

No.

20-5012
19-8138

1 of 4!

Includes
IN FORM
Papers

CURRENTLY IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT
WRIT OF CERTIORARI
IN THE

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 08 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Petition FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

Jeanette Ross (AKA Woolsey)
— PETITIONER
(Your Name)

CURRENTLY IN THE
U.S. SUPREME COURT ON
WRIT OF CERTIORARI
CASE #

VIRGINIA Child Support Enforcement
Winchester VIRGINIA Child Support Enforcement
— RESPONDENT(S)
Winchester Virginia, Domestic Relations/Juvenile
CIVIL PART
TITLE IV-D-Administrative, Director Interstate
February 20th 2020

MATTER ON APPEAL U.S. SUPREME COURT
SUPREME COURT, RICHMOND VIRGINIA
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

Winchester Virginia, Juvenile Domestic
MAY 19th 2020 CIVIL DIVISION

Jeanette Ross (AKA Woolsey)
(Your Name)

2785 West 5th Street Apt. 6F
(Address)

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11224
(City, State, Zip Code)

646-662-0744
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

JUN 23 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- Should a writ of Prohibition Be issued while this matter is and continues to Be on Appeal in your Court U.S. Supreme Court writ of Certiorari Case # 19-

- Should a writ of Mandamus Be issued while this matter is and continues to Be on appeal in your Court U.S. Supreme Court writ of Certiorari Case # 19-

- As I have stated in my petition for writ of Prohibition, writ of mandamus, I also stated or whatever the US Supreme Court Deems Just and proper. AT THIS TIME what writ if NOT one I NAMED in my petition, Does the US Supreme Court Deem's Just and proper at this time to prohibit the Virginia child support Enforcement From Continuing to Enforce child support, that was Based on a legally Unenforceable, Nullity From the Foreign State Jurisdiction of New York, ORANGE County, TITLE IV-D - Case # 0004959693. Unlawful, UnConstitutional

- What writ Does the US Supreme Court Deem Just and proper to Issue to the Winchester Virginia Court Prohibiting them From Adjudicating, creating, orders, Dispositions, Judgements or otherwise in - Re JAMES ERIC Woolsey and Jeanette Ross (AKA woolsey - Ross), child support Weekly, or means or otherwise.

- Is there a writ that can Be issued to prohibit any further orders, Dispositions, Judgements, Adjudications or otherwise, Based on NOT JUST THE FACT THAT THIS MATTER is a complete nullity, which is on appeal in your Court through writ of Certiorari, But NOT 00000000, and or currently, The STATEMENT OF FACT THAT NO PARTY Domiciles in Winchester Virginia, THAT NO child is domiciled or a dependent child with either parent, and the FACT As per Federal Law, Jeanette Ross (AKA woolsey - Ross) is an SSI Physically Disabled Recipient Social Security SSI Case Closure criteria under TITLE IV-D.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- What Constitutional Rights, Federal, Interstate Laws are Violated when the Legal Language created By Congress Custodial and Non-Custodial Parents no Longer Legally exists, and the Non-custodial parent continues to Be subject to child Support?
- What Constitutional Rights Federal, Interstate Laws are Violated when Neither the mother & father of a child no longer Domocules in the Courts Jurisdiction, and that Court ignores the Law of Jurisdiction, which it NOT Subject to Discretion, and continues TO create orders, Dispositions, Judgements or otherwise?
- What Constitutional Rights, Federal, Interstate Laws are Violated when a Non-Custodial parent who is no longer subject to the Legal Language of Non-custodial parent and is also an SSI Recipient of SSI Social Security Disability, Also where NO child Domocules as a Dependent child with either parent, No parent Domocules in the Jurisdiction, and the TITLE IV-D Federal Interstate Child Support matter was legally Unenforceable from Inception with NO legal Effect, and The Court and the Child Support Enforcement Agency of Winchester Virginia continue to Enforce, and Charge Enormous Weekly Amounts of child Support, outside of their legal Judicial Administrative Capacity, and continue Violating the Oath they took to uphold The United STATES Constitution, But to Knowingly willfully Violate the Rights protected under the Constitution of a (Legal Language) Non-Custodial parent?

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

IN Legal Terms "Custodial Parent" Refers to parent who Has Physical Custody of a "Dependent child", This Legal Language Enacted By Congress, along with the Legal Language "Non Custodial" parent which was enacted By Congress, which cannot legally exist in this case legally because there are NO NO Dependent children domiciled or legally dependent AS per the laws of The Internal Revenue Service and any law governing, AS all our children are Adults, who pay Federal Income Taxes, AS self Supportive, working Adults, who Do NOT domicile, OR are domiciled Dependent Children, Since the Legal Court Language and Federal circumstances Do NOT legally exist. Neither can any child Support Enforcement case, child support matter in any capacity, Question... what Constitutional and Civil Rights are Being violated against the Non-custodial parent, when a Court creates and continues a false narrative, of Proceedings, Orders, Adjudications, and Furthermore Does so knowingly and willfully?

In 1776 Thomas Jefferson penned as part of the Declaration of Independence "All Men are Created Equal" "We held these truths to be self-evident, That all men are created Equal"

In 1868, The Equal Protection Clause, from the text of the 14th Amendment (fourteenth) to the United States Constitution provides "NOR SHALL ANY STATE... Deny to any person within its Jurisdiction The Equal Protections of the Law"

Those protections continue to be wholly violated, By The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement & The Lower Courts of Winchester Virginia, and without any regard that this matter continues to be on appeal under writ of certiorari currently. Something, that is A MATTER OF LAW, and where your court holds Jurisdiction, and where they blatantly choose to ignore, is erroneous, egregious, unconstitutional.

WHO officer can acquire Jurisdiction by deciding He Has It, The officer, whether Judicial or ministerial, Decides at His own peril - *Middletown v. Low* 1866) 30 C. 596 citing *Prosser v. Secor* (1849) 5 Barb (N.Y.) 607, 608

LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner - Jeannette Ross (AKA Woolsey - Ross)
2785 West 5th Street, Brooklyn New York 11224
(6F)

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

[x] All parties **do not** appear in the 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: Respondents - TITLE IV-D Agency Administrative
Director Washington DC

- Stephen Solomon → AAG FOR Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, 629 Cedar Creek Glade

- Judge Elizabeth Kellas (Burton) - Winchester Virginia, Juvenile Domestic Relations (Civil part) Lower Court, 5 NORTH Kent Street, Winchester Virginia

- Judge Alex R. Iden - who operated as a Judge in this Case in the Winchester Juvenile Domestic Relations (Civil part) BUT (NOTE ~~NOT~~) He is an Appellate Judge in the Winchester District Court, NOT A Judge FOR The Winchester Juvenile Domestic Relations (Civil part)

- Emily Heishman - Deputy Administrative Court Clerk FOR - Winchester Virginia Civil part, Juvenile Domestic Relations, 5 NORTH Kent Street, Winchester Virginia

- Appellate Winchester Virginia District Court - 5 NORTH Kent Street, Winchester Virginia, where there is NO Administrative Clerk signature or name, and where there is NO Judge name or signature. RELATED CASES

- U.S. United States Supreme Court, your Courts current Jurisdiction over this Entire matter Docketed on March 30th 2020 Docket NO-19-

Related Case, which includes BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WHAT HAS TAKEN Place in Winchester Virginia, since March 30th 2020, Unconstitutionally Lawlessly, without legal Authority under Constitutional, Federal Interstate TITLE IV-D Child Support Enforcement Law, and all other Federal, Constitutional and Interstate Laws that Apply in this matter.

