

No. 20-6934

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
\_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

Fred Cartwright — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.  
Silver Cross Hospital and Medical  
Centers and Crothall Healthcare Inc. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

FILED  
NOV 04 2020  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Fred Cartwright

(Your Name)

507 E. Cass Stree

(Address)

Joliet, IL 60432

(City, State, Zip Code)

(815) 582-3116

(Phone Number)

7

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The Petitioner does not know what he are doing, please view the next page labeled "List of Parties" for more details and everything that listed may have been a wast of time. It takes too much time to learn how to do this without medical assistance and legal assistance. The Petitioner are requesting help from an un-bias Counsel whom would actually present all the Petitioners Factual Evidence and numerous Witnesses.

1. Petitioner is completely confused on filling out all the forms in the Petitioner Appeals motion, that's due to he Petitioners difficulties of focusing, concentrate, physical and medical issues, (PTDS) post-traumatic stress disorder and other incapacibilities.

2. On July 17, 2020, the Appellant filed a Motion Petition Request for a EN Banc Rehearing by the Full Committee Panel Member and for the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, of the June 18, 2020 Final Judgment Decision Regarding the Erroneous Dismissal Decision made in the June 25, 2019 Dismissal of Case No. 15-cv-06759 (as Exhibit 90).

3. On July 23, 2020 Appellant filed an Appellants' Special Second Attachment Motion Petition request for a EN Banc Rehearing by the Full Committee etc. (as Exhibit 91).

4. Petitioner will be sending a copy of the General Dockets that I requested for all filing and the Petitioner are isting below Petitioners October 3, 2020 Docket ex 97.

5. On August 31, 2020 the Petitioner filed, Motion To Recall Mandate, to the Court of Appeals, received and issued on 9/2/2020 and that was also denied on 9/10/2020 (as Exhibit 92)

6. On October 3, 2020 the Petitioner filed an apology letter to the Supreme Court (as Exhibit 97)

7. On Appellants' Motion Request for special consideration for extension of time to file, Petition for Writ Of Certiorari to the Supreme Court, due to the Petitioners medical condition and be treated, evaluated and cared or by caregivers and continue to follow Doctors Orders. Petitioner are inconveniently deprived while being unable to focus and concentrate while being without Counsel for fairness and justice. The Petitioner did provide to the Supreme Court the Petitioners evaluation from his Psychiatrist and Therapist/Counselors and will again provide Exhibits 88-1in Appendix A and 88-2 Appendix B evaluations (as Exhibit 97).

8. Petitioner are beyond confuse and trying his best



## **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:

**(1) Silver Cross Hospital and Medical Centers**

**(2) Crothall Healthcare Inc.**

## **RELATED CASES**

**(a) The Petitioner does not know what he is doing, while unable to focus and concentrate, due to the Petitioner's lack of knowledge of the Laws and the Petitioner's (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder, physical and mental medical conditions etc. (b) The Petitioner is filing a motion for an extension of time not to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari until the Petitioner can follow the Petitioner's Doctor's orders and be treated and cared for by (c) the Petitioner's Therapist/Counselors whom was consulted or acquired by Petitioner's Doctor for another evaluation opinion by another Professional Scholar of the medical field for an more accurate or precise evaluation and (d) the Petitioner's Therapist/Counselors acquired or consulted with the Petitioner's Psychiatrist for another Professional Scholar opinion for an more accurate and precise evaluation for treatment and care so the Petitioner can properly prepare and fairly participate in this writ of certiorari etc. Petitioner has evaluations attachments from the Petitioner's Psychiatrist as Appendix A and Trial Exhibit 88-1 and the Petitioner's Therapist/Counselors evaluation attachment as Appendix B and Trial Exhibit 88-2.**

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED**

### **CASES**

### **PAGE NUMBER**

**District Court Civil Case  
Northern District of Illinois,  
Eastern Division  
District Judge John Robert  
Blakey**

**15-cv-06759**

**United States Court of  
Appeals for the Seventh  
Circuit**

**19-2595**

### **STATUTES AND RULES**

**This is an employment discrimination and Appellant's 13 Separate Courts of Allegations Case. Jurisdiction in the District Court over the violations alleged under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3). Jurisdiction over the violations alleged under 42 U.S.C. §1981 is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §1988. Jurisdiction over violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 29 U.S.C. 626 and 42 U.S.C. §12117.**

### **OTHER**

**View - Appendix D Link to Part 2 of - Constitution and Statutory Provision involved document for more details.**

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 C to the petition and is

☒ reported at June 25, 2019; 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 \_\_\_\_\_; 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.

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 June 18, 2020.

☐ 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: September 10, 2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

☐ 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 June 25, 2019.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: June 18, 2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

☐ 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

### Jurisdictions

“FIRST AND MAIN” “JURISDICTION” “PETITIONER ARE SEEKING REVIEW” to the “Supreme Court” are a copy of United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit June 18, 2020 “FINAL JUDGMENT” of “Appeal Case No. 19-2595” along with a copy of Petitioners apology 1 page letter and (as Exhibit 96) a copy of Petitioners October 3, 2020 Affidavit accompanying motion for permission to Appeal in Forma Pauperis to the Court of Appeals (View Attachment APPENDIX AA – 1)

Jurisdiction (under the lower court) to decide this Case pursuant to U.S.C. 28 U.S.C. §1291 of the Civil Case No. 15-cv-06759 and Appeal Case No. 19-2595 Jurisdiction to decide this Case pursuant to U.S.C. 28 U.S. Code § 1746 of the Supreme Court.

Jurisdiction over the violations alleged under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3). Jurisdiction over the violations alleged under 42 U.S.C. §1981 is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §1988. Jurisdiction over violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 29 U.S.C. 626 and 42 U.S.C. §12117. Jurisdiction over violations of the Sex Discrimination Act (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) Title IX is a federal civil rights law in the United States of America that was passed as part of the Education Amendments of 1972. This is Public Law No. 92-318, 86 Stat. 235, codified at 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688. Wage Discrimination, Job Segregation, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 12 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 397 (1978-1979);

I. Petitioners and other African Americans Rights must be protected under the First Amendment etc. Rights under the Constitution.

1. 18 U.S.C. § 1503 – Criminalizes “corruptly” attempting to “influence, intimidate, or impede” the New Lenox Police Official investigation and proceeding of a “Civil Rights Investigation” into a “Hate Crime” committed by three non-African Americans whom admitting to Plotting to Kill a co-worker, by running the Petitioner off the road with cars and made two attempt at least before the Petitioner became aware after the Petitioner reporting the two

incidents to Boss's, Supervisor and due to corrupt attempt issues, the petitioner was force report the hate crime incident to the President of Corporation's and to Corporations Human Resources. While the corruptness continued with protecting the unstable non-African Americans, while Respondents began intimidating and bullying the Petitioner to shut up and go to work. When that didn't work, the Petitioner was suspended for one week etc. then terminated etc. (1-a) that was obstruction of justice by the Respondents (1-b) Respondents were creating a toxic and hostile workplace environment (1-c) Respondents was consistently continuing with violations of abuse of their own rules, policies and the federal laws etc. (1-d) (view Petitioners Trial Exhibits 32, 33, 34 and all Trial Exhibits etc. for factual evident of the details of the Civil Case No. 15-cv-06759)

