

5.

PETITIONER'S CERTIFICATION

Petitioner ALBERTO SOALR *under the penalty of perjury* certify that rehearing is restricted to the grounds specified paragraph 2 Rule 44 and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Dated July 7th, 2021

/ALBERTO SOLAR SOMOHANO/



Petitioner

5.

PETITIONER'S CERTIFICATION

Petitioner ALBERTO SOALR *under the penalty of perjury* certify that rehearing is restricted to the grounds specified paragraph 2 Rule 44 and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Dated July 7th, 2021

/ALBERTO SOLAR SOMOHANO/

Petitioner

APPENDIX A

No. 20-7407

In the Supreme Court of the United States

ALBERTO SOLAR-SOMOHANO,
Petitioner

v.

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY-UNITED STATES
Respondents,

*On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit*

MOTION FOR GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE

The Petitioner, ALBERTO SOLAR-SOMOHANO hereby pursuant to *Rule 21* motioning the Court [1] to direct the United States to file a response to the question presented [2] for they have filed a waiver not to answer [3] what the question shows the Court should know the cause led to the appointment problem that *US v. Arthrex* does not resolve only resolved by *Field v. Clark*, through this case the Court is require to take in the first place preserved constitutional challenge objection under *Ryder v. US* [4]

1

Respondents did not consent to the filing of this motion.

2

"Whether the 2002 Intellectual Property High Technology Technical Amendments Act be repealed, missing the section that made the entire act inoperable, and that is why the 2008 Amendment of Titles 35/6 & 15/1067 Act which is why appointment clause problem"

3

United States was bound file response they intervned responding to certified question below that is yet to be decided currently stayed.

4

"We think that one who makes a timely challenge to the constitutional validity of the appointment of an officer who adjudicates his case is entitled to a decision on the merits of the question and whatever relief may be appropriate if a violation indeed occurred"

2.

CONCLUSION

The Court should request the United States to say what they didn't want to say that they did said below that no court have ever said what *Solar-Somohano* constitutional question challenge says before it's too late they raking the Court getting away with *Arthrex* a fake.

Filed May 3rd, 2021

/ALBERTO SOLAR-SOMOHANO/
Petitioner
365 908-8532
solar@coca.life

