No. 20-1451				
	N. Carlo	 , , , ,	Al Villa	

IN THE

Supreme Court, U.S. FILED FEB 0 2 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

1

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Your Name) — PETITIONER

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

united States court of Appeals

<u>for the Federal Circuit</u>

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(Your Name)

(Address)

Dallas Texas 75215 (City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

APR 1 3 2021

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Whether The U.S. District Court Judge Commit AN Error In Decision adopting the Juis Magistrate Judges order signed on June 11, 2020 Petitioner Submitt Appendix(A) As Evidence. And ASKS Whether Appendix(A) Relied on as Evidence, Was The Respondent Properly Served According to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 4(a)(h), frcp 4(e)(1)... 2. Whether Respondent GMC Registered as a foreign corporation In Texas upon Proof It failed to Maintain A Registered Agent Entitle Petitioner to Deafault Judgment. 3. Whether The Method of Service on Respondent According to Appendix (A) was In accordanc with service on a NON-Resident by the Texas. CIV. Prac. and Rem. Code 17.044. (a) Texas Business corporation. ACT 8.10 4. Whether The APPENDIX(A) ALLOW The Federal Court to Exercise Personal Jurisdiction Over Respondent.

5. Whether After Clerks Entry of Default Judgment

5. Whether After Clerks Entry of Default Judgment

Was the Court Refusal To Issue Default

Judgment A Prejudice to Petitioner

P.2

LIST OF PARTIES

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

All parties **do not** appear in thé 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:

Tracy Nixon 4415 South Malcelm x BIND Dallas Texas 75215

General Meters Corporation Global Headquarters 300 Renaissance Ctr Detroit, MI 48243

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

28 u.s. C. 636 (C)(1)(3)

Texas Business Corporation Act 8,10

Texas Civil Practice and Remedy Code 17.044(a)

Texas Civil Practice and Remedy Code 17.044(b)

14th Amendment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Petitioner Filed Civil Complaint Respondent Foiled to Answer, appear or Take Any Action Showing Intent to defend FRCP 55(9)(b)(M) Franchise Holding II, LLC, v, Huntington Rests Group 375 f.3d 922,927-28 (9th Cir. 2004),

The Petitioner Requested Entry of Default Judgment That The U.S. District Clerk Entered against Respondent. Petitioner Then asked the court for Default Judgment. The Trial court Denied the Reauest upon Magistrate Judges Order Attached to this Petition for Writ of Certionari Appendix F Retitioner Timely Appealed the U.S. District Courts order Abopting the U.S. Magistrate Courts order Abopting the U.S. Magistrate Judges Recommendation under 28 U.S.C.1636 (C)(1)(3) Petitioner Originally assummed (C)(1)(3) Petitioner Originally assummed The Appeal Was Interlocutory The Appeal Was Interlocutory The Appeal Was Assigned to Two Different Appeals Was Assigned to Two Different Appeals Court Appendix D and Appendix E The Notice of Appeal was filed with the Wrong court. Appendix E Is the outcome of the Appeal.

Respondent was properly Served In Accordance to F.R.C.P. 4(e) served with walver, Summons and Complaint See, Omni Capital Int'L v. Rudolf Wolff and Co., 484 U.S. 97, 104, 108 S,Ct 404-409 (1987) Service was Amendable by Statute When Respondent failed To Molintain a Registered Agent while Doing Business In The State.
of Texas. The Texas—
General Long-Arm Statute Authorizes substituted Service on the Secretary of State. See, -Texas Bussiness Corporation. Act 338.10 (N)(BXCXO)(E) Service of Process on foreign Corporation Texas has other Long Arm Statutes under Texas, CIV, Prac and Rem, Code 17,044(a), See, Campus Investments, INC. V. Cullever, 144 SIW. 3d 464 (Tex. 2004) Holding That Secretary of STATES certificate of showing receipt and Forwarding to Defendant Conclusively established Service of Process on Defendant, The Petitioner Was Prejudice By The Setting Aside the Entry of Default By The U.S. District Court Judge Decision. Sees Enron 10, F.3d at 96

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW...... 1

JURISDICTION.	
CONSTITUTION	AL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
STATEMENT OF	THE CASE
REASONS FOR	GRANTING THE WRIT
CONCLUSION	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	INDEX TO APPENDICES
APPENDIX A	The STAte of Texas Secretary of STAte 2020-312-826-1
APPENDIX B	
APPENDIX C	1.5. court of Appeals Federal Circuit
APPENDIX D	1.5. Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit Document 00515652399
APPENDIX E	J.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit
APPENDIX F	4.5. District Court
	Marshall Davision order
	· 11464.m 16 1U

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

PAGE	NUMBER
<u> </u>	
0	
	H
10	e
9	,
(AXBXCXDX 2 17.0441	(a) 10
	0 5.W.3046

OTHER

F.R.C.P. 4(e)(h) F.R.C.P. 4(e)(h) F.R.C.P. 4(e)(i)

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

 [] 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	
The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix	
the petition and is	. to
[] 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 to the petition and is	
[] reported at; or,	
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [] is unpublished.	
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,	

JURISDICTION

[] For	cases from federal courts:	
	The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my was June 11, 2020.	case
	was June 11, 2020. No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.	
	[] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United Stat Appeals on the following date:, and order denying rehearing appears at Appendix	es Court of l a copy of the
	[] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari to and including (date) on in Application NoA	was granted (date)
	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 A copy of that decision appears at Appendix	•
	A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the formula and a copy of the order denying reappears at Appendix	
	An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari to and including (date) on Application NoA	was granted (date) in
r	The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under $98 \times 9 \times 100$	

Because The District court Failed to establish
The Three Criteria that Must be
assessed In order to decide whether
To relieve a party from Default or
From a default Judgment.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey Nxon

Date: April 7, 2021