2. 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – the Respondent's believe to and has engaged in influence, delay and prevent the testimony of any of witnesses, while preventing depositions of witnesses, (2-1) Respondent's has altered evidence as a fact, believe to have destroyed evidence and attempt to conceal information of criminal activities as detailed throughout this Constitution and Statutory document (2-b) hindering, delaying and preventing the communications to a law enforcement officer (a New Lenox Police Officer Brian Morrison Trial Exhibit 34) and maybe the States Attorney Official (view Trial Exhibit 68-of page 63 1/10/14 Official Carson ?) and Federal Judge John Robert Blakey (2-c) co-workers Plot to kill the Petitioner , while making two attempts with use of force etc. (2-d) view 32, 33 and 34 etc.) (2-e) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
3. 18 U.S.C. § 1520 – Destruction of corporate document and video tapes (3-a) Respondents falsely stated to Petitioner that they (the Respondents) had a state of the arts video tape showing the Petitioner did not do his job (3-b) the Petitioner requested to view the video tape and was denied by the Respondent's (3-c) Petitioner stated to the Honorable Judge Robert Blakey about 2016 at the Status Hearing, that the Respondent's would not permit the Petitioner to review the video tape that the Respondents accused (which was defamation) the Petitioner of not doing his job and when Judge Blakey asked the Respondents why wasn't the Petitioner allowed to view the video tape, the Respondent's, response was that they lost the (state of the arts) video tape (3-d) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.

4. Constitution – Petitioners First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the Petitioner and other African Americans rights to peacefully petition (4-a) the Petitioner and 12 other African Americans signed a Racial Discrimination Petition(s) that was Notarized by a Notary Public on December 4, 2013 (4-b) on the same day presented to, signed and dated by President of the Corporations Secretary and (4-c) signed and dated by Human Resources Representative/employee (4-d) Petitioner was intimidated, bulled, harassed, suspended and terminated to keep the Petitioner from peacefully assembling petition and that invoked the Respondent's to take egregious action to remove the Petitioner to (stop the bleeding) or more violation of the constitution (4-e) Petitioner was terminated for exercising Petitioner and other African Americans constitutional right with fearing for his life and job etc. (4-f) also, this is consistent with, in line with and the same violations and standard as In paragraph 1-a, 1-b and 1-c (4-g) the Petitioner has requested for the Petitioner's courts appointed counsel's, the Honorable Judge Blakey and the Court of Appeal Circuit Judges to investigate all the 12 African American who signed the Petition to see if they were harassed, intimidated or unjustifiably terminated by Respondent's for exercising their First Amendment Constitutional Right to Petition and none of them mentioned was willing to do the right thing of protecting Americans, Native Americans and African Americans Constitutional Rights (4-h) (view Trial Exhibit 39) (4-i) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
5. 18 U.S.C. § 1510 – Obstruction of Criminal Investigation (5-a) view paragraph 1,2 and 3 for details (5-b) view Petitioner Trial Exhibits 41, 31, 32, 33, 34) (5-c) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
6. Title 18, U.S.C., Section 245 – Federal Civil Rights Statutes and Federally Protected Activities (6-a) this statute prohibits willful injury, intimidation, or interference, or attempt to do so, by force or threat of force of any person or class of persons etc. (6-b) view paragraphs 1 and 2) (6-c) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
7. Title 18 U.S.C., Section 249 – Hate Crimes Prevention Act (7-a) This statute makes it unlawful to willfully cause bodily injury—or attempting to do so with their cars etc. (7-b) the crime was committed because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin of any person etc. (7-c) tribal jurisdictions to help them to more effectively investigate, prosecute, and

prevent hate crimes etc. (7-d) the law provides for a maximum 10-year prison term, unless death (or attempts to kill) results from the offense etc. (7-e) view paragraphs 1 and 2 (7-b) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.

8. Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 – Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law (8-a) this statute makes it a crime for any person acting under color of Law etc. and protected by the Constitution and laws of the U.S. (8-b) the law further prohibits a person acting under color of law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom to be subjected any person to different punishments, pain or penalties etc. (8-c) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
9. Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 – Conspiracy Against Rights (9-a) this statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate any person of any state etc., in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the U.S. etc. (9-b) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
10. Title 42, U.S.S., Section 14141 – Pattern and Practice (10-a) this civil statute was a provision within the Crime Control Act of 1994 etc. (10-b) whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a violation has occurred, the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States, may in a civil action obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice. (10-c) types of misconduct covered include, among other things such as Discriminatory Harassment (10-d) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
11. 18 U.S.C. § 1519 – Destruction, alteration and falsification of records calls for Federal investigations (11-a) Respondent's egregious surreptitious attempts and insidious actions to falsify document was harmful, illegal and criminal that invokes an immediate investigation (11-b) view Trial Exhibit 31 as proof of facts (11-c) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
12. 8 U.S. Code § 1324c – Penalties for document fraud (12-a) Respondent's provided to the Petitioner a falsified document to harm by terminating the Petitioner to shut him up and to prevent or keep other African Americans from their First Amendment Constitutional Rights to peacefully petition without retaliation from their employer's (12-b) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.

13. This is an employment discrimination and Appellant's 13 Courts of Allegations Case. Jurisdiction in the District Court over the violations alleged under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3). Jurisdiction over the violations alleged under 42 U.S.C. §1981 is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §1988. Jurisdiction over violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 29 U.S.C. 626 and 42 U.S.C. §12117. Jurisdiction over violations of the Sex Discrimination Act (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) Title IX is a federal civil rights law in the United States of America that was passed as part of the Education Amendments of 1972. This is Public Law No. 92-318, 86 Stat. 235, codified at 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688. Wage Discrimination, Job Segregation, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 12 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 397 (1978-1979); (13-a) View: Trial Exhibits (85) of Appellants' Brief, (13-b) Ex. Appellant's first Original filed Complaint filed on August 3, 2015 Appellant's (13-c) Ex. 23 - Subpoenas to (IDHR) & (EECO) AND (13-d) EX. 42-IDHR Record Related to Other Claims Against Appellee's and an undated Subpoenas is required to see if the Respondent's Toxic Racial Discrimination etc. and other despicable actions of patterns continues (13-e) view ex. 25 of Petitioners 6/18/2019 pending motion to Second Amended Complaint (13-f) view ex. 82 of Petitioners 6/25/2019 pending Plaintiffs' Status Report (13-g) also, this is consistent, in line and the same standard has with paragraph 1-a, 1-b, 1-c and 1-d.
14. The rules of law identify it with the fundamental principles of liberalism and democracy, citing, as constituent elements, the principle of separation of powers, legality, recognition of individual freedom and equality, judicial review and the relationship between law and morality (12). Petitioner believes the Courts are required to immediately "Invoke" an investigation into Appellant's Civil Right Hate Crime (Federal Statute, 18 U.S. 245 Civil Rights Act), "All secrets of wrongdoing will eventually come out and Justice will prevail".

