

No. 20-6858

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Benjamin Mario Soto PETITEIONER

Vs.

AFSCME Union Council 5 Local 2181 et al, and  
Minnesota Department of Human Services et al

RESPONDENTS ON PETITION  
FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT

**REQUEST FOR REHEARING FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

**BENJAMIN MARIO SOTO**

**407 GOODRICH AVE.**

**ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA, 55102**

**PHONE: 612-449-4921**

As evidenced by all orders issued by the judicial officers in all Minnesota Courts et al of this case are fraudulently depriving me of my legal and contractual due process rights and equal protection of the laws arbitrarily in violation of both Federal and State Constitutions and the laws pursuant to claiming that the U.S. Constitution including 42USC1983 does not apply/(has no force of law) in any State of the Union acting beyond their judicial capacities fraudulently legislating/extrapolating law deliberately

fraudulently misinterpreting the clear and explicit language of governing CBA contract

nowhere in the governing CBA states I was an "at will" employee but does state I had "just cause" rights,

RECEIVED

APR 12 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

are in clear violation of their oaths or affirmations of office including violating Articles 1 and 6 of the U.S. Constitution as I conveyed many times in all my filings in their courts acting clearly outside their judicial capacities or in complete absence of jurisdiction hence has no 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment Immunity with the State of Minnesota fraudulently claiming immunity from suit and therefore not required to fulfill their contractual obligations in their courts utilizing the reasons/laws/ (case laws) of this case all of this State fraud needs to be corrected by ~~an Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (giving the lower federal courts jurisdiction) and 42 USC 1983 action~~ <sup>the U.S. Supreme Court</sup> which are the Supreme Laws of the Land and anything to the contrary notwithstanding to which all Federal and State Judicial Officers took a Solemn Oath or affirmation to uphold (according to)/(required by) Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution ~~(therefore the "Rooker-Feldman doctrine" does not apply and is contrary to Ex parte Young case law)~~ guaranteeing the Rights of We the People as promised.

Ali v. Cangemi, 419 F.3d 722, 723(8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) does not apply to this case since Ali was released from imprisonment ~~with uncertain possible future outcomes~~ requiring an issuing of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to be absolutely unnecessary but in my case I am still being deprived of my rights without uncertainty by the State of Minnesota Government, which is exactly what occurred in Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 requiring an issuing of an injunction by the Federal Courts giving prudence to my ongoing controversies including Article 3 U.S. Constitutional jurisdiction ~~to the federal courts.~~

The State and Federal Courts are allowing the State of Minnesota Government to make contracts and then grant immunity for breach of contract with my case which will be used as case law precedence in future decisions.

Respectfully Submitted

Name:

*Benjamin M. Soto*  
Benjamin Mario Soto Pro Se

Date:

*04/01/2021*

Phone: 612-~~839-7982~~

*449-4921*

Email: benjamin.soto30@yahoo.com

No. 20-6858

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Benjamin Mario Soto PETITEIONER

Vs.

AFSCME Union Council 5 Local 2181 et al, and  
Minnesota Department of Human Services et al

RESPONDENTS ON PETITION  
FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT

**REQUEST FOR REHEARING FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

BENJAMIN MARIO SOTO

407 GOODRICH AVE.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA, 55102

PHONE: 612-449-4921

This entire case all my filings to the Minnesota District Court from the very beginning to the Minnesota Supreme Court needs a De Novo Review by the U.S. Supreme Court as evidenced by all orders issued by the judicial officers in all Minnesota Courts et al of this case are fraudulently substantially depriving me of my legal and contractual due process rights and equal protection of the laws arbitrarily deciding the substantiating fact in violation/deprivation of my 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment U.S. Constitution request in my initial compliant in violation of both Federal and State Constitutions and the laws pursuant to

claiming that the U.S. Constitution including 42USC1983 does not apply/(has no force of law) in any State of the Union acting substantially beyond their judicial capacities fraudulently legislating/extrapolating law deliberately fraudulently misinterpreting the clear and explicit language of governing CBA contract nowhere in the governing CBA stated I was an "at will" employee (I read the entire contract) but the CBA does state that I had "just cause" rights, are in clear/ substantial violation of their oaths or affirmations of office including violating Articles 1 and 6 of the U.S. Constitution as I conveyed many times in all my filings in their courts acting clearly/ substantially outside their judicial capacities or in complete/ substantial absence of jurisdiction hence has no 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment Immunity with the State of Minnesota fraudulently claiming immunity from suit and therefore not required to fulfill their substantial contractual obligations in their courts utilizing the reasons/laws/ (case laws) of this case all of this State substantial fraud needs to be corrected by the U.S. Supreme Court which the Supreme Laws of the Land and anything to the contrary notwithstanding to which all Federal and State Judicial Officers took a Solemn Oath or affirmation to uphold (according to)/(required by) Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution guaranteeing the Rights of We the People as promised.

Ali v. Cangemi, 419 F.3d 722, 723(8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) does not apply to this case since Ali was released from imprisonment requiring an issuing of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to be

absolutely/ substantially unnecessary but in my case I am still being substantially deprived of all my rights with uncertainty by the State of Minnesota Government.

The State and Federal Courts are allowing the State of Minnesota Government to make contracts and then grant immunity for breach of contract with my case which will be used as case law precedence in future decisions in substantial violation of Article 1<sup>st</sup> of the U.S. Constitution.

Respectfully Submitted in Good Faith and Not for Delay

Name: Benjamin Mario Soto Date: 04/29/2021  
Benjamin Mario Soto Pro Se

Phone: 612-839-7982

Email: benjamin.soto30@yahoo.com