

In the Supreme Court of the United States

William Sandlin McLaurine II

Petitioner Case No. _____

v. Elizabeth C. Bern; Daniel D. Bennet; Marzette Fisher; Courtney C. Brett; Michael Chapman; Patrick B. Davis, Jr.; Jim H. Seay, Jr.; Mary Goldthwaite; Arthur Schwartz; Paul McCain; Daryl D. Bailey; Rick Huett; M. Elizabeth Hyde; Nathan Johnson; Randall Whorton; Marc S. Barter; Richard Grace; Helen Adams-Morales; A. Frazier Christy; Regina Dinger; D. Holley; and A.D. Gorum Respondents.

William Sandlin McLaurine II; 104 East Washington, Demopolis Alabama; phone number: (603)540-8005; email: wsmpe@hotmail.com.

PETITION TO JUSTICE THOMAS TO DISREGARD FILING TIME

William Sandlin McLaurine II, the Petitioner, brings this PETITION TO JUSTICE THOMAS TO DISREGARD FILING TIME to extend the filing time for a petition and direct the Court Clerk to file the petition styled ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA.

July 29, 2019

PETITION TO JUSTICE THOMAS Page 1 of 7
RECEIVED
AUG 1 - 2019
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

On the fourth day of June, 2019, the Petitioner executed and mailed a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States, styled ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA. The petition arrived on the fifth day of June, 2019, which can be confirmed by U.S. POSTAL TRACKING CODE: EK803380106US. The Petition was marked received on sixth day of June, 2019, even though it arrived the day before. On the sixth day of June, 2019, the petition was deemed beyond the time period for review in the Supreme Court of the United States by Redmond K. Barnes, under the name of the Clerk, Scott S. Harris. See the attached notice from the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States. A MOTION TO RECONSIDER was filed and denied by Redmond K. Barnes, under the name of the Clerk, Scott S. Harris on the second day of July, 2019. See the second attached notice.

As Grounds for this PETITION TO JUSTICE THOMAS TO DISREGARD FILING TIME, which has brought within the limits of Rule 30 from the latest decision, the Petitioner asks the following be considered separately and severally:

1) The primary decision under review is the decision of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama to strike from the record, a petition for mandamus, on the decision of that Clerk to prevent the full court from hearing a separate petition for mandamus on the trial court. This decision was filed by the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama on the seventh of March, 2019, and was within the ninety day time limit for filing with the Supreme Court of the United States.

2) The Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama sat in judgement of herself when striking the petition for mandamus meant to correct her actions, and hence the striking was invalid on procedural grounds. The inclusion of previous orders and decisions of the Supreme Court were necessary to show the underlying decision was invalid or improper, otherwise review by the Supreme Court of the United States would be a moot and useless act.

3) The decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama to deny the petition for a writ of mandamus on the eleventh day of December of 2018 was not a final decision. The final

decision on the matter by the Supreme Court of Alabama was on the seventh day of March of 2019. The notice of such final decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama was not actually receive by the Petition until after ninety days from the original decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama on the eleventh day of December of 2018. In order to meet the ninety day filing requirement based on the order of December 2018, The Petitioner would have had to file with the Supreme Court of the United States before the Supreme Court of the Alabama had made a final ruling, and would be a due process violation by the Supreme Court of the United States if allowed. Moreover, the denial of the writ of mandamus done in December of 2018 came after the trial court agreed to rehear the issues, implicitly invalidated the original orders of the trial Court that the first mandamus was directed at. The dismissal at that time was proper on procedural grounds as it was untimely. At the hearing on the twentieth day of December, 2019 the trial Court judge raised the issue of the denial of the writ, and was given the explanation that it was procedurally correct. No attorney raised an objection at that time and it cannot be raised now that the denial of the writ of mandamus in in

December of 2018 was final decision. The final decision of the trial court did not come until the second day of January, 2019. Requiring the Petition to begin counting the time to submit to the Supreme Court of the United States before the final decision of the trial Court or the Supreme Court of the Alabama, or both, is a violation of due process.

4) A writ mandamus is not certiorari. A denial of a writ of certiorari has an implication that the underlying decision is valid. A writ of mandamus is a writ of last resort requiring immediate correction, and a denial of a writ mandamus may be an indication of a Court that the correction is untimely, even if otherwise justified.

5) The decision by Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama that the Petitioner submitted a petition for mandamus on the trial Court's orders of the second day of January, 2019; that it should have been denied on the supposed grounds that it was a rehearing, untimely, or both, is matter of controversy and it is beyond the jurisdiction of Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States to conclude

as correct in order to deny filing the Petitioners petition as untimely.

6) A challenged to jurisdiction is never untimely, and the petitions previously filed with and reject by Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States identified that jurisdiction had been challenged as matter of the record on multiple occasions and hence cannot be considered untimely. The decision of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama to strike a petition for mandamus that was directed her decisions was without jurisdiction. Several actions of trial court judge were without jurisdiction, and have been challenge on multiple occasions as part of the record.


7) The judiciary of the State of Alabama is in breach of duty, both to the Alabama's Constitution of 1901 and the Constitution for the United States of America. It is in the interest of justice to see that breach corrected.

Therefore, The Petitioner asks Justice Clarence Thomas to direct the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States to file the accompanying petition, styled as ON PETITION

FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA,
regardless of whether the petition is out of time for
filing or not, consistent with Rule 22, other provisions,
or some combination thereof.

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

Executed on the twenty ninth day of July, 2019



William Sandlin McLaurine II
104 East Washington, Demopolis Alabama; phone number:
(603)540-8005; email:wsmpe@hotmail.com



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA

December 11, 2018

1180188

Ex parte William Sandlin McLaurine, II. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS: CIVIL (In re: William Sandlin McLaurine, II v. Elizabeth C. Bern, et al.) (Montgomery Circuit Court: CV-18-326).

ORDER

The Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by William Sandlin McLaurine, II, on November 26, 2018, directed to the Honorable Jimmy B. Pool, Judge of the Circuit of Montgomery County, having been submitted to the Court,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Writ of Mandamus is DENIED.

Stuart, C.J., and Bolin, Parker, Shaw, Main, Bryan, Sellers, and Mendheim, JJ., concur.

Witness my hand this 11th day of December, 2018.

A handwritten signature in cursive ink that appears to read "Julia Jordan-Weller".

Clerk, Supreme Court of Alabama

FILED
December 11, 2018
3:36 pm

Clerk
Supreme Court of Alabama

CC:

Jimmy B. Pool
Montgomery County Circuit Clerk's Office
William McLaurine
Madeline H. Lewis



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA

February 1, 2019

1180188

Ex parte William Sandlin McLaurine II. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS: CIVIL (In re: William Sandlin McLaurine II v. Elizabeth C. Bern, et al.) (Montgomery Circuit Court: CV-18-326).

ORDER

The Petition Upon the Clerk for Reconsideration filed by William Sandlin McLaurine II on January 28, 2019, having been fully considered,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition is STRICKEN pursuant to Rule 40(a)(3) Ala. R. App. P.

Witness my hand this 1st day of February, 2019.

A handwritten signature in cursive ink that appears to read "Julia Jordan Weller".

Clerk, Supreme Court of Alabama

FILED
February 1, 2019
9:44 am
Clerk
Supreme Court of Alabama

cc: Jimmy B. Pool
Montgomery County Circuit Clerk's Office
William McLaurine
Madeline H. Lewis
Christopher R. East

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