II. Petitioners Constitutional and Statutory Provisions involved below are a few of the Petitioners allegations that detailed above and was provided in the Petitioners Brief to the Court of Appeals

1. This is an action for employment discrimination pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1981 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

- a. View Appellant's Exhibit (I) February 14, 2014, Silver Cross's Discovery Documents SCH000308, SCH000309, SCH000310 and SCH000311, that was provided to the Appellant through discovery from Appellees;
2. This is an action for employment discrimination pursuant to Title V11 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C. §1981 and the Race/Color Discrimination in Employment Act.
3. This is an action for employment discrimination pursuant to Title V11 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 12 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 397 (1978-1979) and Wage Discrimination and Job Segregation in Employment Act;
  - a. Appellant December 19, 2013 document signed by (Notary Public) dated April 8, 2014 for EEOC and Fax dated December 19, 2013 to Tracy P. Ardis "Begging" to return back to work ASAP and Tracy sent a FedEx December 20, 2013 document stating the Appellant is now on "unpaid" suspension until contacting EAP, that means "Terminated" and the Appellant had to go to the Illinois Department Employment Services (IDES) and was required to try and obtain a Job while receiving Unemployment benefits and the Appellees had to agree and approve to the Appellant termination to pay benefits, for the Appellant not being Employed by them anymore. If anyone who have received Unemployment benefits knows this;
  - b. View Exhibit (L) document in Appellant's first Original filed Complaint filed dated August 3, 2015, regards to July 18, 2011 document titled ("Sex/Gender Discrimination, Name Calling Harassments, Retaliation and Misleading Pay Issues in Sterile Processing Department") and (this is also a "Hate Crime" that should be investigated) and that has been provided to the Appellees through discovery;
4. This is an action for employment discrimination pursuant to Title V11 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, This is Public Law No. 92-318, 86 Stat. 235, codified at 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688 and the Sex Discrimination in Employment Act.
  - a. Appellant Pleads to the Court and the Honorable Judge John Robert Blakey to permit the Appellant to resubmit, the Appellant's second reply Motion to the Appellees Motion for Partial Summary Judgment to the Appellant's Sex/Gender Allegation due to the Appellees argument that the Sex/Gender incident occurred outside the statute of limitations;

5. Appellant are not arguing the point that the one Sterile Processing Department incident with Debbie Olea a/k/a Debbie Ohla was not outside the statute of limitations, but the Appellant argument is that the Debbie Olea incident was a history of a pattern to all the other Sex/Gender incidents that the Appellant has detailed in his Motion filed on May 8, 2018.
6. While working in the Sterile Processing Department only one African American employee was male working in the SPD department when the Appellant started, and he passed away. Appellant was intentionally discriminated against by the Appellees and his Supervisor, person of Authority, because of his gender in matters that included, but were not necessarily limited to the following:
  - a. Appellant's female supervisor, Debbie Olea a/k/a Debbie Ohla a/k/a Debbie Olha, regularly made despicable, derogatory, discriminatory and hateful comments to Appellant about his gender. She told Appellant that "She hated men", that "Men are the scum of the earth", that "Men could not clean her dogs' poop" and other derogatory remarks about men;
  - b. View Exhibit (Q) in Appellant's April 9, 2014 document signed by (Notary Public on April 17, 2014) to Tracy P. Ardis, Paul Pawlak and Mark Jepson;
  - c. Appellant reported this to Jim Tyrell Sterile Processing Whom was the new Department Director on July 18, 2011 and Dehlia Hatten Jim Tyrell's and Appellant Supervisor, that has been provided to the Appellees through discovery;
  - d. Nothing was done in regards to Debbie's racist gender/Sexual remarks and more factual evidence will be provided through discovery to show the continuous Toxic Racial Discrimination African Americans had to deal with and the Appellees will not be able to provide any documentation of any inquiries nor investigations of the incidents that was provided to them by the Appellant and this type of continuous behavior must be investigated through discovery etc.;
  - e. View Appellant Exhibit (U) document dated August 3, 2015/July 18, 2011 titled ("Sex/Gender Discrimination, Name Calling Harassments, Retaliation and Misleading Pay Issues in Sterile Processing Department") and (this is also a "Hate Crime" that should be investigated) and that has been provided to the Appellees through discovery;

7. After the President Paul Pawlak, Mark Jepson, Tracy P. Ardis, Dan Thomas, John Farrell and others shown no concerns after being given a considerable amount of time and they made more attempts to cover it up and sweep it under the rug, so the Appellant had to go to the New Lenox Police Department on November 26, 2013;

- a. Regarding three of the Respondents non-African American employees Plotted to Kill an African American co-worker, the Petitioner, the three disturb individuals admitted to their Executive Employer's they plotted to kill the Petitioner and two attempts was made on the Petitioners life without the Petitioner becoming aware of the plot.
- b. This is only one of the Appellants 13 Separate Counts of Allegations, that stated in this document;
- c. Appellees continues to "Create a Hostile Workplace Environment";
- d. Appellees continues to coverup "Hate Crimes";
- e. The Appellees actions of "Gross Negligence" (1) are a vital and relevant part of the Appellant's "Damages" by the Appellees 'Malicious' "Toxic" "Discriminatory Actions" of "Intentional Intent" of "Recklessness" Actions etc. (2) the Appellees gross negligence, disturbing carelessness that recklessly disregard the safety and lives of the Appellant and Others which was a "Conscious Violation of other people's rights and safety, it was more than simple inadvertence, but it was and is just being "Intentionally Evil" (3) the Appellees Gross Negligence is a conscious and voluntary disregard of the need to use reasonable care, which to cause foreseeable grave injury or harm to persons and property in which the Appellees conduct was "Extreme" etc.;

8. On or about December 4, 2013, Appellant, Fred Cartwright delivered a petition titled "RACIAL DISCRIMINATION" to the Appellees, that was signed by Appellant, (12) co-workers (African American Employees) that were having problems with racial discrimination to Paul Pawlak, the President and Chief Executive Officer of Silver Cross Hospital and to Human Resources;

30

- a. Appellees "Criminally" violated the Appellant's "Constitutional Rights" by preventing the Appellant's "Rights of Freedom of Speech" and the Appellant's of "Right to Petition";
  - b. Appellees continues to "Create a Hostile Workplace Environment";
  - c. Appellees continues to coverup "Hate Crimes";
  - d. Other similarly situated white and non-African Americans employees that had not submitted a petition on racial discrimination to their employer were not suspended and were not required to go to the Employee Assistance Program even though they committed worse acts than those the Appellees claimed Appellant engaged in;
  - e. Appellees "Criminally" violated the Appellant's "Constitutional Rights" by preventing the Appellant's "Rights of Freedom of Speech" and the Appellant's of "Right to Petition";
- A. Appellant was suspended without pay on or about December 18, 2013 and later terminated from his employment and was forced to sign up for Unemployment benefits at the Illinois Department Employment Services (IDES);
- a. IDES decision was the Appellee's termination of the Appellant was ruled Unfair, Racially Motivated, Violation of the Appellees own Rules, Policies and Federal Laws, by the Appellant understanding;
  - b. The Appellees was given an opportunity to respond, deny or reject the IDES Ruling of the Appellant unfair termination by the Appellees;
9. Appellant was granted Unemployment Benefits and the policy of receiving or collecting benefits, the Appellant has to continue to look for work while receiving benefits, that the Appellant continue to do with no success and need Doctors care and Counseling to help the Appellant with his damages and illness that he vitally needed, due to the Appellees disturbing, vicious unstable and reckless Discriminatory etc. behaviors of the Appellant (13) Count Allegations.
10. WHEREFORE, Appellant demands that he be awarded all available appropriate injunctive relief, lost wages, back pay, liquidated damages, back pay, front pay, compensatory damages, punitive damages, pre-judgement interest, post judgment interest and all costs including attorney fees and expert witness fees allowed by Title VII (42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(k), 42 U.S.C. 1988 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (29 U.S.C. 626(b) & 29 U.S.C. 216(b)).