- Orange County Goshen New York State - Unlawful; Unconstitutional Registration & Enforcement, Perpetrated SOLELY By the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Agency & The Winchester Virginia Court. Of an Arcade Legally Unenforceable, VOID, VOIDED, Complete Nullity of a November 26th 2008, December 26th 2008, ORANGE County New York State Child Support order from the Foreign Interstate Jurisdiction and Issuing and Vacating State of New York. Held no legal Effect, Holds no legal Effect, will forever Hold no legal Effect IN ANY State. EVER. In 2016 New York State Child Support Enforcement Legally VACATED the entire Child Support matter, to 0.00 Balance of Arrears 0.00 weekly owed to New York State.

- ALL MATTERS IN VIRGINIA, Including Now are Subsequent ITS There were NO Child Support orders that existed in Virginia to Enforce, when this matter Began in Virginia in May 2016. (Signed)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

- Pursuant Res Judicata - Winslow v Commonwealth
- Ex parte Seidel 395 W. 3d 221, 225 Tex Crim App 2001)
- Ex parte Spaulding 6875 w2d at 745 (Teague v Commonwealth)
- Interstate Commerce Act - P.L. (1887) 24 STAT 379, 49 US CA § Let Sec. 1) Federal Regulations of Unfair Business, Originally Designed to prevent Unfair Business.
- FFC - FAIR Debt Collection Practices Act
- Cheney, 542 U.S. at 380: SEE ALSO Sup CT, R. 201.
- Williamson v Berry 8 How, 945 540, 12 L. Ed. 1170, 1189 (1850 U.S. SUPREME COURT - UNDER FEDERAL LAW, IF A COURT, IS WITHOUT AUTHORITY. ITS ORDERS AND JUDGMENTS ARE NULLITIES, ARE SIMPLY VOID EVEN BEFORE REVERSAL, AND CANNOT GO BEYOND THAT AUTHORITY
- Joyce v US 474 2d 215 - NO DISCRETION TO IGNORE "LACK OF JURISDICTION"
- ~~Stuck v~~ ~~1997 945 540~~ ~~12 L. Ed. 1170, 1189~~ ~~Medical Examiners~~ 94 ca 2d 751, 271 P2d 389
- Basso v UTAH Power & Light Company 495, F2d 906, 910 "

STATUTES AND RULES

- Consumer Protection Act clause 1673 B)
- The Supremacy Clause
- Black Letter Law - Law of Jurisdiction
- Procedural Due Process of Law - is a Fundamental liberty Interest, a Constitutional Right.
- Equal Protection Clause - 1868 14th Amendment
- Interstate Commerce Act - 1887) 24 STAT 379
- Writ of Prohibition
- Writ of Mandamus
- Declaration of Independence 1776
- The Bill of Rights
- 45 CFR 303.11 b) 5)
- United States Interstate Family Support Act section 322, Full, Faith & Credit for child support orders under Act 28 USC 1738
- TITLE IV-D 45 CFR - THE ENTIRE Social Security Act in Re-Child Support Enforcement Federal / Interstate.

OTHER

The Record in Virginia cannot be taken on face, as from Inception in May 2016, without Due Process of Law in a Judicial Court in Virginia, Winchester Virginia Child Support Administrative Agency Entire Case & Matter in its entirety even now is ALL Based on the legally Unenforceable child support matter in its entirety from the Foreign State Jurisdiction Orange County New York. NO legal effects nullity will never have any legal effect Everything in Virginia is Subsequent - The child support matter

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
- In-Re Kayachitch, 683 N.W. 2d 325, 326, (Minn App 2004)	
Questions of Law are subject to De Novo Review	
- STATE V FINCH 865 N.W. 2d 696 700 (Minn) 2015	
- Williams v Berry	
- Basso v - Utah Power & Light Co 495 F.2d 906, 910 "Jurisdiction Can Be challenged at any Time"	
- Hilltop Developers v Holiday Pines. Serv Corp 478 So 2d 368 FL 2nd DCA 1985 "Defense of Lack of Jurisdiction over the Subject Matter may be Raised at anytime even on appeal"	
- See eg. Pennzoil Company v Texaco Inc. 481 US 1 107 Ct. 1519 (1987)	
By Attempting to Relitigate issues presented in a prior State court proceedings the plaintiff would force this court to interfere in the Enforcement (or not) of a State court judgement such intervention is prohibited	

STATUTES AND RULES	
18 U.S. Code § 241	- 28 USC 1651 (a) Issuance of extraordinary writ of Prohibition, writ of Mandamus
18 U.S. Code § 242	- Pursuant to 603 rule
18 U.S. Code § 286	- The Bill of Rights
18 U.S. Code § 287	- The United States Constitution
18 U.S. Code § 371	- The Declaration of Independence
18 U.S. Code § 1031	- Rule 21 writ of Prohibition
18 U.S. Code § 1951 (a) b) (2)	writ of Mandamus
18 U.S. Code § 1961 (1) a) b) 2) 3) 4) 5)	
28 U.S. Code § 455	
31 U.S. Code § 729 (a) 1) a) B) E	
42 U.S. Code § 658 TITLE IV-D section 458 - Incentive payments	
45 CFR TITLE IV-D case closure	
45 CFR - TITLE IV-D social security Act child support Enforcement Federal Interstate Program - All Federal Interstate Rules, Laws Codes, Statutes.	

OTHER

45 CFR 303.7 - Registration of foreign state child support orders and on or appears Federal Interstate TITLE IV-D, and The Enforcement of, to a responding STATE. IT must be a Legally valid, legally enforceable child support order or appears. IT must be a controlling order, NOT a non-controlling order. IT must be a controlling order, NOT a non-controlling order. STATE, HAS TO HAVE HAD JURISDICTION, ALL BUT NOT LIMITED TO ALL of which do not exist here, thus it is a complete nullity NO legal effect.

