

20-6358  
No. USCA9 # 19-1624

ORIGINAL  
PETITION

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
WA, DC.

DONNA DAWSON — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

FILED  
JUL 18 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

MARY ANN VALDEZ, et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

US COURT OF APPEALS NINTH CIRCUIT COURT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DONNA DAWSON  
(Your Name)

4437 E. CATALINA Ave  
(Address)

MESA, AZ 85206  
(City, State, Zip Code)

480-621-1490  
(Phone Number)

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. CAN MARY ANN VALDEZ, WHO HAS AT LEAST 30 YEARS EXPERIENCE IN ESCROW/TITLE INSURANCE, WAS EMPLOYED BY SECURITY TITLE/FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE VIOLATE HR POLICIES INCORPORATED IN THE HR MANUAL AND VIOLATE THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT?
2. CAN EEOC PHOENIX LOCATION IGNORE A CLAIM AND NEVER CONTACT THE EMPLOYER?
3. CAN EEOC PHOENIX REOPEN CLAIM SINCE IT WAS NEVER PROCESSED?
4. CAN ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS IGNORE AND NOT ANSWER MOTIONS FILED?
5. CAN ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS CHECK THE PLAINTIFF'S HR RECORDS WITHOUT PROPER AUTHORIZATION FROM PLAINTIFF?
6. CAN A SEPARATE CASE BE CREATED AGAINST ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON FOR SUPPORTING THE DEFENDANT'S VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT AND VIOLATION OF HR POLICY AND PROCEDURES?
7. CAN THERE BE A VIOLATION SET FORTH AGAINST ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON FOR INTERFERING WITH THE COURT CASES WITHOUT CAUSE?
8. CAN AN ADDITIONAL CASE BE CREATED FOR DISCRIMINATION CAUSED BY MARY ANN VALDEZ AT THE SAME

TIME SHE VIOLATED THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT?

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

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

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:

MARY ANN Valdez

SECURITY TITLE

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE

JAMES THOMPSON, ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS

## **RELATED CASES**

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**

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[] reported at UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS; 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 \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[] reported at US DISTRICT COURT OF AZ; 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 US DISTRICT COURT OF AZ; or,  
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 3/9/20.

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: 3/9/20, 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).

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 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. § 1257(a).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- VIOLATION OF American DISABILITY  
ACT
- DISCRIMINATION
- VIOLATION OF PRIVACY

## **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

**MARY ANN VALDEZ, EMPLOYED AT THE TIME BY SECURITY TITLE/FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE, WITH MORE THAN 30 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE USED HER POSITION AND CAUSED A VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT**

**MARY ANN VALDEZ CAUSED DISCRIMINATION**

**MARY ANN VALDEZ VIOLATED THE HR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE**

**ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON UPHELD THESE VIOLATIONS AND VIOLATED PRIVACY ACT TOWARD PLAINTIFF**

**REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

**THE EEOC PHOENIX FAILED TO PROCESS THE EEOC CLAIM  
AGAINST DEFENDANTS**

**INAPPROPRIATE ACTIONS AND MOTIONS CAUSED BY ATTORNEY  
JAMEY THOMPSON**

**VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT CAUSED BY  
MARY ANN VALDEZ, ET AL**

**VIOLATION OF DISCRIMINATION CAUSED BY MARY ANN  
VALDEZ, ET AL**

**VIOLATION CAUSED BY ATTORNEY JAMEY THOMPSON WHEN  
ATTORNEY CHECKED HR RECORDS OF PLAINTIFF WITHOUT  
AUTHORIZATION**

**AS A RESULT OF ALL OF THESE VIOLATIONS PLAINTIFF SUFFERS  
DEPRESSION, FINANCIAL HARDSHIPS AND ONGOING MEDICAL  
ISSUES**

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dawson

Date: 9/18/20