Appellant further demands that the Court grant such other relief as the court may find appropriate;

11. Appellant is requesting Civil Damages that are usually monetary awards due to Appellant winning in the Court of Law and can be general, punitive or any combination of Civil Damages and Compensatory Damages;
  - a. The Appellant's Physician has currently prescribed the Appellant, "Escitalopram" and "Venlafaxine" for Appellants (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder, mental disorder, depression and anxiety, sleepless nights of nightmares of being killed by co-workers etc.
  - b. The Appellant was being treated and cared for by Appellant Therapist/Counselors whom was acquired or consulted by Appellants Physician for additional evaluation form another Professional Scholar of the medical field, (b-1) Appellants Therapist/Counselor "Suspiciously" refuse to continue working with the Appellant as her Client, after the Respondents revealed the names of all the Appellants Caregivers (b-3) after the Appellant file a motion for the Respondent's not to contact the Appellant Caregivers with the presiding Judge Blakey's or the Appellants permission or approval. (b-4) the Appellant believes the Civil Case No. 15-cv-06759 should be fully investigated to expose the unfairness, misrepresentation, conspiracy and corruptness by the Respondent's, Federal Judge Blakey, Appellants Court appointed Attorney's for fair justification for all Parties, but the opposing Parties have did their best to deceive, deny and coverup their out of control mass to avoid Prosecution etc.
  - c. The Appellant's Psychiatrist was acquired or consulted by Appellants Therapist/Counselors for additional evaluation form another Professional Scholar of the medical field, whom prescribed medication of "Quetiapine" and "Clonazepam".

12. Expert was requested in civil case;

- a. Appellant's Physician, Psychiatrist and Counselors;
- b. Forensic scientific methods and techniques of documents maybe needed;

13. Jury Trial Demanded in civil case;

14. Petitioner are still open to meet and confer;

15. Petitioner are open to continue a "Fair Mediation" by starting from our June 12, 2017 Settlement Conference Hearing Negotiation that was mediated by the Honorable (Petitioner thought) Judge John Robert Blakey's, whom statement was to the Petitioner was "you can't negotiate with me", while we were in the middle of Settlement Conference Hearing "Negotiating", who would have thought Judges or anyone in the Justice System could act like this.

16. WHEREFORE, Appellant demands that he be awarded all available appropriate injunctive relief, lost wages, back pay, liquidated damages, back pay, front pay, compensatory damages, punitive damages, pre-judgment interest, post judgment interest and all costs including attorney fees and expert witness fees allowed by Title VII (42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(k)), 42 U.S.C. 1988 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (29 U.S.C. 626(b) & 29 U.S.C. 216(b)). Appellant further demands that the Court grant such other relief as the court may find appropriate;

DATED: November 4, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

  
/s/ Fred Cartwright

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an employment discrimination and Appellant's 13 Separate Courts of Allegations Case. Jurisdiction in the District Court over the violations alleged under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3). Jurisdiction over the violations alleged under 42 U.S.C. §1981 is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. §1988. Jurisdiction over violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 29 U.S.C. 626 and 42 U.S.C. §12117.

### I. LEGAL STANDARD

District courts have broad discretion when ruling on discovery-related issues, including motions to compel brought under Rule 37(a). *See Peals v. Terre Haute Police Dep't*, 535 F.3d 621, 629 (7th Cir. 2008); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a). If a party fails to properly respond to written discovery, the party that propounded the discovery may move for an order compelling an answer. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B). "For the purposes of a motion to compel under Rule 37(a), 'an evasive or incomplete disclosure, answer, or response is to be treated as a failure to disclose, answer or respond.'" *Jones v. Syntex Labs.*, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17926, at \*4 (N.D. Ill. 2011) (*citing* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)).

### II. PETITIONER'S FIRST ARGUMENT REGARDING RESPONDENT'S BEFORE THE JUNE 25, 2019 "ERRONEOUS DISMISSAL" "WITH PREJUDICE" ERROR

Discrimination and Petitioner's (13) Separate Counts of Allegations etc. can be proven through factual and circumstantial evidence, which typically includes "(1) suspicious timing, ambiguous oral or written statements, or behavior toward or comments directed at other employees in the protected group; (2) evidence, whether or not rigorously statistical, that similarly situated employees outside the protected class received systematically better treatment; and (3) evidence that the employee was qualified for the job in question but was passed over in favor of a person outside the protected class and the employer's reason is a pretext for discrimination."). *Mullin v. Temco Machinery, Inc.*, 732 F.3d 772, 776 (7th Cir. 2013). Proof of "behavior toward or comments directed at other employees in the

protected group" can support an inference of discrimination). See *Zafar Hasan v. Foley & Lardner LLP*, 552 F.3d 520, 529 (7th Cir. 2008). (view Trial Exhibits 56 of motions filed "June 10, 2019", "June 25, 2019", "June 26, 2019", "July 11, 2019", "June 24, 2019 unfinish Status Report") and ("ex. 82 June 25, 2019 Status Report etc."), (ex. 25 June 18, 2019 Pending Motion to Petitioner's Second Amended Complaint), (view ex. 27, February 14, 2014 EVS Employees Discrimination discovery document provide by Respondents), (view "ex. 34 Police report", "ex. 39 12/4/2013 signed Discrimination Petition by 12 African Americans employees of the Respondent's", "ex. 32 Re; Civil Rights Hate Crime of three non-African Americans Plot to Kill an African American (the Petitioner) while making two attempts without Petitioner being aware"), (view all Trial Exhibits)

Here, in addition to the direct evidence supporting his case, Petitioner intends to support his case through more factual evidence than circumstantial evidence. As such, Petitioner has requested, among other things, documents and information relating to other employees similarly situated as Petitioner during the time Petitioner was employed by Respondent's. Petitioner has requested personnel files for employees who worked in the same department as Petitioner during the period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's. Petitioner has also asked for information relating to claims asserted by other employees against Respondent's. (view ex. 23, A/K/A ex. 42 of January 29, 2018 Subpoenas response from (IDHR & EEOC) records relating to other claims against the Respondent's etc.) and (view all Petitioners Trial Exhibits for complete factual details of evidence)

Respondent's refusal to provide any information about other employees and other claims plainly lacks merit. Petitioner is entitled to this information because the treatment of similarly situated employees is a recognized and accepted method of proving discrimination. *Davis v. Precoat Metals*, No. 01 C 5689, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13851, at \*3-\*7 ,\*8-\*13 (N.D. Ill. July 26, 2002) (noting that "other Respondent's complaints of discrimination may be relevant to establish pretext," and granting Petitioners' motion to compel production of personnel and disciplinary files of all non-clerical/non-administrative employees who worked at Respondent's plant for five-year period of Petitioners employment from 2008 thru 2013). Petitioner has acquired January 29, 2018 document from the "Illinois Department of Human Rights" of the Respondent's patterns of other "charges, complaints, and claims that is relevant information filed against them, "just" from 1/1/2008 to 12/31/2014. That proves the Respondents are withholding from the Petitioner of the treatment of similarly situated employees is a recognized and accepted method of proving discrimination etc. as discovery and discoverable

information that is relevant and significant documentation of evidence. view ex. 23, A/K/A ex. 42 of Trial Exhibits.