JURISDICTION

[] For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

[] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

[] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

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

Petition for - WRIT OF PROHIBITION

(Writ of Certiorari)

[] For cases from state courts:

This Case and matter is Docketed in your US Supreme Court Jurisdiction Currently #19-8138
The date on which the highest state court decided my case was February 14th 2020
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A (A writ of certiorari was Filed By myself Jeanette Ross AKA Woodsey-Ross) Docket # - Docket # 19-8138 IN THE US SUPREME COURT YOUR COURT JURISDICTION
[] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____ and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____

AFTER THAT, I received a letter dated February 25th 2020 from Stephen Solomon, Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, acknowledging this case
[] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

This case, He worded it "Unworkable" During the Covid 19 - Shelter in place, I receive a Docketed Court Appearance for May 11th 2020. From Emily
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).
A Court Clerk from Winchester Virginia Court, with The Judge Hon. Judge Kellas (Bulton) Name, where the Court Clerk used a Motion to vacate, that I Motional 2 years ago in May of 2018, in which I Requested a written Decision from any further litigation as I have Been trying to vacate this matter with and as per all the Exculpatory Material Evidence The Court and Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, She the Court Clerk Docketed a matter to "modify", which cannot legally exist in any capacity, and I Filed a Motion on May 18th 2020 TO vacate
QUESTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 18 U.S. Code § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights....
- 18 U.S. Code § 242 Deprivation of Rights under color of Law....
- 18 U.S. Code § 286, Conspiracy to defraud the United States Government...
- 18 U.S. Code § 287, False, fictitious or fraudulent Claims....
- 18 U.S. Code § 371, Conspiracy to Defraud the United States....
- 18 U.S. Code § 1031, major Fraud against the United States....
- 18 U.S. Code § 1951 (a)(b)(2), Interference with Comm, by threats or violence....
- 18 U.S. Code § 1961 (1)(a)(b)(2)(3)(4)(5), Racketeering Activity....
- 28 U.S. Code § 455, Disqualification of Justice, Judge, or Magistrate Judge....
- 31 U.S. Code § 3729 (a)(1)(A)(B)(E) False Claims....
- 42 U.S. Code § 658 TITLE IV-D, Section 458 Social Security Act, Incentive payments to States....
- 45 CFR TITLE IV-D case closure
- 45 CFR - TITLE IV-D, Social Security Act child Support Enforcement Federal, Interstate Program, Act chapter 11 of TITLE 45
- TITLE IV-D child Support Enforcement Federal Interstate Program - All Federal, Interstate Rules, Laws, Codes, Statutes
- TITLE IV-D 45 CFR is very specific - 45 CFR 303.7 - Requires a Responding State Enforcing child support of a foreign States VALID "legally enforceable only controlling order, to send money collected in the Responding State to the "issuing foreign State" when it is not a controlling order, and legally unenforceable nullity NO ACTION can legally be taken Federal Interstate Law, but not limited to

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 18 U.S. Code § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights....
- 18 U.S. Code § 242 Deprivation of Rights under color of Law....
- 18 U.S. Code § 286, Conspiracy to defraud the United States Government....
- 18 U.S. Code § 287, False, fictitious or fraudulent claims....
- 18 U.S. Code § 371, Conspiracy to Defraud the United States....
- 18 U.S. Code 1031, major Fraud against the United States....
- 18 U.S. Code § 1951 (a)(b)(2), Interference with Comm, by threats or violence....
- 18 U.S. Code 1961 (1)(a)(b)(2)(3)(4)(5), Racketeering Activity....
- 28 U.S. Code § 455, Disqualification of Justice, Judge, or magistrate Judge....
- 31 U.S. Code § 3729 (a)(1)(A)(B)(E) False Claims....
- 42 U.S. Code § 658 TITLE IV-D, Section 458 Social Security Act, Incentive payments to States....
- 45 CFR TITLE IV-D Case Closure
- 45 CFR - TITLE IV-D, Social Security Act Child Support Enforcement Federal, Interstate Program, ACF Chapter 11 of TITLE 45
- TITLE IV-D Child Support Enforcement Federal Interstate Program - All Federal, Interstate Rules, Laws, Codes, Statutes
- TITLE IV-D 45 CFR is very specific - 45 CFR 303.7 - Requires a Responding State Enforcing child support of a foreign state VALID "legally enforceable only controlling order, to send money collected in the Responding State to the "issuing foreign state" when it is not a controlling order, and legally unenforceable. Nullity No Action can legally be taken Federal Interstate Law, but not limited to

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

42 U.S. Code 658 TITLE IV-D, SECTION 458, Social Security Act, Incentive payments, to the States, ...

18 U.S. Code § 242 Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law, ...

18 U.S. Code § 287 False, Fictitious or Fraudulent Claims, ...

31 U.S. Code § 379 (a)(1)(A)(B) False Claims, ...

28 U.S. Code § 455 Disqualification of Justice, Judge or Magistrate Judge.

18 U.S. Code 238, Conspiracy against Rights

This is a Constitutional, Federal, Interstate, Child Support Enforcement Case, which involves 2 or more States.

Constitutional Template - Full, Faith, Credit Clause, Tempered By The Due Process Clause (Clause) Two Constitutional Principles Provides the Starting Point For "any" "Judgement" Enforcement ~ within the United States Jurisdiction.

The First is Full, Faith + Credit Clause, which Requires All All Courts in the United States TO Honor VALID and Final Final Judgements (Especially those that are Vacated + VOID, VOIDED, VOID ABINITO, From a former or otherwise Foreign Jurisdiction Sister State Issuing State.

A Vacated Judgement, makes the previous Legal Judgement or otherwise "Legally Void" and "Legally Unenforceable" Case over Period.

Due Process Provides the Basic Right of All American Citizens, THAT includes "Fair Due Process of Law", when Fairness is Violated So is the Due Process Clause, But NOT Limited TO and There are NO Exceptions.

28 U.S.C. 1738 Case LAW HAS NOW the Less Read in ITS Finality / That includes Finality as in Vacated, VOID, VOID ABINITO VOIDED, and must also pass THE TEST OF JURISDICTION ABOVE ALL First Because any order or otherwise, entered in a Court that Lacked Jurisdiction, Lacked Legal Authority, Lacked Personal and/or Subject Matter Jurisdiction, IS A Complete Nullity, WITH NO Legal Effects, U.S. (U.S. SUPREME COURT)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Fourteenth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Fifth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Sixth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Eleventh Amendment U.S. Constitution

Tenth Amendment U.S. Constitution

First Amendment U.S. Constitution

Eighth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Ninth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Fourth Amendment U.S. Constitution

Seventh Amendment U.S. Constitution

45 CFR TITLE IV-D Case Closure 303.11, TITLE IV-D
Social Security Act of the Federal, Interstate,
Child Support Enforcement.

45 CFR TITLE IV-D Social Security - Act Child Support
Enforcement Federal Interstate Program / ACF Chapter III
OF TITLE 45

TITLE IV-D Social Security Act - Child Support
Enforcement Program, All Rules, Laws, Codes, Statutes,
Governing, Interstate - Child Support Support Enforcement
Of a Foreign States Jurisdiction - child Support Order &
OR alleged arrears. In this Case, None existed in
any Capacity - From either State, The Issuing Foreign State
New York State Jurisdiction Orange County Goshen New York State
Jurisdiction OR The Receiving State of Virginia, Winchester
Virginia. (The Foreign State of Orange County, Goshen New York
State and Pleads State of New York child Support Enforcement
Unenforceable, Voided, and Legally acknowledged that they lacked
Jurisdiction and Legal Authority, Voided, Unenforceable "All is, was
will Always be a Complete Nullity" "With NO legal effects",
Not even Subsequently, in the Foreign Receiving State
of Virginia, Winchester Virginia or anywhere ever -
Nullity, all "legally Unenforceable with NO legal effect
& NO Virginia Child Support matters EVER existed, NO NOTHING
IN ANY Capacity EVER existed OR was justified Prior Enforcement
OR Subsequently Through Registration & Enforcement of Police, or otherwise.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The 5th Amendment Due Process Clause Requires Equal Protection under the Law, and Requires The United States Government to practice Equal Protections, and Prevents the Government From Discriminating in any unreasonable, unjustified manner.

