

NUMBER 20-7458

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PROMILA RAJPUT, *Petitioner*

Versus

1. TIFFANY TERRELL,
 - i. 9+ million Virginia residents & businesses
 - ii. In re: Promila Rajput
 - iii. In re: Promila Rajput
 - iv. UMFS
 - v. *Et al*
2. SHARON WAKE,
3. RONALD IRVING FOGG,

Respondents

ADMITTED
BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

On COMBINED petition for Writ of Certiorari

To Transfer or To Quash or To Remand All Rulings

FILED
FEB 16 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

To : (1) Supreme Court of Virginia for 4th Circuit; that included (2) its Judicial Districts

COMBINED PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Rule 12.4 USSC *Promila Rajput*
2/27/21

Respectfully submitted on 16 February, 2021 by

Promila Rajput

Promila Rajput
Self-represented Petitioner

Cell: 804 968 9026

Add: 3404 S Street, Richmond, VA 23223

Email: promila.rajput.11@gmail.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Rule 14.1(a)

If the system does not provide adequate measures to address culpability, the injunctive rulings as to why; how; 'when entered' manifest improper purpose to tamper with me presenting as witness to legal system to diminish by trickery my secured rights and privileges guarded by this court, in an act of retaliation meant to conceal misconduct of court and related officers ONLY by taking shield of 9+ million population to make them act against their own welfare [like my son by CNN, Arlington DHS, KIF, & UMFS, by *Tort of Conversion* - an act of fraud by misusing to make legal statements on behalf of 9+ million population involving minors without justification, consent, publication or notice affecting their secured rights, privileges, then the actions not to provide adequate measures constitute egregious abuse of discretion and office.

Arlington's GDC judge Karen Hanenberg's illegal 2/6/12 injunctive order moots itself nunc pro tunc in Appendix F pg s37-43 for (a) conflict because she initially presided over my divorce matters in Fairfax from 1997-2003, (b) in 2012 Arlington exceeding, lacking and unconstitutional jurisdiction that was of the Supreme Court's designate judge only because opposing parties were public officers, and (c) any standing of Arlington assistant county attorney and AG's civil litigation attorneys as petitioners. This action was mirrored in Jan & Mar 2019 by hon judge Ms. McCleaney in Fogg's case from Richmond district court, by hon judge Mr. Jenkins in 8&9&12/19 from Richmond circuit; hon judge Mr. Hewitt in '15 Fredericksburg and hon judge Mr. Chuckers in '16 in Henrico.

QUESTION # 1 - This petition questions judge Hanenberg's mental condition and why not be removed and barred from any government job of trust in any capacity whatsoever, to include from subbing DC courts or facilitating Virginia Supreme Court by masking her corrupt mind functioning, and apparent danger and threat to the public as a whole.

Under investigation by a special prosecutor, after CA Todder concluded "significant" conflict, serving DC & Virginia Supreme Court, on 2/6/12 judge Hanenberg extorted money for filing fees from me and never conducted a trial on the matters that were paid. Fraudulently entered injunctive order on 2/6/12 as bribe to people in her own field of profession without having jurisdiction because of conflict with the defendants equally corrupt actors - Esther Wiggins, Jason McCandless, *et al*, authority of designate judge only from Supreme Court, that judge Hanenberg usurped by deceit, deception and exploitation of your petitioner without representation assaulting me from bench : *"Don't say anything"*. In totality renders 2/6/12 order fraud *nunc pro tunc* for this court to unequivocally quash or command transfer, or remain for full trial.

QUESTION # 2 - Why this court must not grant exemplary damages of \$9,000,000 from Karen Hanenberg/Arlington/ABC/CNN/Renae Steel for destruction they put in motion actively contributed that my son and I face to date. Had she not tampered with us then, we would not have been destroyed nor our lives at stake today by ABC/CNN/Arlington DHS's RICO agents. She doesn't care for the public nor has any scant care for human life.