Additionally, Petitioner has identified over 70 individuals who may have information supporting his claims against the Respondent's. All, or most, of the 70 plus witnesses were employed by Respondents at some time during the period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's. Petitioner has requested that the Respondent's provide the last known contact information for the witnesses, and the witnesses' titles or positions during the time they were employed by Respondent's. Respondent's has objected to all Petitioners allegations, claiming that Petitioner seeks information relating to time periods that have no relevance to Petitioner or in the Petitioners (13) separate counts of allegations in his complaint. (view Trial Exhibit 42 for details of witnesses etc.), (ex. 35 interrogatories by Brian T. Maye & Shane B. Nichols on 11/9/17 ex. 36 notice to compel discovery).

Contrary to Respondent's assertion, Petitioner is entitled to information covering the entire time period he was employed by Respondent's, because conduct that may be barred by the statute of limitations may still be used to support timely filed claims. *Ahad v. Southern Illinois School of Medicine*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68430, at \*4-\*5 (C.D. Ill. May 25, 2016) (denying motion to strike paragraphs in complaint as time-barred because "[c]onduct that is not actionable may still provide relevant background information to support timely claims"); see also *AMTRAK v. Morgan*, 536 U.S. 101, 113 (2002) (holding that even if discriminatory act is time barred, it does not prevent an employee from using the prior acts as background evidence in support of a timely claim"). Inexplicably, Respondent's has produced a very limited number of internal emails, and many have been redacted without a privilege log having been produced. (view Petitioners entire Trial Exhibit documentations of documents for proof of prior and other acts and ex. 69 May 8, 2018 motion Regarding the Petitioners reply to Judge Blakey's partial summary judgment filed May 9, 2018), (view ex. 25 of Petitioners June 18, 2019 motion of Pending Second Amended Complaint) and (ex. 69 of Petitioners May 8, 2018 Reply to Partial Summary Judgment filed 5/9/2018), (ex. 27 of February 14, 2014 EVS Discrimination document from Respondent's Employees), (view all Petitioners Trial Exhibit for more factual details of evidence).

In addition to its failure to produce clearly discoverable information, Respondent's has asserted that Petitioner can only contact witnesses through counsel for Respondent's. Respondent's asserts this without providing any information about the witnesses' employment status, job title, or the basis for an

invocation of attorney-client privilege. In short, Respondent's and Respondent's Counsel's has asserted a blanket attorney-client privilege covering all witnesses and potential witnesses without providing any support for such invocation. (view Trial Exhibit 28 of Petitioners Court appointed Counsel's Brian T. Maye's May 31, 2017 demand letter with relevant attachments of (1) First Amended Complaint filed 10/14/16 by John F. Donahue, (2) signed petition by 12 African Americans employees, (3) February 14, 2014 Discrimination document provided by Respondents, (4) Falsified documents by Respondents, December 20, 2013 suspension/termination letter).

Petitioner filed this lawsuit almost (5) years ago August 3, 2015. Since that time, Respondent's has produced a very limited amount of information it possesses relating to this litigation. Petitioner asks this Court to order Respondent's to provide supplemental responses to Petitioner's First Set of Interrogatories and Document Requests, and produce information (that the Petitioner revise and resubmitted motions and noticed for presentment on 6/11/19 that Judge Blakey were referring to as "Recycled" in his 6/3/2019 in the Judge's Docket Text minute entry Doc. No. 228), (revised, due to Petitioners Court appointed Counsel's has abandoned all motions and noticed for presentment, due to the withdrawal as Petitioners Counsel's) and documents identified in its Rule 37 Letter. In particular, but not to exclusion of other information and documents demanded herein, Petitioner asks that Respondent's be ordered to produce the following:

1. Name, address and contact information (personal phone number and email) for all employees who worked in the same departments as Petitioner during the time period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's (November 2008 to June 2014);
  - a. Each department of which Petitioner has work, which was (1) Environmental Services Department (EVS) as a Floor Technician from 2008 thru 2013, full time and part time, (2) Sterile Processing Department (SPD) in 2011, (3) Behavior Health Department (BHD) 2012 (4) Petitioner worked in EVS "part time" and SPD at the same time (5) Petitioner worked in BHD "part time" and EVS at the same time;
2. The last known contact, dates of employment and job title of all witnesses identified by Petitioner in;

- a. Trial Exhibit 65 - June 18, 2019 Gmail sent to Respondent's on September 22, 2019 of Crothall's first 9 witnesses and Silver Cross first 11 witnesses to be depose for deposition;
  - b. Trial Exhibit 42 - June 18, 2019 witnesses to Respondent's on September 22, 2019;
  - c. Trial Exhibit 66 - February 24, 2016 Petitioners initial witness list;
3. For all witnesses identified by Petitioner, identify each individual, if any, Respondent's is invoking attorney-client privilege on behalf of such individual. For each invocation, identify in a privilege log the date or dates on which Respondent's claims the witness participated in communication covered by attorney-client privilege. Also, describe the subject matter discussed and the individual(s) involved in the communication with the witness.
4. All data, material, documents, information, etc. identified through an electronically stored information (ESI) search of Respondent's servers, including email accounts, using search terms provided by Petitioner, covering the period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's.
5. All documents, including, but not limited to, memoranda, reports, emails, statements, correspondence, etc., prepared by, sent by or received by Respondent's relating to Fred Cartwright covering the period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's.
6. The personnel records for all employees who were assigned to the same departments as Petitioner during the time Petitioner was employed by Respondent's.
7. All documents and information regarding complaints, grievances, lawsuits, claims, administrative actions or allegations relating to alleged to the Petitioner's (13) Separate Counts of Allegations such as discrimination, harassment, hostile work environment etc., or retaliatory termination based on race, age or gender by or against a Silver Cross or Crothall employees covering the period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's.
  - (a) View Petitioners Trial Exhibits as in paragraph 2 - a, b and c.

8. Surveillance recording that Respondent's claims provided the basis to discipline Petitioner in late 2013. Additionally, provide
  - (a) the identity of the individual or individuals who viewed the recording;
  - (b) the identity of the individual or individuals who were responsible for maintaining the recording, and;
  - (c) produce its policies and procedures relating to maintaining and retaining surveillance recordings;
  - (d) all documents of investigation of each and every incident mentioned by the Respondent's and the Petitioners and in the Petitioners 13 separate counts of allegations.
9. Respondent's document retention policy if not have already done so.
10. Respondent's policies, practices, etc. as to assigning an employee to EAP, if not have already done so.
11. Respondent's organizational chart(s) in effect at the time Petitioner was employed.
12. Communications with, and information provided to, Respondent's insurer regarding Petitioner's claims against Respondent's.
13. During the time period Petitioner was employed by Respondent's, communications with, and information provided to, Respondent's insurer regarding any claims, complaints, or allegations that Respondent's or any of its employees or supervisors discriminated on the basis of race, gender or age.