The Due Process Clause of The 14th Amendment and the 5th Amendment of the Due Process Clause Prohibits the Government from Discrimination, and when that Discrimination is so unjustified, It wholly Violates Due Process of Law.

Due Process Clause of The United States Constitution, No State, shall make or enforce any Law, which shall abridge the Privileges or Immunities of citizens of these United States of America.

Equal Protection Clause, a Clause from the text of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, The Clause took effect in 1868 provides "Nor shall any State [...] deny to any person within its Jurisdiction the Equal Protections of the Law.

The 6th Amendment of the United States Constitution Guarantees a defendant in any type of Court Proceeding The "Right to" Adequate Representation, this is true whether the Defendant is Indigent and has a Court appointed Attorney or a Defendant that hired their own.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Substantive Due Process, Substantive Due Process has been interpreted to include the right to work in an ordinary kind of job, disabled, not to work at all, to marry and to raise and support one's children as a parent, without unconstitutional, unlawful, legally unenforceable, with no legal effect government, administrative intrusion, violating separation of powers, due process, equal protection, double jeopardy, consumer protection.

42 U.S.C. 658 TITLE IV-D, Section 458, Social Security Act Incentive Payments to States, and the application of those statutory provisions, whether the U.S. Supreme Court finds constitutional or not, if those statutory provisions are found to be constitutional, and those federal interstate statutory rules laws codes statutes, are "NOT" applied in conformity with the federal interstate laws that affect all 50 states THEN Fair Due Process of Law "cannot" exist and due process has been violated all citizens of these United States of America have the constitutional right to the procedural due process to be applied in conformity with the law, "NOT" "NOT" IN CONFORMITY WITH FEDERAL INTERSTATE TITLE IV-D STATUTORY FEDERAL LAW, AS LONG AS THOSE STATUTORY PROVISIONS ARE THEMSELVES NOT VIOLATING THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS, when not applied in conformity with the law, Supremacy Clause, Equal Protection Clause, Consumer Protection Clause, Double Jeopardy Clause, Due Process Clause, are all violated.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- Interstate Commerce Act - of 1887 (24 STAT 379) (49 U.S.C.A. § 1et. Seg. 1) Federal Regulations of Unfair Business, originally Designed To Prevent Unfair Business.
- Consumer Protection Act Clause - 1673 (B) which includes provisions & protections Regarding Child Support.
- Pursuant Res Judicata - Winslow v The Commonwealth - 62 VA App 539, 544, 749 SE 2d 563, 566 (2013) Once a Court of Competent Jurisdiction declares a prior order to be void, vacated, that Declaration Becomes Final and Subject to No Further Adjudications it itself to the protection of Res Judicata
- The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, is the Supreme Law, and protects from Egregious, Erroneous, miscarriages of Justice
- Blackletter Law - Lack of Jurisdiction - However Late the Objection has Been made in any Cause, in an inferior Court, or Appellate, Court of the United States of America, It must Be considered & Decided; Before any Lower Court Can move one Further step in the Cause; as any movement is necessary "The Legal Exercise of Jurisdiction"
- Procedural Due Process of Law is an Essential Fundamental Liberty Interest Constitutionally protected. "Fundamental Fairness"
- Ex parte, Seidel 395 W. 2d. 221, 225 (Tex Crim App 2001) ex parte Spaulding 6875 W. 2d at 745 (Teague J. Concurring) It is entitled to NO Respect "whatsoever" Because it Does NOT Affect, impair, create legal Rights.

- Equal Protection Clause - (1868) 14th Amendment "NOR SHALL ANY STATE [...] deny TO ANY person within its Jurisdiction the Equal Protections of the Law."

The Equal Protection Clause, But NOT LIMITED TO, is wholly violated in all 50 States in this Country, everytime, An Child Support Administrative Child Support Agency, on a perponderence of Evidence, violating the separation of powers, violating Judicial Due Process of Law, all But NOT LIMITED TO ALL Federal, State, Interstate & Constitutional Law Being violated when an Administrative Clerk from a Child Support Enforcement Agency, TAKES ANY Order of child support from a foreign issuing STATES Jurisdiction, SOLELY BASED on an application and The Custodial parent Statement ONLY. An Application for services, Using, A Non controlling child support Order in this case, But EVEN in cases involving controlling ones, and where the Non-Custodial parent starts to be charged child support in a foreign State Jurisdiction, without ever stepping in to a Courtroom, the irreputable HARM Begins on that DAY. THERE ARE NO SAFEGUARDS, protecting a Non-Custodial PARENT from that Erroneous UnConstitutional Actions taken By THE Child Support Administrative Agency, WITH NO Due Process AT ALL. AND THE CUSTODIAL PARENTS FALSE FICTITIOUS Application.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Debt collection 2017 marked the 40th Anniversary of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, THE FTC'S commitment to ensuring that Agencies or otherwise comply with the law when collecting debts, they are owed, and are fighting back against those that violate the FDCA and the FTC Act by collecting debts THAT AREN'T OWED, AS IS IN THIS CASE, AND MATTER, AS CHILD SUPPORT IS LABELED A MONEY JUDGEMENT, and in this case NO MONEY OF CHILD SUPPORT EVER WAS LEGALLY OWED, and the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Agency violated the Separation of Powers Doctrine starting in May 2016, where they began enforcing and collecting money using a non-controlling legally unenforceable child support order from Orange County New York States Foreign State Jurisdiction, and then registering the non-controlling child support order from Orange County New York State September 2016, and then continued enforcing it, and created a false and fictitious narrative that legally did NOT exist ever, creating an adjudication of alleged arrears from New York State, and a civil contempt of arrears from New York State, setting a purge amount, and threatened jail, based on a complete fictitious, false narrative, AS New York State vacated the entire matter deeming it legally unenforceable, and closed their case, and they continue this entire false, fictitious narrative to this day, and blatantly refuse to close this matter and vacate, even though it legally HAS NO NO legal effect. They being Winchester Virginia Courts and the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Administrative Agency.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respectfully, Jeanette Ross (aka Woolley-Ross) Comes Now with a Petition For Writ of Prohibition Writ of Mandamus, whichever the Court of The UNITED States Supreme Court Deems Just and Proper.

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV
All Persons Born or Naturalized in the United States, and Subject to the Jurisdiction thereof are Citizens of these United States and of the State wherein they Reside. No State shall make or Enforce any law, which shall abridge the Privileges or the Immunities of Citizens of The United States; Nor shall any State Deprive any person of life, liberty or Property.

The United States Supreme Court Hears Cases which, Involving 2 or more States, IN which this Case and matter Does.

Established Pursuant to article III, Section 1 of The United States U.S. SUPREME COURT Holding Original Jurisdiction.

The U.S. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON March 30th 2020, Docketed my Petition For Writ of Certiorari, Docketed Case No: 19-8138

The Case Brought to the U.S. Supreme Court of The United States, one which operated under The TITLE IV-D, Section 458, Social Security Act which Incentive payments to the States 42 USC § 658, 45 CFR Registration of Foreign State Child Support orders, Through The TITLE IV-D Social Security Act, and the entire Child Support Enforcement, under The Federal Interstate Child Support Enforcement Program, Social Security Act.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On March 30th 2020, The U.S. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT Docketed my petition For writ OF Certiorari case No: 19-8138

The U.S. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDS JURISDICTION OVER THIS CASE and matter Currently.

