No.

In The Supreme Court of the United States of America

MICHAEL RAMON OCHOA,

Petitioner, pro se,

v.

Dr. Arthur Levine, et al.,

Respondents.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing has been produced in compliance with Rule 33.1(h) regarding word limitations. There are 944 words in the petition excluding the parts of the petition that are exempt by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d).

The original version of this petition was produced and submitted per Rule 33.2. That version was received and time-stamped by the Assistant Clerk of the Court on 11-05-19. Clerk Barnes interpreted an order at 14-8625 Ochoa v. Rubin as also applying to this case and directed the petition to be re-submitted per Rule 33.1. The text of this petition is identical to that except for indexing and numeration. The lengthy Root Facts were only reproduced at 134/326. Unfortunately, the symmetry of the original was disturbed by that process. Any discrepancies or errors should be interpreted in favor of the original which can be best seen here:

https://www.academia.edu/

40869294/11-07-19_Petition_for_Writ_of_Certiorari 135 327

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Michael Ramon Ochoa, Petitioner, pro se 58 West Portal Ave #218 San Francisco, CA 94127 (415) 373-2172 michaelochoa@mac.com

Date: November 26, 2019