In addition to its failure to produce clearly discoverable information, Respondent's has asserted that Petitioner can only contact witnesses through counsel for Respondent's. Respondent's asserts this without providing any information about the witnesses' employment status, job title, or the basis for an invocation of attorney-client privilege. In short, Respondent's has asserted a blanket attorney-client privilege covering all witnesses and potential witnesses without providing any support for such invocation.

### III. PETITIONER'S SECOND ARGUMENT REGARDING RESPONDENT'S

BEFORE THE JUNE 25, 2019 ERRONEOUS DISMISSAL ERROR

By the Petitioner challenging the Court and Judge Blakey, the Petitioner hopes to advise everyone to be aware of the unjustifiable treatments the Petitioner experienced by the Judge John Robert Blakey retaliative motive, Petitioner's Ex-Legal Counsel's and the Respondents, before the June 25, 2019 "Erroneous Dismissal" "With Prejudice" and throughout Petitioners Civil Case preceding are fraudulent misrepresentation, dereliction of duty, abuse of authority and abuse of duties etc. (view Petitioners Trial Exhibit 57)

Petitioner request for all Petitioner documentation that have been provided to the Respondent's as Petitioner's discovery information and all documents provided as Trial Exhibits for Petitioner's appeal and admit Petitioner's September 22, 2019 filings Docketing Statements, Courts Reporters Transcript (that the Petitioner requested and was denied access to and denied viewing Transcripts) and Court of Appeals requested Trial Exhibits documents be added as the Second Part of Petitioner's Brief as significant, vital and relevant information that supports the Petitioner's October 7, 2019 deadline Brief. Petitioner has provided numerous of documents through the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois as requested after the June 25, 2019 dismissal that Petitioner requested to be viewed as vital, significant and relevant for this Petitioner's Brief.

Due to the Petitioners beliefs and knowledge of the Respondent's racist, abusive, disturbing, demonizing reputation of particular habits, characteristic and patterns of systematically plotting, falsifying documents, destroying documents, destroying state of the arts video tape, "supporting, ignoring, intentional covering up, assisting in protecting criminal activities of dangerous criminals of non-African American whom are involved in an Civil Rights Hate Crime of three of the Respondents employees Plotting to kill a co-worker, an African American (the Petitioner), while making two attempts with their vehicle's without the Petitioner being aware of the Plot etc. that all Respondents actions cause serve damages (view Petitioners Trial Exhibits 88-1 and 88-2 of Petitioner's Doctors, Psychiatrist and Therapist/Counsel's treatments with meditations and evaluations), with the Respondents illegal acts of obstruction of Justice etc. and taking advantage of their unfair, unjustifiable and unlimited scope of influencing, power and wealth, with their engaging and engagements in unethical and immoral behaviors of collaborating, conspiracies, collusions, as a conspirators of the Respondents illegal actions of plotting, falsifying documents, potential destroying documents,

40

potential destroying state of the arts video tapes and destroying of any and all evidence that that the Petitioner can prove through the "Truthfulness", "Factual Evidence" and with an "Entourage of Witnesses" and Discovery (through the Discovery process, view Petitioners Trial Exhibits).

## **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

### **I. Petitioners Plea For Special Consideration, While Under Exceptional Circumstances And Human Decency**

Petitioner filed this Case August 3, 2015 and the Petitioner is 66 years of age, separated from his wife of marriage after about 35 years of 40 years without any spousal abuse issues etc. and now, no spouse and no spousal support etc. Due to Petitioners wife not being educated about mental illnesses etc. of the damages of suffering the Petitioner endured and sustained while working for the Respondent's, due to a Hate Crime and other disturbing recklessness of unpresidential allegations of incidents filed, that occurred while working under the watchful eyes of a "Select Few of Racist Dysfunctional Individuals" such as, "Executive's" of the Respondent's with "Power and Control" that's related to Blacks/African Americans "SLAVE MASTERS". No one wants to hear the truth, but after what the Petitioner have been through and continues to go through, I, the Petitioners "DON'T GIVE A DAME" about what people don't want to hear. This Disturbing and Dysfunctional story are now of public records and will be told to be transparent or exposed for transparency, for the truth of how Blacks/African American are "Victimized", "Exploited" and "Violated within the Systemic Racist Disease infested Court's System and Systemic Justice System, that "Guarantees" and "Designed" for White's to keep the upper hand over "Blacks", despite the Truth, a sea of Factual Evidence, a tsunami number of Witnesses and with an Admission of the Guilt to/of a Racist Plotted Hate Crime/truth, that the Three Racist Dysfunctional Non-African American Employees of the Respondent's Admitted to their Employers, the Respondents of Plotting to Kill a Black Man Co-worker with their vehicles, by running the Petitioner off the road. The "Select Few of Racist Dysfunctional Individuals" such as, "Few" "Select" "Executive's" of the Respondents are more of a Criminal and Corrupt than the Three Racist Non-African American Criminals whom are employed by the Respondents. The Three Racist Hate Crime Criminals was not punished, suspended nor terminated, but protected, sheltered and harbored by their Employers, the Respondents.

The Petitioner care less about how Racist people views this Case, because Black People are going to continue be treated like this, whether the Petitioner receive his Appeal, win his Appeal or not win his Appeal etc. Petitioner has been suffering for a long time, due to the damages caused by the Respondents racial discrimination, toxic, abusive, malice and recklessness of behaviors etc. The

Petitioner has been requesting Doctors Assistances from Petitioners Courts appointed Counsels since 2016 with unusual and unexplainable disregard and the same from the Honorable Judge John Robert Blakey etc., due to the Petitioner not having any insurance until Obama Care was acquired by Petitioners family's doctor etc. At the October 10, 2018 Status Hearing, the Petitioner stated to Judge Blakey that, he the Petitioner has finally obtained Doctors assistance to help with the Petitioners mental medical issues etc. and Judge Blakey statement was that he was pleased to hear I have a Doctor now, something like that. There are more details of Judge Blakey's questionable statements listed below.

II. Petitioners Mental, Physical and Medical Disorder With (PTSD) Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Emergency Plea

What was so ironically disturbing and twistedly deranged about this is, (a) the Respondents of Silver Cross Hospital and medical Centers, (with Crothall Healthcare Inc. having full knowledge, due to their history of medical institutions involvement etc.), are believed to be or have been ex and former Doctors, Surgeons and Professionals believed to have been scholars of highly respectable White Collar individuals in most cases of the medical field etc., especially the Respondents Executives involved in the Petitioners Civil Case, whom have treated patients whom are or have been in similar situations etc. or with the same or similar mental condition as in the Petitioners condition or (a-1) have some knowledge of the Petitioners condition or (a-2) have family members whom were dealing with similar or the same mental and physical issues as the Petitioner (b) the Petitioner has made numerous of pleading for an extension of time through special consideration and exceptional circumstances of human decency between right and wrong while enduring vital and significant mental, physical and medical conditions, while, also presently dealing with (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder while pleading to all parties regarding the Petitioners Chronic Illnesses (c) the Petitioners has made numerous reasonable attempt to delay all proceeding until the Petitioners can properly be treated and cared for by Petitioners Doctors, Psychiatrist and Therapist/Counselors (c-1)

