a Nursing Home Illegally, since 2013, by the Respondents, and by U.S.D.C., and Appellate Judges, with **no concern about my Family's plight**. Motion to move my Father out of Amarillo, Texas, to my Home in Eureka, CA. Amended Complaint **Dkt. 9, pgs. 7, 8, & 9**(7 July 2015).

Instead sending my Father to me, the Conspiracy to keep him there, by the Court, to go through the motions of a trial, to later Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim. *See Dkts. 107, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 123, 125, 127 & 128*. Docket 134 Judge Determined that I had no legal standing. Final Judgment. In 2019, after suffering a Stroke, and my Home and Truck being taken, with my Mother Dead! I moved to Pittsburgh, PA, to try and get my Father to a safe place, and me. That was not to be! I had Filed Motion for Emergency Relocation of my Father, *See Dkt. 141*. Shortly, he was Dead and his Remains Shipped to California, Illegally. This to keep his demise secret; and to hide evidence of his History and Treatment or lack thereof. No one from the Court Contacted me, I found out by a Phone Call, from a Respondent L.C. Fuller, in CA.

The City of Amarillo after keeping my Father locked in the different Nursing Homes, to keep him away from 1107 N. Washington St. Amarillo, Texas,

Respondents bulldozed the property without notifying me and wanted me to sign a waiver from their Liability. Judge Matthew J. Kacsmark, was assigned the Case No. 15-00214-Z, on 7 August, 2019, I Filed the Emergency Relocation on 12 Sept. 2019. John Henry Wright died under his watch; Remains shipped under his watch. to make a Ruling on the Motion to Re-Open the Case, DENIED, Filed March 3, 2020. Chief U.S. District Court Judge Barbara M. G. Lynn was Responsible for the Operation of the U.S. District Court, and I hold her Liable for all Decision made. The Decision was made to protect Amarillo, Texas, at the expense of my Rights. After holding my Father since 2013, the Conspiracy to deny that I had Power of Attorney for both of my Parents, and California and Texas worked in concert to take their lives and nearly mine.

Why I didn't File in the Jurisdiction where I was Locked in Nursing home?

To save my Father's Life and mine! These Respondents had the Power. to kill my Mother! I had to save my Father. I had been denied Due process and Equal Protection for over 30 years; Judicial Misconduct constant. Mother was dead, I could not revisit litigation in California; I did not know who all were trying to kill me. I knew that I was on my own, with no protection but me. I had hope that Justice would finally be found in Texas, it was not. These courts participated in

Violations of the Rules of Law, to follow The Constitution, and to Defend it against Enemies Foreign and Domestic. there was Quid Pro Quo to protect each other, the U.S, Courts of Appeals, 5th and 9th Circuits, followed the U.S. District Courts in these assaults on the U.S. Constitution.

What Lessons to Aid Appellate Courts jurisdiction

U.S. Courts of Appeal should be the overseers of Conduct of subordinate Courts and Judges, and not Participants in Misconduct. Documentation.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court has the Article III Charge to proceed over inferior courts, and has Jurisdiction. I believe the below requirements has been met.

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) is not a matter of right, but of discretion sparingly exercised. To justify the granting of any such writ, the petition must show that the writ will be in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

I declare under penalty of perjury all statements are true and correct to the best of my ability.

Petitioner Linda Ann Wright, /s/ Linda Ann Wright, Petitioner, Pro Se.

Amended March 15, 2020


Amended May 18, 2020

Proof of Service

28 U.S.C. § 1746

I Certify that all Respondents have been served, by E-Mail and
U.S. Mail. As of 18 May 2020.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION



LINDA ANN WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
2:15-CV-214-Z

ORDER DENYING POST-JUDGMENT MOTION TO REOPEN

Before the Court are several post-judgment filings by Plaintiff to reopen this lawsuit and proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF Nos. 138–143). By her filings, Plaintiff requests that this Court vacate the June 13, 2016 judgment in this case dismissing all claims against all Defendants and awarding Defendants costs of litigation. For the reasons below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motions (ECF No. 138).

Plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal in this case but did not appeal the June 13, 2016 judgment. She waited nearly three years to file a request to reopen these proceedings after that judgment became final. By her motions, Plaintiff claims that Defendants have committed new offenses against her after judgment was entered in this case. To the extent that Plaintiff addresses the claims in this lawsuit at all, she argues that she was denied due process of law. Because Plaintiff seeks to reopen her case and vacate the June 13, 2016 judgment entered in favor of all Defendants, the Court must consider her motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b).

The purpose of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) "is to balance the principle of finality of a judgment with the interest of the court in seeing that justice is done in light of all the facts." *Hesling v. CSX Transp. Inc.*, 396 F.3d 632, 638 (5th Cir. 2005). In order to see that justice is done,

a court may relieve a party from final judgment. *Parker v. Wal-Mart Stores Inc.*, 464 Fed. Appx. 224, 228 (5th Cir. 2010). A Rule 60(b) motion “must be made within a reasonable time—and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) no more than a year after the entry of the judgment.” FED. R. CIV. P. 60(c)(1). A “‘reasonable time’ depends on the facts of each case, taking into consideration the interest in finality, the reason for the delay, the practical ability of the litigant to learn earlier of the grounds relied upon, and prejudice to other parties.” *Osborne v. Homeside Lending, Inc.*, 379 F.3d 277, 283 (5th Cir. 2004) (citations omitted). District courts have “considerable discretion in deciding whether to grant or deny a motion to alter a judgment.” *Hale v. Townley*, 45 F.3d 914, 921 (5th Cir. 1995).

Under Rule 60(b)(4), a court may relieve a party from final judgment when “the judgment is void.” FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(4). The Fifth Circuit has recognized “two circumstances in which a judgment may be set aside under Rule 60(b)(4): [1] if the initial court lacked subject matter or personal jurisdiction; and [2] if the district court acted in a manner inconsistent with due process of law.” *Callon Petroleum Co. v. Frontier Ins. Co.*, 351 F.3d 204, 208 (5th Cir. 2003) (citing *Carter v. Fenner*, 136 F.3d 1000, 1006 (5th Cir. 1998)). In the instant case, the Court lacked personal jurisdiction over certain Defendants, but these Defendants were dismissed pursuant to a lack of jurisdiction and *res judicata*. Thus, Plaintiff cannot challenge the judgment on these grounds.

Rule 60(b)(5) allows a court to provide relief from final judgment if “the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable.” FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(5). In the instant case, it is clear from Plaintiff’s filings that this could not be the basis of her request to reopen.

Rule 60(b)(6) allows a court to “relieve a party ... from final judgment, order or proceeding for . . . any other reason that justifies relief.” FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(6). However, relief from judgment should only be applied in “extraordinary circumstances.” *Liljeberg v. Health Servs.*

Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 863 (1988) (citing *Ackermann v. United States*, 340 U.S. 193, 207 (1950)). The basis for challenge of the judgment must have been absent at the time of appeal so that Rule 60(b) may not serve as an end run around the statutory limitations of the appeals process. *Pryor v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 769 F.2d 281, 288 (5th Cir. 1985).

Plaintiff does not specifically assert *any* legal authority for reopening this lawsuit, nor does she attempt to address her reason for delay in filing the motion. Thus, the Court finds her motion is untimely if sought pursuant to Rule 60(b)(1)–(3) and unjustified by facts or law if sought pursuant to Rule 60(b)(4)–(6). Plaintiff has not argued that any of these specific grounds apply to her request to reopen. Additionally, Plaintiff has not shown why she could not appeal any perceived due process violation in a timely fashion following entry of judgment.

Plaintiff's Rule 60(b) motion to reopen (ECF No. 138) is DENIED. As such, Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon reopening of this lawsuit is MOOT.

SO ORDERED.

March 3, 2020.


MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**