When I compared Mr. Fogg - my former employer, had 68 filings in one same jurisdiction - Richmond, all employment-related [self admitted 10/15/19], to 5 filings I had,

it verified I was attacked with injunctive ruling, a weapon judge Cann and Samuel Towell AG's office who concealed themselves, nor serving me with petition, or any hearing, applied to retaliate on 7/18/19, to insulate 7/10/19 claim to falsify court documents, conceal misconduct by extortion to falsely malign me, filed against Ms. Hensley, independent contractor in AG's office, *representing Ms. Terrell & Ms. Wake deputy clerks in Richmond district court to falsify court records, conspire in coordinated effort [admitted 9/4/19], to maliciously harm me as a desired outcome to tamper with me.*

QUESTION # 3 - This petition questions the mental state of Mr. Towell/AG's office, without due process, or standing, this 7/18/19 injunctive order be quashed.

Next, in civil matters where statutes and rules are violated and damages are involved, public and related officers do not get lawyers from the Attorney General's office, known to historically misappropriate government funds in this manner.

QUESTION # 4 - This petition questions AG's representation for Ms. Terrell & Ms. Wake by Ms. Hensley, independent contractor, must be removed because insurance does not make provision for civil action for violation of statutes and rules involving damages.

It is clearly known that the government does not represent contractors, or else would be representing landscapers, cleaners, plumbers, electricians, because independent contractors are mandated to carry their own insurance.

QUESTION # 5 - This petition questions AG's representation for Attorney Hensley an independent contractor in AG's office by Ms. McNeill must be removed for a reason that Ms. Hensley is mandated to carry her own insurance; thus waste of government money.

The above seems to be happening under Samuel Towell's direct consent as head
of civil litigation misusing and exploiting the office of the Attorney General of Virginia.

QUESTION # 6 - Questions immediate removal and punish Samuel Towell, Deputy AG, Civil Litigation, acting as a RICO proxy in gross misconduct of malicious prosecution, pursuing me, fraud, waste abuse of government resources for personal interests, political benefits to conceal misconduct by extorting me using legal means to abuse me, bring us to question of "Inequality" in application of laws by AG's office-civil, this court punishes.

QUESTION # 7 - This petition questions why not AG's civil litigation pay us exemplary damages of \$9,000,000.

AG's office blows a horn of "public interest" and "human rights". In context, I was referred by the local police. Every time, from Human Rights department, fraudulently, Mr. Timothy L. Wilson, Admin/Ops Manager, appears before me as an alternate reality, threatens me : "We don't represent public; leave; I will call capitol police to arrest you."
When questioned 'human rights department', he responds, "It is for our people only"

QUESTION # 8 - This petition questions Mr. Wilson's continued employment and the necessity for punishment and immediate removal from AG's office.

QUESTION # 9 - Whether court's rulings constituted an abuse of discretion requiring reversal of all of the judgements below for reasons of constitutional deprivations of due process, redress from government, equal application of law to violate rules of conduct for conflict, jurisdictional authority, standing of petitioners, clandestine extrajudicial comments to enter injunction, prejudicial dismissal orders prohibited in civil cases.

QUESTION # 10 - Whether review must happen only if a ruling on merits exists. Thereby placing commands of notice below to set aside their personal policies, conduct mandatory trial, refrain from injunctive rulings on behalf of silent/non-parties who don't receive motion/petition for injunctive relief hidden by deception violating V4 Code 8.01-249(1), no publication to the effect, by Tort of Conversion illegally claiming ownership of non-parties affecting their rights and privileges against their interests.

QUESTION # 11 - Whether it is proper to apply a defective and particularized injunction to insulate public and related officers who act personally by abrogating their oath.

QUESTION # 12 - Whether injunctions must be applied as exemption from culpability to insulate public and related officers by extortion of grieving party resulting in apparent 'inequality' unequivocally repudiated by the constitution and guarded by this court.

QUESTION # 13 - Why Devanshi Patel is not incarcerated and removed permanently from any job of trust dealing with government and public, for threatening, mentally torturing me to sign to give up and relinquish my son to CNN/Arlington DHS/Hillary Clinton/Nancy Pelosi/Jason McCandless in exchange for dropping Arlington DHS case who gave a release and closed on 5/13/11. Patel is now director Arlington Bar.

