

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Quondalis V. Sanders — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

Brian Foster — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Quondalis V. Sanders, do swear or declare that on this date, June 21, 2020, 2020, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Wisconsin Department of Justice; Criminal Appeals Division
P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857

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

Executed on June 20, 2020, 20____

Quondalis V. Sanders
(Signature)

August 29, 2020

Clerk, U.S. Supreme Court
1 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: Sanders v. Foster

APP. No. 19-1581, Case No. 18-CV. 628AJ

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed for Re-filing are the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, therein, from the final judgment and order(s) entered upon Re-hearing on April 8, 2020 and January 28, 2020, in the above noted captioned entitled matter and case for federal habeas corpus relief upon state court criminal case NO. 19-CF-110.

Whereas originally on June 23, 2020, I, the Petitioner filed a Petition and application for stay and certiorari review, therein, from the Seventh Circuit's final judgment and order entered on January 28, 2020 and upon Re-hearing on April 8, 2020, in the above noted captioned case, civil and appeal, seeking the immediate release and judicial determination of the legality of my presently confinement within Wisconsin state custody (see original Petition for Certiorari Review and Application for stay filed therein and certiorari Petition Returned and Attached hereto).

Whereupon on August 21, 2020, the Clerk of U.S. Supreme Court, although it has a ministerial duty to have filed both the certiorari Petition with the Court and justices therein, misused and abused its discretion returning the certiorari Petition back to I, the Petitioner for reasons that cannot be found to have been supported by the Rules of U.S. Supreme Court and thus frivolous and malicious thereunder, in contrary to Johnson v. Avery, 383 U.S. 483, 485 (1966) (Prisoners' right to access of courts may not be denied or obstructed)).

Whereas the Clerk(s), therein, asserted a false claim that the Petitioner failure to comply with Rules 13.1, 29.2, and 30.1, Set Rules, therein (see letter correspondence Entered by Clerk of U.S. Supreme Court dated August 21, 2020).

Knowingly and maliciously, falsely accused and asserted that I, the Petitioner had unduly filed the certiorari Petition, misconstruing the facts

RECEIVED

SEP 10 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

of the case upon the miscalculation of the time limit from the initial final judgment and order of January 28, 2020, rather than the order entered upon Rehearing Petition filed and granted within the appeal on April 8, 2020, in contravention to Rule 13.3, S.Ct. Rules, therein (See Clark's Reason (5) for Return of Certiorari Petition, Reason #1, reciting Rule 13.1, 29.2 and 30.1, S.Ct. Rules.)

Moreover, the Clark also went on and asserted two more reasons falsely, falsely accusing the Petitioner, but as the State of Wisconsin has falsely accused the Petitioner of failure to have provided updated information to the Sex Offender Registry while expanding from Parole and extended supervision, in contravention to § 301.45 (2)(b), Wis. Stat. (Case No. 16-CF-294 & 466), alleging that I, the Petitioner had failed to include an affidavit of proof of services with the certiorari Petition, which the Clark had provided with the certiorari application forms, that I, the Petitioner had filled out and attached and enclosed with upon the filing of the Petition (See Affidavit of Proof of Services submitted and attached, hereto, and hereto, certiorari Petition re-filed, herein)

Also, the Clark asserted and stated that the time limit for filing the certiorari Petition, therein, does start upon the filing of the issuance of mandate on appeal, citing Rule 13.3, S.Ct. Rule (See Clark's order for Reason #3, therein)

However, the Petitioner also made this same argument within the certiorari Petition, where upon the Seventh Circuit, having granted the Petition for Rehearing En banc, but failure to enter a final judgment and order upon the Rehearing Petition (See Question(s) #7, Presented in Petitioner's certiorari Petition filed therein, attached hereto)

Also, the Clark falsified the Postdate(s) upon the last transactions in this matter to make it appear that I, the Petitioner had filed the certiorari Petition within 30 days upon it had returned it back to the Petitioner (See Postmarked date that Clark noted upon alleging receiving and returning the Petition back to me)

Wherefore I re-submit and file the certiorari Petition for review, therein, U.S. Supreme Court of the Seventh Circuit's order entered on April 8, 2020 and upon June, 2020, seeking immediate release on bond upon having contracted the corona virus while in state custody pursuant to Rule 13.3, S.Ct. Rules where the time limit started herein, upon the order granting and denying of a final order thereupon, as argued by the Petitioner.

I
Quondalis V. Sanders