In and around the month of April 2020, During the Covid-19 shelter in place, In which I Domocile in Brooklyn, New York, and was the epicenter of the pandemic, During the time. I Received a letter from Stephen Solomon Dated February 25th 2020, Stating that He HAS Full Knowledge that I am, an SSI, Social Security (Physical) Disability Recipient, Out of Brooklyn New York, and He Forwarded the Same Document, to the Winchester Virginia Court, To a Court clerk named [Emily Heishman ^{Court} clerk]

Stephen Solomon, Assistant Attorney General, For Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, 629 Cedar Creek Grade, Winchester Virginia 22601 Stated to, and Directed Emily Heishman, Court clerk of the Winchester Virginia Court THAT Quote "That I am an SSI Recipient, and For that Reason the case is Unworkable" is the word Stephen Solomon used, and that He issued a Capis on May 24th 2018, For me (which I was never aware of) and that He Directed the Winchester Virginia Court TO Dismiss The Capis and Underlying Show Cause petition, and Remove it From the Court OF Winchester Virginia Docket.

Note: There HAS Still Been NO Acknowledgement From Winchester Virginia Court OR Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, THAT THIS ENTIRE matter HAS, HAD, will Never Have ANY legal effect, is A Nullity

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Shortly after Recieving the Letter Dated February 28th 2020 From Stephen Solomon AAG From Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement as Described Herein, I then Recieve a Document From the Same [Emily Heisman ^{Court Clerk} Winchester Virginia Administrative Court Clerk, That She HAS Docketed the case for May 19th 2020, Using a motion, I - Jeannette Ross (AKA Woolsey - Ross) Made on April 27th 2018, 2 years prior, TO vacate the matter, That During the appeal Process, The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, Continued to Harass me, Continuing to Bring me to Court on The same matter that was on Appeal

Because I cannot afford an attorney and Had already suffered from Inadequate Counsel that was assigned to me, previously in the Winchester Virginia Court, As per Child Support Enforcement, of the UnConstitutional, Unlawful Enforcement of a Foreign State of New York Non-controlling child support order, Dated November 26th 2008 (14 years) ago. Signed 14 years ago, in The Foreign State Jurisdiction on December 26th 2008 (Two thousand - eight) By The Orange County Goshen New York State Child Support Magistrate) Signed 14 years ago NOT IN 2016 when James Eric Woolsey, fraudulently Used a legally Unenforceable, with No legal effect Foreign State of New York OLD child support order TO Apply in Winchester Virginia, for Application for Child Support Enforcement Services, Using a Legal Instrument from a Foreign States Jurisdiction that HAD NO legal effect, In the Foreign State of New York OR Any State, and will Never have any legal effects. Legally Unenforceable

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

As the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, Acting outside of their Legal Capacity and in Violation of the Separation of Powers Doctrine, Unconstitutionally Started Charging \$113.00 a week in their Winchester Virginia, State of Virginia Jurisdiction, Using only the Orange County Goshen New York Foreign State Jurisdiction, Legally Unenforceable Child Support Order Described Herein.

Between May 2016 and September 2016, I was being charged \$113.00 a week, without any Due Process of Law, in Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement was enforcing a Legally Unenforceable, Foreign State of New York November 26th 2008 (December 26th 2008 signed 14 years prior in the Foreign State of New York State Jurisdiction with NO legal effect, Legally Unenforceable in 2016, when James Eric Woolsey Unlawfully used it to apply for Child Support Enforcement Services in Winchester Virginia Administrative Child Support Enforcement Services.

For Clarity and Brevity - There was NO Standing Controlling Child Support Order in the State of Virginia when James Eric Woolsey went to, Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, Applying for Child Support Enforcement Services, This entire case from inception on May 2016 5 years ago is all based on a Legally Unenforceable, Legal Instrument, with NO legal effect from inception in the Foreign Issuing State Jurisdiction, and was, is, and will never be Legally enforceable in the State of Virginia or anywhere ever, and HAD NO legal effect in 2016 (Two-Thousand-Sixteen)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On September 20th 2016, Winchester Virginia Registered and Enforced, the Now-Controlling Legally-Unenforceable Child Support Order, as Described Herein From Orange County, Goshen New York (November 26th 2008) (December 26th 2008), and Filed a civil Contempt against me using the Legally Unenforceable Document, of child Support order from the Foreign State of New York as Described Herein. civil Contempt. I pled NOT GUILTY wholly

The Winchester Virginia Court, Acted Unlawfully Unconstitutionally the Registration and Enforcement of Orange County Goshen New York States, Legally Unenforceable Foreign / Interstate, Foreign State of New York States Jurisdiction. Where the Federal Interstate TITLE IV-D 45CFR, all Laws associated only Allow, a Legally Valid Controlling child Support Order From a Foreign States Jurisdiction, To Be Enforced. Not one that HAD any Legal Effect, and was and Continues to Be a Complete Nullity.

So Egregious, Is that the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement HAD Full Knowledge that the Foreign State of New York Child Support Order was Legally Unenforceable, and that New York State, Child Support Enforcement, after months of Administrative Review of the matter in thier Foreign Issuing State Jurisdiction, Legally Vacated the entire matter, and Did NOT EVER certify any arrearages or weekly Amount, AS The Orange County Family Court in 2016, Legally Acknowledged they Lacked Jurisdiction, when Jurisdiction was challenged. Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, with the Winchester Virginia Courts, Acted outside of thier Legal Capacity and Unconstitutionally, and Did so knowingly and willfully.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The false and fictitious narrative was solely created by the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, Winchester Virginia Court, and the assigned Counsel, That Winchester Virginia Court assigned, As they used the Orange County, Goshen New York State, Legally Unenforceable Child Support Order (November 26th 2008, December 26th 2008, as described herein, TO Bring forth a civil contempt proceeding in the Foreign State Jurisdiction of the Winchester Virginia, civil divisions Juvenile Domestic Relations Court, Alleging I owed \$0,000 approx (Because their numbers continuously changed) Adjudicating Annals in their Virginia Court Jurisdiction, Using the Legally Unenforceable Orange County New York State (November 26th 2008 December 26th 2008) Child Support Order from The Foreign Issuing State of New York, AFTER New York State NOTIFIED, Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement, That ALL is Legally Unenforceable, and the entire child support matter is vacated void, no legal effect, and The discontinuance of child support Account in August 2016 from New York State \$0.00 weekly, \$0.00 arrears, and refunded \$20.00 Dollars TO Terette Ross (Woolsey - Ross AKA) on September 14th 2016, For \$20.00 overpayment to the Orange County, Goshen New York State Child Support Enforcement Unit.

That check Dated September 14th 2016, 6 Days Before, Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Registered a new-controlling child support Order from ORANGE County Goshen New York.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I was threatened with Jail, if I did NOT pay a \$5000.00 purge Amount to Winchester Virginia Court, Based on a False, Fictitious, Very Egregious ACT OF FRAUD upon myself, my children, and The United States Government all Based on a child Support matter from the Foreign Issuing State of New York Orange County, That was legally VAcated, Void, Nullity, and legally case of child Support matter Closed IN August 2016, NOT Forwarded For Enforcement, BUT Closed Account 0.00 Balance owed TO New York State.