QUESTION # 14 - Why Heather Stowe is not incarcerated and removed permanently from any job involving government and public, for mentally torturing me : "We will never return your son." . Stowe now is with the DC Aging Department.

QUESTION # 15 - Questions mental derangement of Sherri Brothers and why she is not yet incarcerated and removed permanently from any job involving the government and public for falsifying court document licking my private part.

QUESTION # 16 - Questions mental derangement of Deborah Olin and why she is not yet incarcerated and removed permanently from any job involving the government and public for falsifying court document because Deborah Olin did sodomy. Olin did not show blood, nor hospital treatment.

QUESTION # 17 - Questions mental derangement of Jason McCandless and why he is not yet incarcerated, removed permanently from any job involving the government and public for malicious prosecution kidnapping, trafficking of my minor son, despite Arlington DHS closed all cases on 5/13/11 as lawyer for CNN & RICO agents by fraud concealing exculpatory evidence and falsifying and concealing multiple court documents 4/28/11. Battery upon me in 3/13 to physically kidnapped me to Arlington from Henrico by falsifying failure to appear for a hearing when there was none, inciting Henrico police custody violation when Ann Poates testimony provee none, and then when in Arlington manipulating extortion of money from me for child support when there was none. But all this didn't matter - the idea was to drag me to Arlington. Mentally tortured me and my son by depriving any minimal human contact to tamper with us. Incited on 1/8/14 to intercept and re-direct to Henrico police my gift and letter to my adult son. With no standing or jurisdiction from Arlington filed a false police report against me on 1/9/14 in Henrico that I laid on Robin's bed and Robin somehow licked my private parts.

QUESTION # 18 - Questions mental derangement of judge Esther Wiggins and why she is not yet in prison acknowledging abuse stated in court's recorded hearing :

"THIS IS COLD BLOOD." Kidnapped and trafficked us, manhandled and ill-treated us, with malicious prosecution despite Arlington DHS closed the cases on 5/13/11. Failed to conduct any trial and incarcerate Sanjay Altekar, Geeta Dubey, Sherri Brothers, Martha Stewart, Kamia McKenzie, Jason McCandless, Deborah Olin, Nader Hasan.

QUESTION # 19 - Questions mental condition of general assembly members to reappoint Esther Wiggins in January 2011, despite serious evidence supporting lives destroyed by the TRIO - Wiggins-McCandless-Olin.

QUESTION # 20 - What right does Hillary Clinton have to incite and encourage her CNN, RICO, DHS agents that my son *"needs a village to raise"* who was a young adult 16 years old when kidnapped by her DHS agents in a coordinated effort and refused to return. Look what she did to my son - unemployable, terminated education, altered image, psychological scars not accounted for, alienation from me, horrific emotional rape of any minimal human contact among each of us., making false statements on behalf of my son.

QUESTION # 21 - In light, whether this court will restore our economic development by reinstating all our rights, privileges, to include the purge of all derogatory records that are FALSE since 2011, as a resulted by fraud PLANTED since 2011 to tamper, to include unifications, to include voting rights, to include 2nd amendment rights, to include travel rights snatched by fraud, to include economic development, to include to be secure in our home, to include immigration citizenship for me.

PARTIES TO PROCEEDING & RELATED CASES

Rule 14.1(b) (i) & (iii)

PROMILA RAJPUT,

PETITIONER

Versus

RESPONDENTS :-

COMBINED SCV 191598

1. TIFFANY TERRELL, Complaint - *Circuit CL19-3415; GV19-9607 Appendix A*
 - i. To The Circuit Court of City of Richmond, Virginia *Appendix A*
9+ million Virginia residents & businesses, CL19-3415,
Judgement entered on 8/23/19 amended on 9/3/19
 - ii. To The General District Court of City of Richmond, Virginia *Appendix C*
In Re: Promila Rajput, no # assigned. Judgement entered 7/18/19
 - iii. To The General District Court of Henrico, Virginia *Appendix D*
In Re: Promila Rajput no # assigned. Judgement entered 4/4/16
 - iv. To The Circuit Court of Fredericksburg, Virginia *In Appendix E*
UMFS v Promila Rajput - CL16-388; Judgement entered 7/20/15
 - v. To The General District Court of Arlington, Virginia *Appendix F*
Et al v. Promila Rajput no # assigned; Judgement entered 2/6/12
2. SHARON WAKE, Complaint - *Circuit # CL-19-3806; GV19-0050 - Appendix A*

