

20-7354

02/10/2021

No. 20-5438

---

---

**IN The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

\_\_\_\_\_  
*In re. Michael Robinson,*


\_\_\_\_\_  
*Petitioner*

ORIGINAL

**ON PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS.**

**-Defendants-**

Northumberland County District Attorney Anthony Matulewicz, the Courts  
of Northumberland County, Shamokin City Administrator Robert Slaby, and  
the City of Shamokin, et al.



Michael Robinson  
66 Buckhorn Rd.  
Bloomsburg, PA 17815

---

---

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The issue here goes *beyond* a miscarriage of justice. It's lower courts' and it's officers as such in this case District Attorney Matulewicz blatant and outright *refusal* to administer justice, when law warrants otherwise; it's contrary to what this court in *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225, 240, (1972) proclaimed, "throws open the doors of the United States courts to those whose rights under the Constitution are denied or impaired",

1. When the doors of the U.S. Courts are willfully, maliciously, and improperly closed to non- influential, self-represented persons, like the disabled petitioner thereby foreclosing (1) a civil forum of justice, and (2) denies petitioner his "day in court", simply because the fraudsters want to protect their own kind via abuse of power, does this court's refusal to intervene and foreclose a civil forum send a disturbing message that the "Las Vegas" kind massacre remains the only avenue for attention/justice?
2. How can a perpetrator/defendant, be also an adjudicator, and worse, be permitted on this court's watch, to corrupt the judicial process? The law profession is clearly incapable of policing its own kind

## LIST OF PARTIES

Northumberland County Court System and District Attorney's office of Anthony Matulewicz, et al. SCOTUS 20-5438

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF PARTIES.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>JURISDICTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>5</b>

INDEX TO APPENDICES.....	5
PROOF OF SERVICE.....	6

**IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

Petitioner respectfully prays for an emergency writ of mandamus as follows.

**JURISDICTION**

Article III of U.S. Constitution, 28 U. S. C. § 1254, §1651, Sup. Ct. Rule 20, Fed Ct. Rule 21a.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

1. 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment "petition the government for a redress of grievances"<sup>1</sup>
2. XIV<sup>th</sup> Amendment, deprive "any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"
3. XIV<sup>th</sup> Amendment, deprive "equal protection of the laws"
4. ADA statute, civil rights statute, 28 U. S. C. § 1981 et seq.,
5. Federal Court Rule 21a. Transfer proceedings to another district due to existing prejudice in current district.

**RELIEF SOUGHT**

A *civil* forum, independent of defendant(s) to adjudicate claim(s) *on merits*, against individuals/entities associated with judicial powers/institutions

**FACTS / STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Pro se, 58 years, single petitioner, knocked federal court's door on denial of my petition. I have been the target of much ongoing prejudice and wrongdoing. Non exhaustive examples include:

1. Defendants are abusing their offices and power to harm me.

2. The Defendants are now doing the same to my witness Joey Leschinskie violating Fed Rule 18 U. S. C. § 1512, which would fall as tampering with a witness.
3. As Pro se I have provided paperwork to the defendants to demand they stop this criminal attack.
4. In Joey Leschinskie's case 2 judges involved (a) Judge John Gembic of Shamokin PA and (b) Judge Michael Toomey of Sunbury PA, have recused themselves and stepped down. They see the conflict and injustice of their involvement. (News Paper articles are proof and are included.)
5. The Defendants are still being able to prosecute me in their own court despite me making it apparent that there has been much prejudice against me over the years as shown in Federal Case 19-3438.
6. I have filed with the Northumberland County's District Attorney's office, the Northumberland County Courts, the Supreme Court of PA, the Judicial Board of misconduct for PA, and the States Attorney General's office and have never once been replied to by any of those listed indicating its being covered up (Papers Included).

### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT**

1. Adequate Relief Cannot Be Obtained In Any Other Forum or From Any Other Court.
  - a. Mandamus appropriate where petitioner "lack adequate alternative means to obtain the relief they seek", *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 309, (1989).
  - b. All attempts to obtain relief, on merits, have been exhausted and proven to be unobtainable in the courts given the cover-up, conflict of interest, fraud on the court, corrupting of the judicial process, et al., there is no other forum, recourse, other than this court, to seek justice. Petitioner simply wants his day in court.
  - c. Both lower courts, Federal Court of Williamsport PA and Federal Appeals court of Philadelphia PA have obstructed justice by shutting the petitioner out, despite petitioner, doing everything necessary to obtain justice on the merits. Both courts summarily dismissed the claims, for no good cause, despite being timely filed.
2. Exceptional Circumstances.

- a. Reason 1 above, abuse and usurpation of judicial power, constitutes as exceptional circumstance, Roche, supra 27. Instances of "clear abuse of discretion," *Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Holland*, 346 U.S. 379, 383, (1953), or conduct amounting to "usurpation of [the judicial] power," *De Beers Consolidated Mines, Ltd. v. United States*, 325 U.S. 212, 217, (1945), to be entitled to issuance of the writ", *Mallard v. US. Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 309, (1989) ("*Mallard*").
- b. Where "circumstance [s] 'inherently results in a complete miscarriage of justice' and 'present(s) exceptional circumstances", a writ must issue, *Davis V. United States*, 417 U.S. 333, 346, (1974).

### CONCLUSION

In this case the lower courts were made fully aware of the Defendant's corruption and continued attacks and threats intended to cause harm to myself. In spite of being made fully aware of this the lower courts allowed the case to be dismissed. If NUC Controlled court will not enforce laws, what good are the laws, and the existence of such courts? Unless this court intervenes, its precedent in *Tennessee v. Lane* (2004) 541 U.S. 509 is "garbaged" by NUC.

This court is the only avenue for seeking attention/justice.

Writ of mandamus, et al., should be granted. Respectfully Submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Michael Robinson

### INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A. Dkt. #1 Evidence of harm committed by Defendants perpetrated against the Plaintiff. SCOTUS # 20-5438
- APPENDIX B. Dkt. #2 Complaints filed properly with no action taken by controlling entities.
- APPENDIX C. Dkt. #3 "Proof of Judicial Inaction" No charges had been brought against the Defendants as of Oct. 16, 2020.

APPENDIX D. Dkt. #4-5 Non Recusal or change of venue by Defendants.

APPENDIX E. Dkt. #1-20 Proof of ongoing harm committed by Defendants against Plaintiff. SCOTUS # 20-5438

APPENDIX F. Dkt. #1-5 Criminal complaint to SCOPA and Board of Judicial Misconduct.

APPENDIX G. Dkt. #1a.-1-3 Reason for writ of certiorari.

APPENDIX H. Dkt. #1-9, 9a-13 Crimes committed on behalf of District Attorney Matulewicz et al.

APPENDIX I. Dkt. # 1-2 Evidence of violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1512 consisting of harassment, intimidation, and tampering of a witness. Joseph Leschinskie SCOTUS # 20-5438

APPENDIX J. Dkt. # 1 Sworn Statement / Private Complaint.

APPENDIX K. Dkts. # 1-2 Letter to John Brown / Sworn Statement.