IRreputable Harm to my life is an understatement That IRreputable Harm continues to this Day, and Could last a life time, life, liberty, pursuit of Happiness Finance BUT NOT LIMITED TO. Here we are 5 years later, and The Winchester Virginia Court, while this entire matter continues TO Be on appeal in the U.S. Supreme Court Docket Under writ of Certiorari case NO: 19-8138, your Court The Winchester Virginia Administrative Court Clerk [Emily Heisman ^{Court} Clerk] Dockets a motion from 2 years ago that Required a 30 day written Response TO VAcate, as the matter was on appeal in 2018 and NOT in the Jurisdiction of Winchester Virginia.

NOT only Did [Emily Heisman ^{Court} Clerk] Winchester Virginia Court Clerk Docket a motion to VAcate from 2 years ago, for May 19th 2020 (Twenty-²⁰Twenty) She Dockets It as a motion TO modify child Support, A completely FALSE, Fictitious NARRATIVE.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON MAY 18th I FAXED AN AFFIDAVIT MOTION TO VACATE QUASH, CLOSE CASE AND REMINDED THE WINCHESTER VIRGINIA COURT THAT THIS MATTER CONTINUES TO BE ON APPEAL AND THEY WERE SERVED THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI

I DID NOT MAKE A MOTION TO "MODIFY" CHILD SUPPORT, AS LAWFULLY YOU CANNOT MODIFY A MATTER THAT DOES NOT LEGALLY EXIST, AND WAS NOT OBTAINED IN CONFORMITY WITH FEDERAL INTERSTATE TITLE IV-D CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND THAT I DID NOT MOTION.

EVEN MORE TRAVEILING, EGRIGIOUS, AND A WILLFUL DISREGARD, FOR THE LAW OF JURISDICTION, I OBJECTED TO ANY FURTHER PROCEEDINGS, LET THEM KNOW THAT NO CHILD IS A DEPENDENT CHILD, AND NO DEPENDENT CHILD IS DOMICILED WITH JAMES ERIC WOOLSEY AND HAS NOT DOMICILED WITH HIM FOR ALMOST 2 YEARS NOW, AND THAT I WHOLLY OBJECT AS THE WINCHESTER VIRGINIA CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT UNIT, LACK JURISDICTION, LACK LEGAL AUTHORITY, AND THE WINCHESTER VIRGINIA COURTS, TO CONTINUE PROCEEDINGS, AND HAVE LACKED JURISDICTION AND LEGAL AUTHORITY FROM INCEPTION.

THE FURTHERANCE BEING AN SSI RECIPIENT PHYSICALLY DISABLED UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, THAT IN ITSELF WARRANTS A CASE CLOSEURE SU-SPONTE, BUT THEY CONTINUE A FALSE FICTICIOUS NARRATIVE, IGNORING THE CONSTITUTION, FEDERAL INTERSTATE TITLE IV-D LAW, SSI DISABILITY LAW, ALL BUT NOT LIMITED TO.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Shortly after May 19th 2020, and where the Court of Virginia, I Recently found out was NOT operating with cases, that were NOT of 'Severe Emergency' I Receive this order Dated May 19th 2020.

The order Reads, that I appeared By FAX, I Also mailed overnight a detailed motion TO Quash, Close case, Vacate, and that The Winchester Virginia Court was served through Certify Mail The Writ of Certiorari, and the

The Winchester Court, Judge continues to write that Based upon attacks of the originating order Those issues were Raised previously on matters that were Decided By the Virginia Superior Courts.

The Judge which their is NO NAME of who the Judge was on the May 19th 2020 order, completely ignores the Fact that the matter Does continue to Be on Appeal in the U.S. Supreme Court Docket NO - Docket NO: 19-8138, on Writ of Certiorari.

Then further creates a false, fictitious narrative that Did NOT Happen, I Did NOT motion for A modification, you cannot modify child support THAT DOES NOT Legally exist, and was NOT obtained in Conformity with the Supremacy Clause, The United States Constitution, Federal/Det state Title IV-D Social Security Act of child Support Enforcement, over the Law of Jurisdiction that DOES NOT ALLOW for Discretion.

The Judge continues to say there was NO Argument. The Detailed Argument sent certify MAIL was to Vacate, Quash, Close case, and that they lack Jurisdiction & Legal Authority and used a 2 year old motion to Vacate, to create False Proceeding & Narrative.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This Case and matter is currently under the Jurisdiction of The U.S. United States Supreme Court, and as I have Described, The UnConstitutional, Lawless and Blatant Disregard For the Facts Supported By Material Evidence I have submitted, and the Courts of Winchester Virginia, & The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Agency acting Outside of thier Lawful & Constitutional Authority, Federal Interstate TITLE IV-D Child Support Enforcement of the Social Security Act, But NOT LIMITED TO, NOT BEEN OR BEING APPLIED IN CONFORMITY WITH Constitutional, Federal, Interstate Law. The FACT THAT THIS case and matter, HAS NO legal Effect IS a Complete Nullity. HAS BEEN legally UNenforceable From Onset, The FACT THAT I am a Physically Disabled Person on SSI Social Security, and that in itself under Federal Law of 45 CFR 303.11 b(5) Constitutes De-Sponte Case closure, when a Non Custodial parent is Receiving SSI Social Security Income Benefits Under TITLE XVI of the Federal Social Security Act, which Governs and is unable to pay, on top of this case Being a Complete Nullity legally Unenforceable, The Judges of Winchester Virginia and The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Blatantly Refuse TO Vacate and close This matter, IS Wholly UNConstitutional But NOT LIMITED TO.

It is Egregious and a Clear Violation of Civil Rights, Harassment, Lawless, and outside of thier Legal, Constitutional Authority, All But NOT LIMITED TO, ONE OF THE Judge Alexander R. IDEN, FORMER Winchester Virginia Commonwealth ATTORNEY, IS AN Appellate, District Court Judge, NOT A Juvenile, Domestic, Civil Prob Judge.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

IN Re - Kayachith, 683 N.W. 2d 325, 326, (Minn App. 2004)
 Questions of Law are Subject to De Novo Review" State v Finch
 865 N.W. 2d 696, 700 (Minn 2015)

Here the Lower Inferior, Court of Winchester Virginia
 and the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Unit
 Docketed proceedings, using a 2 year old Motion to vacate, from
 April 2018, and falsely perpetrated it as a New petition to Modify,
 The petition from 2 years ago, was to Receive a 30 day written
 Response, that never happened, and was completely ignored by
 the Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Unit, and
 The Winchester Virginia Lower Courts, as (the matter was on
 appeal) and they kept trying to enforce what was on appeal
 in 2018, The same thing is happening now, and their orders
 documents and such cannot be taken on face, as they are
 perpetrated with wholly false fictitious narrative, and
 all while this matter is on appeal in your Court of the U.S.
 Supreme Court, in while all parties, respondents continue to ignore

The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement
 Administrative Agency, is not only violating Separation of Powers
 Doctrine, continuing this false narrative, cooperating, aiding the
 Winchester Virginia Court, with their continued Docketing
 of child support, Federal Interstate TITLE-IV-D civil matter
 as described herein and writ of Certiorari, they are operating
 unconstitutionally and unauthorized by Federal, Interstate
 Laws, all laws associated with this matter, violating the
 Supremacy Clause, BUT NOT LIMITED TO.