COMBINED SCV 200081

3. RONALD IRVING FOGG, *Appendix B*
 - i. Warrant in Debt Appeal from general district court *GV #19-012875,*
[underlying matters not addressed in GV180404332],
to Richmond Circuit court # CL-19-2573
 - ii. Complaint - *Richmond Circuit court CL-19-3172*

DECLARATION FOR RELATED CASES

Rule 14.1(b)(i)

I reserve my right to make the next instalment payment and combine if any other pending unrelated case emerges like RICO racket facing similar fate, because they are lumped up illegally by Arlington's judge Karen Hanenberg and Richmond's judge Jenkins under SCV 191598.

Respectfully submitted on 16 February, 2021 by _____



Promila Rajput
Self-represented Petitioner
Cell: 804 968 9026
Add: 3404 S Street, Richmond, VA 23223
Email: promila.rajput.11@gmail.com

PRECEDENCE OFFERED

1. Laws for extrajudicial written or spoken comments that are agreements prior or after proceeding like judge Jenkins voice recorded, or illegitimately sealed in the case file, because there are controversies surrounding such behavior, leaving themselves liable to accusations of bias and having their decisions overturned, that interfere in the performance of judicial duties, particularly when there is room for improvement in the area of administration of justice as we see herein.
2. Separate powers of the judiciary from General Assembly members, Attorney General's office, Commonwealth's Attorneys, police department, County Attorneys, and other related officers, as we see herein telling the judges how to do their job - an outright insult of their sanity, an evidence of RICO racket for political maneuvering, detrimental to any person.
3. Term limits judicial district judges in general district courts and circuit courts, for failing to set aside their personal policies.
4. Prohibit general assembly to re-appoint judicial district judges, to further prevent failure of judicial district judges to set aside their personal policies.
5. Prohibit injunctive rulings by statute, as they abridge substantive rights and privileges by *Tort of Conversion* claiming ownership of unrepresented national population against their interest and welfare, without first serving whose rights are at stake under particularized petitioners' personal interests and political benefits. It is outright fraud, assault on nation's population as totalitarian regime.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page #s</u>
I. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
 <u>Opinions from conspiratorial rhetoric</u>	
applied to wilfully create false legal court	
documents are not protected speeches	1
 <u>For such compelling reasons</u>	
★ <u>Judgements below are illegal, obligating this court to</u>	
command below to transfer or quash with exemplary damages...	2
★ <u>Restore our rights and privileges</u>	2
II. OPINIONS	2
III. JURISDICTION	4
IV. STATUTORY PROVISIONS.	4
 <u># 1 BASIS TO HOLDING OFFERED - <i>At bar</i> 8/23/19 injunctive order</u>	
amended on 9/3/19 in SCV 191598 <i>Rajput v Terrell</i>	4
 <u># 2 BASIS TO HOLDING OFFERED - <i>At bar</i> renewed 2/6/12 injunctive</u>	
order from Arlington General District Court	5
 <u>Congress's attention is cited to judicial misconduct</u>	
USSC's decision <i>Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council</i>	
vacated injunction for failure of qualifications	6
<i>Thornton v Commonwealth</i> withheld material fact	7
 <u><i>Chilton-Belloni v. Angle</i> all remedies not exhausted, abused discretion...</u>	
<i>Supreme court of Virginia Rule 1:6(a)</i> must decide all matters on merits...	7