III. Supreme Court for the United State has an Opportunity to Correct the Wrong of Others and the Petitioner Would Like to Regain High Confidence Within the Justice System for All People

On October 3, 2020 the Petitioner by via mailed Appellants' Motion Request for Extension of time for Petitioner to be treated by caregivers to be able to obtain Counseling "Before Filing" an Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court, (a) under special consideration and exceptional circumstances of human decency to allow the Petitioner something reasonable, like permit the Petitioner time to be treated and cared for Petitioners mental illnesses etc. (a-1) Permitting the Petitioner the time would benefit everyone at this time of the rising coronavirus Pandemic such as the Supreme Court, Judges and Attorneys of all parties from unnecessary precious valuable time to do other important things such as preventing unnecessary travel, costs and to spend more valuable time with their families, something the Petitioner wish he could do, just thank of everything the Petitioner has not been able to do, the same as you and others. (b) On October 6, 2020 Petitioner received from the Supreme Court's a "Guide for Prospective Indigent Petitioners for Writs of Certiorari" form, that is still difficult and incapable for the Petitioner focus and concentrate due to the Petitioners physical mental, medical and (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder issues (as Trial Exhibit 101) (b) a "MEMORANDUM to those intending to prepare a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in booklet format and pay the \$300 Docket Fee" (as Trial Exhibit 100) (c) this was an difficult process and unable to achieve for the Petitioners, due to Petitioners ongoing disabilities and incapability's disorders, under Doctors Orders, dealing with (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder, physical and mental disabilities, while Petitioner not being able to concentrate and focus. (d) the Petitioner has provided medical documents of Petitioners Psychiatrists evaluation as Appendix G and Trial Exhibit 88-1 (e) the Petitioner has provided medical document of Petitioners Therapist/Counselors evaluation as Appendix H and Trial Exhibit 88-2

- A. Petitioner has filed numerous of appeals for extension of time to be treated for damages, and this appeal for an extension of time due to the Plaintiff's inability and incapability to concentrate or focus under considerable amount of depression, stress, anxiety, nightmares of sleepless nights etc. and (1) Plaintiff has been continuously under Plaintiff's Doctors, Psychiatrists and Counselors medication, treatment and care. Plaintiff's care givers has placed their patient under critical and vital restrictions such as, (1-a) Plaintiff Doctors 3/11/2019 and 2/20/2019 excuse slip restricted Plaintiff from traveling and (1-b) restricted Plaintiff from sitting in

depositions, meetings or group sessions etc. for long periods of time and (1-c) restricted Plaintiff from being around and among large crowds and groups of people. The Plaintiff incapacitated disabilities and unstable medical conditions cause the Plaintiff to be not physically and mentally capable of understanding or dealing with this type of appeal issue at this time without caregivers treatment and care (2) the Petitioner has reached out to the presiding Federal Judge John Robert Blakey for fair representation, (2-a) for an extension of time to delay depositions and oral arguments etc., (2-b) to prevent unjustifiable justice until Petitioner can abide his Doctors orders and properly be treated and evaluated by Psychiatrist and (2-c) Therapist/Counselors whom consulted Psychiatrist and Petitioners Doctors whom first consulted with Therapist/Counselors, for more accurate and precise evaluation from the medical practice of Scholars of the medical Professional to "Prevent" and "Avoid Unjustifiable" decisions to avoid unwarranted delays and cost to the Respondent's, Federal Court, Court of Appeal's and the same for the Supreme Court (3) view 3/21/2019 No. 194 Docket text, Judge Blakey bias behaviors was demonstrated in one of Judge Blakey's tactical statements was (3-a) "Even through Plaintiff might benefit from being evaluated by a psychiatrist, the motion and provide no evidentiary details upon which the request for delay remains based, and provide no basis to believe, given the prior record in this case, that Plaintiff will actually pursue such an evaluation by any certain date(if at all) etc." (3-b) Petitioner believes he should have been given the time and opportunity to consult with Psychiatrist and Therapist/Counselors for treatment and care for fair justice, fair and equal rights under the laws of the Constitution etc. (4) Justice is the concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, fairness, religion and/or equity. Justice if is the result of the fair and administration of law. It is the quality of being just: in conformity to truth and reality in expressing opinions and in conduct: honesty: fidelity: impartiality of just treatment: fair representation of facts respecting merit or demerit. It also can refer to a person duly commissioned to hold court sessions, to try and decide controversies and administer justice. (This was more finding researched information for justice of the laws) (5) Petitioner provided to the Court of Appeal, Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett copies of (5-a) Petitioners Psychiatrist's April 30, 2019 dated evaluation and (5-b) Petitioner's Therapist/Counselor's October 29, 2019 dated evaluations through and under the Petitioner's Doctor's

control, in the Petitioners December 27, 2019 motion response to Respondent's Brief, for the purpose of providing the Petitioner extension of time that was also requested in Petitioners December 23, 2019 motion the Petitioners provided to Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett for an extension for time to be properly treated and cared for by caregivers for fairness under the equal justice act and under the rights of the constitution laws etc., that was denied also by Amy Coney Barrett.

- B. That is why (1) the Petitioner were filing numerous of motions of considerations for (1-a) motions of reconsiderations, (1-b) motions appealing different issues, (1-c) motions for proper representation by Counsel and (1-d) give the Petitioner proper time to be consulted care and treatment by Petitioners caregivers (2) for the Honorable Judge Blakey to recuse himself from the Plaintiff's Civil Case (view Docket text of No. 140 minute entry before Judge Blakey, Petitioner asked for Judge Blakey to "Recuse Himself" believed to have been on 5/30/2018 DKT: No. 140 minute entry)
- (2-a) due to Judge Blakey's racially bias unstable behaviors, unfair statements, unfair rulings, bullying, retaliations etc. (2-b) Judge refuse to delay making critical rulings and court orders until Judge Blakey make his mind up on if he would appoint the Plaintiff new counsel or not (view DKT: No. 140) (2-c) view same DKT: No. 140 for more information (3)
- In Docket text No. 218 minute entry before Judge Blakey's "Untrue" stated "No sealing order has been entered in this Case" "An conceal order was placed by Federal Judge Blakey on February 20, 2018 regarding Petitioners Court appointed Counsel Brian T. Maye Withdraw as Counsel and Filed by Brian T. Maye through Judge Blakey's Order, that was suggested by Petitioner, due to no Legal knowledge that Judge Blakey was fully aware of" or (view Judge Blakey's residing behavior over the Plaintiff and the Defendants June 12, 2017 mediation that demonstrated bias, unfair, one-sided mediating, mediation rules were unjustified, questionable and all should be investigated. Judge Blakey's "Unjustifiable Dismissal" of this Case "With Prejudice" that the Plaintiff's believes was revenge of retaliation that justifies the Plaintiff's appeal and a review of Judge Blakey's personal issues, patterns of incidents and patterns of favoritism throughout this Case (view Docket text of No. 140 minute entry before Judge Blakey, Petitioner asked for Judge Blakey to "Recuse Himself" believed to have been on

(view Memorandum opinion and order by Judge Blakey on 4/30/2018 of Judge Blakey response to the Petitioners request for Judge Blakey to recuse "itself" in Blakey's word")