45 CFR 303.11(b) - TITLE-IV-D case #0004559693 (must as a matter
 of Law, be closed Se-spate, which includes but not limited to, all of
 which is stated in the writ of Certiorari, which includes but not limited
 to all of the subsequent child support, + alleged arrears from N.Y.
 State, that are, were will always be legally unenforceable with
 no legal effect. THE ENTIRE MATTER of child support in Winchester
 Virginia is solely based on TITLE-IV-D case #0004559693 Federal
 Interstate Registration + Enforcement of Non-controlling order
 with no legal effects. ALL IN VIRGINIA IS Subsequent of.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

That All men are defined "Created Equal" with Equal Protections under the Law, yet There are still many Areas of Constitutionality of TITLE IV-D, and the Implication of those Federal, Interstate Rules, Laws, Codes, Statutes, That Violate the Constitutional Rights of "NON-CUSTODIAL PARENTS" That Have Not Been Addressed By The U.S. SUPREME COURT.

That Those rules, laws, codes, statutes Enacted By Congress under Federal, State Interstate TITLE IV-D 45 CFR, Child Support Enforcement of a foreign States, child Support Orders, must Be Legally a "Controlling Child Support orders that are legally Certified By the Issuing, STATE, and County that Had the "Current" Legal Enforceable, Jurisdiction TO enter that certification of any alleged address, and weekly amount, NOT VIRGINIA.

New York State "Did Not" Forward FOR ENFORCEMENT of child Support, They "VACATED" the entire matter, and Closed Their case, NO CEST existed Between New York State Child Support Enforcement and Virginia Child Support Enforcement.

VIRGINIA CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT HAD Full Knowledge of this, WITHHELD THE exculpatory Material Evidence, and FAILED TO CLOSE THE TITLE IV-D Social Security Act under 45 CFR Incentive payments to the STATES. This is an Egregious, lawless, UnConstitutional ACT AGAINST Tearette Woolsey (AKA) ROSS, BUT NOT LIMITED TO

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

In The Interest of Justice, and the protections Guaranteed by the United States Constitution, that No Person shall Be Deprived, Life, liberty, pursuit of Happiness.

That No Person shall Be Denied, The Due Process Right to "Fair Due Process" of Law.

That Fair Due Process of Law, HAS NOT existed Legally in this case and matter in the Foreign State Federal Interstate matter in Virginia. As a Pro-Se litigant I cannot even obtain Adequate Counsel in Winchester Virginia, and Did Not, It is Impossible for a Pro-Se Indigent litigant, Trying to obtain Fair Due Process of Law in the Lower Courts of the State of Virginia.

Fair Due Process of Law cannot legally exist, when a Government Agency such as child Support Enforcement, withheld exculpatory material evidence, in civil child support Federal Interstate TITLE IV-D MATTER, where they registered and enforced and continue to a legally enforceable child support matter from Orange County Goshen New York, that is a, was a, will always be a complete nullity created, void, voided, case closed 0.00 balance owed. A non-controlling child support matter closed, vacated, void, voided August 2016, Winchester Virginia child support Enforcement was notified, NOT TO ENFORCE anything from New York State Orange County New York, yet they The Winchester Virginia Courts and the Winchester Virginia child support Enforcement continue this False, Fictitious, Unlawful, Unconstitutional Narrative.

Fair Due Process of Law cannot exist when a Pro-Se (Non-custodial) parent is being erroneously egregiously subjected to an Enforcement of child support order and appears that legally did NOT exist in the Issuing Foreign State Jurisdiction, Being then Registered and enforced in a Foreign State Jurisdiction.

Interstate Commerce Act of (1887) (24 STAT 379) 49 U.S.C.A § 1et. Sec. 1 Federal Regulation of Unfair Business, originally Designed to Prevent Unfair Business

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner Recognizes Respectfully that the Writ of Prohibition is an extraordinary Remedy used Reserved For Extraordinary Circumstances.

Those circumstances exist Here, where the Lower Court of Winchester Virginia, Has Disregarded Federal/Interstate Rules Laws codes Statutes that Govern Title IV-D Child Support Enforcement, the Registration and Enforcement of a Foreign State Jurisdiction child Support order, and the fact that it can only Be a Controlling Child Support order at the time of Enforcement, Registration or otherwise, and How arrears from a Foreign States Jurisdiction are Governed, Registered, Enforced or otherwise, from a Foreign State Issuing States, Jurisdiction?

In this case and matter, There was NO Controlling Child Support order, and NO Arrears from the Foreign State of Orange County, Goshen New York State, OR Any State, NOT even the State of Virginia, when Enforcement Began in May 2016, Solely Based on an application submitted By James Eric Woolsey using a Non-controlling Orange County Goshen New York State child Support order that was Dated November 26th 2008 (14 years ago) Signed December 26, 2008 (signed 14 years ago) NOT in 2016, and Had NO legal effect in the issuing State Foreign State of New York Jurisdiction, and where NO child Support order OR Arrears Legally existed or were Forwarded For Enforcement TO THE STATE OF VIRGINIA, But was Legally VOID, VOIDED, VACATED, Deemed Legally Unenforceable Legally unenforceable, Be the Issuing New York State

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This Court of THE U.S. Supreme Court who Holds Currently Complete Jurisdiction over this case and matter under writ of Certiorari docketed on March 30th 2020 case # 19-8138.

This Court issues writs of prohibition, writ of mandamus "IF the Lower Inferior Courts exceeded it's Lawful Authority or so Abused its Discretion in this case, and matter, the use of Discretion is NOT Allowed Legally, when Addressing the Legality of Lack of Jurisdiction, But NOT Limited to, AS Described in the writ of Certiorari case # 19-8138, and Herein this writ of Prohibition, writ of Mandamus.

The Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Agency, & The Winchester Virginia Court system, Both the Lower Courts (civil part) Juvenile Domestic Relations Court & The Appellate Division Winchester Virginia 5 North Kent Street, Winchester Virginia 22607 Exceeded its Lawful Authority, abused its power, and Abused its Discretion where Discretion, IS NOT Legally Allowed, From Inception May 20th 2016, and Continues this Egregious Behavior, So UnConstitutional, so Unlawful, the Irreputal Harm Began May 2016, and Continues to this Day, In Direct Violation of The Rights afforded to all American Citizens of these United States of Equal Protection Clause, Due Process Clause, FAIR Due Process of Law HAS NOT existed From Inception, and Continues NOT TO exist, Consumer Protection Act, TITLE-IV-D, and BUT NOT LIMITED TO.

