

No. 19-880

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

Yisrael M. Kemp,

Petitioner,

Versus

Board of Regents of University System of Georgia,
Members, et. al.

Appellee - Defendant,

On The Petition for Rehearing Writ of Certiorari to the United
States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

**PETITION REHEARING FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI**

(s) Yisrael M.. Kemp

Pro—Se Attorney

P.O.Box 623

Atlanta, Ga 30301

Date: March 18 , 2020

(678) 826-6817




Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|-----------|
| Table of Contents | i |
| Petition Rehearing for Writ of Certiorari | 1-5 |
| Appendix A | 1a |
| Higher Education Act 1965 | |
| Three General Provision of | |
| Title IV – Student Assistance | |
| Board of Regents Overview: Exclusive Policy, Exercise | |

Rehearing Grounds and Issues to The Supreme Court of United States

The United States Constitution for “higher” Education has incorporation grounds within and above states constitution for an “higher” Education amendment, to assist non-discrimination for petitioner (*student*) to choose from various entry level classification in respondent university system manual and undergraduate catalogs for one's admission consideration.

Petitioner maintain the fourteenth amendment equal protection clause and Title VI of the civil right act of 1964 for non-discrimination federal funded programs which respondent violated within meaning of title VI of the civil rights act of 1964, 42USC 2000d-1et.se for federal funded programs non-discrimination and such claims 42USC 1981 for equal rights under law; and incurred 42USC ,1983, civil action for deprivation of rights.

Therefore, the Board of Regents of The University System of Georgia manual should fully disclose and allow in its institution catalogue general admission policy same liberty and rights to admission, assisting various academic entry level classification applicants and to include in respondent manual a financial free (*fees*) tuition federal assistance undergraduate program. (*Writ of Certiorari, Board of Regent Approve Manuel and Notification Catalogue. Pg.68 Pg.69 and Rehearing Petition app.1a Higher Ed. Act of 1965, Provision. App.1a Rehearing Petition B.O.R. Exclusive Overview Policy*) That's currently in several states. (citation omitted)

Petitioner rehearing review request has legal standing for compliance from respondent not to discriminate criteria during admission evaluation and to complete its obligation of liberty and rights to (*applicants*) students' undergraduate catalogue for an exclusive approve authorization. (*Writ of Cert. Pg.12-14*)

Petitioner exercise choice entry level classification non-traditional transfer and referred in the Georgia State University catalogue as non-traditional. The lower court agree, respondent was not in violation of their color of law merit standard with the respondent admission evaluating process of petitioner summer 2006 undergraduate application (Pg. 7-9 of *the report and recommendation doc.74 and Pg.13-14*)

May judges grant review for issues and facts of Board of Regents of University system of Georgia (*respondents'*), General admission policy is refusing to provide admission evaluation assistance for approving many qualified applicate which has authorize meaning in its equal opportunity policy for admission evaluation. (*Writ of Cert. Pg.58 equal opportunity policy and Pg.60 Requirement for undergraduate admission*)

Respondent admission program for various types academic applicate such as special (*any*) approve criteria or high criteria applicate is not complying to fully disclose of applicate entry level classification choice (*liberty and rights*) for assisting admission evaluation consideration (*writ of certiorari Pg.65 Non-Traditional Transfer and Pg.72 Presidential Exception Policy*)

Respondent admission evaluation two system policy for higher and minimum application evaluation that exercise wait list consideration for minimum standard applicate, allow evaluation process to discriminate and refuse assisting applicate full disclose entry level classification choice. Is very reason respondent motive of intent violation refusing petition choice of non-traditional category (*DOC.74P10,Writ Pg.54-55, Priority and Regular*)

The duties of the court's decision are not equally protecting respondent board of regent's university system manual, as well determine Georgia system institution catalog are to maintain full disclosure entitlement and liberty rights for prospective criteria applicate and high criteria applicate (Rehearing *app.1a Exclusive*) (Writ of Cert. pg.6 *DOC.74, judge states GSU may exceed rule and policy sent by Board of Regent*)

Genuine Trial evidence continue with respondent's institution responsibility policy use during admission procedure to not note and not notify petitioner for adequate standard guidelines to get necessary back ground check. (*Wit of Cert. Pg.71 Institutional Responsibility Policy and Pg.46 Judge Martin States A Crime to See Dean of Students*)

February fourteen 2006, summer application stated crime, name change of petitioner, yet respondents waited until may 19, to inform one need FBI check and respondent reason, may 19 to deny admission due to not getting documents of background check (*writ of certiorari Pg.55 Judge Martin States Petitioner Had No Relevant Information*)

The Respondent institution responsibility policy is not fully disclosing a normal procedure of applies to have state and federal background check if one has a crime other than traffic citation. (*Writ Pg.71&72 policy 411 GSU Responsibility*)

Petitioner request for respondent full disclosure that the review of supreme court of the united states decide the lower court admittance of a background check institution responsibility policy is not clearly being stated in respondent's manual or its institutional catalogue. (DOC.74 of R&R, Pg.6 and 7 M. Judge States Interview with Dean for Crime, Other Than Traffic Violation)

Petitioner summer evaluation created an appeal to respondent for improperly denying prose summer application base upon academic matters incorrectly and respondent gave incorrect reason of one Morris Brown College transcript was erroneous (*DOC.74 Pg.9 Non-Traditional Transfer Rule Pg.12 Error of Transcript Stated by Judge*)

Respondent action for its uniform academic calendar is same for 2006 and 2020, concerning summer admission evaluation is until June, yet respondent denied evaluation an withdrew summer application in May.(writ pg.47&Pg.65)

Such action of respondent throughout its admission evaluation not to act upon petitioner equal education opportunity entitlement admission criteria, maintain in its general admission policy discrimination and non-compliance of (*prospective*) students authorize approve admission assistance and financial assistance to encompass state wide acceptance of (*applicate*) students for its university system (Writ Pg.45&58 RE. App.1a)

Respondent action were entirely in line with regular admission policy as court agreed Therefore students (*people*) exclusive rights is its university system catalogue from respondents to assist applicates during admission evaluation for such rights are important issues. (*writ Pg.54 & Pg.58, Rehearing app.1a*)

Students (Applicate) exclusive constitution and civil rights entitlement complete assistance, review issues, orders, In such cases as The Jennifer Johnson settlement with Georgia University and Amy Fisher in the State of Texas for percentage enrollment changes (citation omitted), Petitioner equal education opportunity as respondent address for particular entry level classification, is not compliant for fully disclosure each priority & special entry level classification in its institutional catalogue. Petitioner is within laws, procedures of federal; statutes, of the constitution of the United States for filing Rehearing Writ.

Therefore the Supreme Court of united states judge's rehearing review for the united states constitution for an equal higher education, admission evaluation entry level classification for various academic applicates to maintain compliance for non-discrimination is petitioner important issues presented.

(s) Yisrael Kemp.

Pro se P.O.Box

623 Atl, Ga. 30301

Date: March 18,2020

Appendix A

1a

Appendix A

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
THREE GENERAL PROVISIONS SECTION

Title IV— STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A— Grants to students in attendance at institution of higher education

Sec. 400 [20 U.S.C. 1070] Statement of purpose; program authorization

Sec. 484 [20 U.S.C 1091] Student Eligibility

Sec. 413c [20 U.S.C 1070b-2] agreements with institutions; selection of recipients.

**Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Manual,
Overview : Exclusive Policy**