(view May 10, 2018 Docket text No. 123 minute entry before Judge Blakey of, Judge Blakey honoring his own decision to make partial summary judgment on, where the Respondent's "Created an hostile workplace environment" in which the Respondent's never filed an motion to dismiss that Separate Allegation of the Petitioner and the Petitioners allegation "Respondent's Created an hostile workplace environment" is a part of all the Petitioners 13 separate counts of allegations and not just on the sex/gender allegation, that Judge Blakey is fully aware of and continued his Bias personal tactical court orders and rulings that benefits the Respondent's throughout the Respondent's Civil Case that the Petitioner believes stated 2016. Before that, the Petitioner had full confidence in the Honorable Judge John Robert Blakey and then the June 12, 2017 Settlement Conference Hearing took place where Judge Blakey resided over, that was bias, unfair for Petitioner, where Petitioner's Court appointed Brian T. Maye and his assistant was threatened, intimidated and bulled by Judge Blakey that cause the Counsel's to shut-down by not continuing with their argument, out of fear of retaliation from higher power (Judge Blakey) their Boss who appointed them (view Petitioners exhibits 28 demand letter from Counsel, ex. 30 letter to Counsel Re: SCH, ex. 60 letter to Counsel Re: SCH)

Respondents' toxic, racist, malice, abusive, irresponsible and recklessness of violations while creating a hostile workplace environment, while engaging in concealing criminal activities, documents, protecting dangerous non-African American employees and refusing to address Petitioners 13 Separate Counts of Allegation such as (a) 18 U.S.C. § 1503 concealing and interfering with a Civil Rights violation investigation and Criminal Investigation etc. of (b) 18 U.S.C. § 1510 Criminal Hate Crime Incidents of "three of the Respondents non-African American employees admitting to Plotting to Kill an African American co-worker, while making two attempts without the Petitioner being aware of about two months of Plotting (c)

Violation of 12 other African Americans Constitutional Rights to Petition etc. and with incidents that involves, Destruction of the Appellee's Corporate Documents, Video Tapes and Records 18 U.S.C. § 1520. Appellee's Tampering with witnesses, evidence and the victim (Appellant & Others) 18 U.S.C. § 1512 and the Appellant's

emphatically made numerous requests for all Parties stated above to prompt or invoke a Civil Rights Investigation into Criminal Hate Crime Incidents 18 U.S.C. § 1510 etc.

Chief Circuit Judge Diane S. Sykes never responded back to "Petitioners' (Pending) motion request for clarification and Justification for the denial of Petitioners motion to request mandate and Petitioners' motion for reconsideration of mandate" dated September 29, 2020 and Petitioners prepared mandate dated and via mailed August 31, 2020.

Court of Appeal Circuit Judges did not respond back to "Petitioners' (Pending) September 29, 2020 motion to preserve evidence".

One of my main reasons for contact you, is regarding the Court of Appeals Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett, to engage in tactical manipulation of unfair justice by the surreptitious and insidious actions making at least two egregious calculating statement by telling the Appellant "the Appellant appears capable of litigating this appeal on his own" even through and despite the Appellant providing to Amy Coney Barrett a copy of the Appellant's Psychiatrist evaluation (dated April 30, 2019) and Therapist/Counselors evaluation (dated October 29, 2019) mental disabilities issues etc., (through Obama Care) before I (the Appellant) filed a motion requesting Legal Counseling (in Appellant's September 29, 2020 motion), for more details, I would like to send you copies of my motion to Amy Coney Barrett that clarifies an distinctive characteristic actions and viewpoints of how she treat individuals with disabilities, incapability's, (PTSD) post-traumatic stress disorder, physical and mental medical conditions that was caused by my ex-employers in the Lawsuit. I would like to send immediately one document that I would hope makes you curious enough to see more. Please view my (the Plaintiff) Civil Case No. 15-cv-06759 and my (the Appellant's) Appeal Case No. 19-2595 for more precise details of why I will fight to the end and make my Civil Case and Appeal Case transparent for the Transparency of Systemic Racist Corrupt Court System, Judges and the criminal Judicial Justice System etc.

My name is Fred Cartwright, when I was unjustifiably terminated in December 2013 from my job for speaking out on a hate crime by three non-African Americans co-workers, whom plotted for about two months to kill me by running me off the road with their cars, while making two attempts without my knowledge of the plot and believed the two attempts was an accident until I

mentioned it in the breakroom, when co-workers who knew about the place made me aware. I was suspended and terminated for not keep my mouth shut and demanding my companies Executives and Supervisors do something about the problem of fearing for my life. The Company's Executives "Falsified Documents", "Lied about having Video Tape that shows me not doing my Job" and no one wanted to investigate anything. While I was on suspension, with the understanding the company was protecting their non-African American employees, I reported it to the police department. The police office contacted one of the bosses and decided that I wanted to long to report the incident and my place of employment stated to them, the problem was solved, and it was hard for me to obtain legal assistance. I filed my case in Federal Court on August 3, 2015 on my own and it was accepted. But no one believed this was possible and I believed they thought I was seeking revenge. I was seeking damages that was caused by the company's actions of Racial discrimination, malice, toxic, reckless abuse and creating a hostile workplace environment etc. After about a year of requesting legal Assistance, I was appointed counsel's whom did not want the case and express their dislike to the presiding Judge and the Judge force them to represent my, that created other issues for me. Appointed counsel would not address the major issues of a Civil Rights Hate Crime and made a poor attempt of contacting my numerous of witnesses etc., along with not addressing and protecting my constitutional first amendment rights to petition and 13 other African American who participated in signing my petition. That was another reason for the company executive suspending me to keep anyone else from signing the petition and participating in their First Amendment Rights etc. My Civil Case 15-cv-06759 was "Erroneously Dismiss" With Prejudice" in June 25, 2019 after I would not cooperate like a slave and continue to be misrepresented by Court's appointed Counsel's and Dereliction of Duty by the Federal Judge whom intimidate and bullied appointed counsel's to quickly get this case off his docket by any means necessary and the Counsel understood who are in charge and has the power of control. The Judge understood what it would take for me to appeal his abusive actions, Dereliction of Duty and Justice. My case would not have lasted this long (5 years) with lies, without undisputed factual evidence, if my allegations can be disputed, denied nor could be argued against and I would have cooperated with their Systemic Racist Corrupt Disease Pandemic within the Civil Justice System and Criminal Judicial Justice System nor bow down to Racist individuals.


4/9

I have Appealed my Civil Case with the Court of Appeal that is also public record of Appeal Case No. 19-2595 that everyone must review as called ("Plaintiff"), ("Appellant") and ("Petitioner") by the Court of Appeals Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett, to engage in tactical manipulation of unfair justice by the surreptitious and insidious actions making at least two egregious calculating statement by telling the Appellant "the Appellant appears capable of litigating this appeal on his own" even through and despite the Appellant providing to Amy Coney Barrett a copy of the Appellant's Psychiatrist evaluation (dated April 30, 2019) and Therapist/Counselors evaluation (dated October 29, 2019) mental disabilities issues etc., (through Obama Care) before and after the Appellant file a motion requesting Legal Counseling (in Petitioner's September 29, 2020 motion), (view ex. 93 dated 9/29/2020,

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date: November 4, 2020