I Jeanette Ross (AKA Woolsey-Ross) continue to suffer injury for which NO ordinary Remedy is Adequate, and where an appeal, Does NOT provide an Adequate Remedy, AS The parties in The writ of Certiorari case # 19-8138, Have NOT EVEN Acknowledged its existence, and Continue Lawlessly to Continue Charging me Child Support, that Never Legally existed and CANNOT Legally exist now June 2020, For Reasons Described in writ of Certiorari NO-19-8138, and New Reasons Described in this writ of Prohibition, writ of Mandamus

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

United Interstate Family Support Act, First Developed in 1992 the NCJUSL Revised the act in 1996 and again in 2001, with additional Amendments in 2008 (UIFSA)

Family Support Act INTERSTATE section 321 mandate for Nationwide implementation of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) the section 322 Revisions to the Full, Faith and Credit For Child Support Orders Act. Under Subsection (c) of the Federal Law, The, Full, Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution and explicit Federal Law (28 U.S.C 1738)

The Full Faith and Credit For Child Support Orders Act (28 U.S.C 1738) only applies to valid Child Support orders, obtained in conformity with the Federal Law, and must have met the TITLE-IV-D 45 CFR Social Security Act, which includes BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE 3 Prong test of the Jurisdiction of the Issuing State, when the Child Support order was ordered, THAT "only" a legally enforceable "Controlling child Support Order at the time of Registration in the Foreign Receiving State can Be Registered and Enforced, and the Receiving Foreign State "cannot" just assume Jurisdiction, and Enforce a Child Support order that HAS NO legal Effect, and is a Complete Nullity from /in the Issuing State. IT IS "NOT" ENTITLED TO Full Faith and Credit OR Enforcement in any Capacity IN A FOREIGN STATES JURISDICTION + Issuing State Jurisdiction

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This matter continues to currently be on appeal in your UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT docketed on March 30th 2020, Case #19-8138. —, your Court of these UNITED STATES of America currently holding Jurisdiction, Respectfully there are Exceptional — Circumstances, so Egregious, Erroneous, and wholly UnConstitutional to justify its issuance, *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 380: see also SUP. CT. R. 201.

Williamson-v-Berry 8 How, 945, 540, 12 L. Ed. 1170 1189 (1850) "Courts are constituted by Authority and they CANNOT GO BEYOND THAT AUTHORITY and they "CANNOT" Go BEYOND THAT AUTHORITY and they, and certainly in — "CONTRAVENTION" of it, their Judgements and "ORDERS" OR Regarded "AS Nullities"; They are NOT VOIDABLE BUT SIMPLY VOID — EVEN BEFORE REVERSAL

(U.S. SUPREME COURT) — UNDER FEDERAL LAW, U.S. SUPREME COURT STATED, THAT IF A COURT, IS WITHOUT AUTHORITY "ITS Judgements and ORDERS are Regarded as NULLITIES" They are NOT VOIDABLE BUT SIMPLY VOID, and FOR NO NO NO BAR, TO A RECOVERY SOUGHT, EVEN PRIOR, TO REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION TO THEM.

(*Joyce v U.S.* 474 20 215) THERE IS NO DISCRESSION TO IGNORE LACK OF JURISDICTION.

(*Stuck v Medical Examiners*) 94 Ca 2d 751, 211 P2d 389 "Once Challenged, Jurisdiction CANNOT BE ASSUMED" IT MUST BE PROVEN TO LEGALLY EXIST.

(*Basso v UTAH Power & Light Company*, 495, F2d 906, 910, "Jurisdiction CAN BE CHALLENGED AT ANY TIME."

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- Hopper 899F Sup at 393; The Hopper Court held that the collection of itself is interstate Commerce because it involves a continuous and individual stream of intercourse among the states, involving the transmission of large sums of money, communications, by mail, telegraph and in this day and age (Email, Fax, Text etc)

The Hopper Court Concurred that a Collection of Intangible debt (In this case NO Debt was owed at all, in any capacity, to New York State, Foreign State Jurisdiction used, NULL/VOID, VACATED "Legally VACATED, Legally VOID & Deemed So" Judicially, By The Foreign Issuing State of New York "Legally Unenforceable" and was NOT Forwarded to Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement to be Enforced in the year 2016 (Two-thousand-sixteen) and Continuation of the False & Fictitious, UNLAWFUL, UNCONSTITUTIONAL Continues to present Day JUNE 2020 (5 years now) see (Docketed Case # 19-) writ of Certiorari Related Case, currently Docketed in your U.S. Supreme Court. Respectfully,

Unlawful, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, proceedings orders, Adjudications Judgements or otherwise By a Receiving State, This Case Winchester Virginia Courts and Winchester Virginia Child Support Enforcement Outside of their lawful & legal, Constitutional Capacity, is NOT only a violation of Herein, NOT only violation of Separation of Powers Doctrine, NOT only did they lack & continue to lack Jurisdiction, this Entire matter Had from Inception NO legal Effects.

- Fair Due Process of law cannot legally exist and Equal Protections for NON-CUSTODIAL Parents "cannot legally exist" with all Herein, that is UNLAWFUL, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and Irreparable harm that has taken place, continues to take place, and can — possibly last generations, it is ERRONEOUS, EGRIGIOUS, and BUT NOT — limited to. All BUT NOT LIMITED too, and when there are NO NO safeguards, to protect a non-custodial parent from ERRONEOUS EGRIGIOUS miscarriages of Justice, so much that it impedes, implodes their/mine liberty interests, protected under the United States Constitution.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

"The SUPREME COURT, The U.S. SUPREME COURT, and all Courts established by Act of Congress may ISSUE all WRITS necessary OR Appropriate in aid of their Respective Jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of Law"

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) Issuance of an Extraordinary writ such as writ of mandamus or prohibition.

"The petition must show that the writ will be in aid of the Courts appellate Jurisdiction, In which this U.S. Supreme Court already Holds Jurisdiction, Through the Docketed, and Current Writ of Certiorari Dated / Docket Case NO: 19-8138)

That exceptional Circumstances warrant the exercise of the Courts discretionary powers and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form from any other Court" SUP CT. R. 20.1

The Exceptional Circumstances in this case do warrant the discretionary powers of the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, As the Lower Court, and Administrative Child Support Enforcement Agency of the State of Virginia, Winchester Virginia exhibit and continue to exhibit, abuse of discretion, where the Law does NOT allow for discretion, when Addressing Jurisdiction, and there lack of Jurisdiction, and lack of any legal Authority to enforce, Adjudicate, create orders, Judgments or otherwise, acting outside of their legal Capacity, and the continuation of a false narrative, that did NOT, does NOT, and cannot ever legally exist, all BUT NOT LIMITED TO

The Administrative Agency, Winchester Virginia all of the above, and violating Separation of Powers Doctrine. Child Support Enforcement.

Prayer Relief - Respectfully that The United States ³⁶
Supreme Court, Respectfully Grant my Petition For
Writ of Prohibition, In the Interest of Justice
The United States Constitution, and those Rights of
The United States Constitution and Federal, Interstate
Law, which Guarantees those Protections afforded to
Citizens, of These United States of America, and where
these issues of Violation of Federal, Interstate and
Constitutional Law, were and Continue to Be wholly
Violated, and However the U.S. SUPREME COURT
Deems Just and Proper.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a Writ of Prohibition should
Be Granted, Respectfully,

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Ross (AKA Woolsey)

Date: June 8th 2020

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