<u>Supreme court of Virginia Rule 1:1(b)</u> order final if all causes addressed...	7
<u>Gamble v. United States</u> , the case on the scope of double jeopardy ...	7
<u>Courts have their traditional equitable discretion only by law</u> ...	8
A. <u>Jurisdiction</u> of hon Judge Jenkins, Richmond circuit court ...	8
B. <u>Standing</u> of Ms. Terrell, deputy clerk, and counsel Ms. Hensley ...	11
C. Judiciary not to settle <u>hypothetical</u> disagreements ...	13
D. This court also sees factors around <u>equal application of laws</u> ...	14
V. STATEMENT OF THE CASES ...	15
Asserted errors consists ...	15
Appendix F Arlington GDC, <i>Et al v. Promila Rajput</i> ...	16
Appendix E Fredericksburg circuit, <i>UMFS v Promila Rajput</i> ...	17
Appendix D Henrico GDC, <i>In Re: Promila Rajput</i> ...	18
Appendix C Richmond GDC, <i>In Re: Promila Rajput</i> ...	19
Appendix B Richmond circuit, <i>Rajput v Fogg</i> ...	19
Appendix A City of Richmond, <i>Rajput v Terrell & Wake...</i> ...	21
VI. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT ...	22
VII. STANDARD ...	23
VIII. CONCLUSION ...	24
DECLARATION ...	24

INDEX OF APPENDICES

Rule 14.1(i)

Appendix A - City of Richmond COMBINED SCV 191598

<u>Promila Rajput v (1) Tiffany Terrell; (2) Sharon Wake</u>	21
<i>Two GDC 6/5/19 disqualification order hon Judge Cann</i>	<i>1.a. & 2.a.</i>
<i>Two GDC 6/5/19 Clerk Blount deceived Hon Justice Lemons</i>	<i>3.a. & 4.a.</i>
<i>Two SCV 6/11/19 flawed orders extracted deceiving Hon Justice Lemons</i>	<i>5.a. & 6.a.</i>
<i>GDC 6/24/19 receipt \$3 review, copy concealed request, 6/5&11/19 orders</i>	<i>7.a.</i>
<i>GDC 7/1/19 procedurally flawed letter to hon judges to fix designation</i>	<i>8.a.</i>
<i>CC 8/15/19 Recusal order of then chief judge Taylor - in Wake</i>	<i>9.a.</i>
<i>CC 8/20/19 Disqualification of hon judge Rupe - in Wake</i>	<i>10.a.</i>
<u><i>CC 8/23/19 Injunctive Order in controversy</i></u>	<i>11.a. to 12.a.</i>
<u><i>CC Deletes disclosure Pt.5 Amends 8/23/19 Order 9/3/19 in controversy</i></u>	<i>13.a. & 14.a.</i>
<i>Two CC 9/4/19 orders dismissing with prejudice</i>	<i>15.a.</i>
<i>CC 9/25/19 recusal order of judge Jenkins</i>	<i>16.a.</i>
<i>Two CC 9/30/19 orders dismissing rehearing</i>	<i>17.a.</i>
<i>CC 10/15/19 disqualification order of all circuit court judges</i>	<i>18.a.</i>
<i>SCV 10/1/20 Order refusing appeal</i>	<i>19.a.</i>
<i>SCV 2/5/21 Order deny rehearing</i>	<i>20.a.</i>

Appendix B - City of Richmond COMBINED SCV 200081

<u>Promila Rajput v Ronald I Fogg</u>	19
<i>Two pages GDC 3/7/19 order</i>	<i>21.b. & 21.1.b.</i>
<i>Five pages GDC 5/10/19 order</i>	<i>22.b. To 25.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 8/7/19 orders continuing to 9/3/19</i>	<i>26.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 10/17/19 dismissal orders</i>	<i>27.b. & 27.1.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 11/25/19 denying rehearing</i>	<i>28.b. & 28.1.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 12/9/19 orders to file Fogg's matter proves injunction applied...</i> 29.b. & 29.1.b.	
<i>SCV 10/5/20 order refusing appeal, Rajput v Fogg. SCV 200081</i>	<i>30.b.</i>
<i>SCV 2/5/21 order denying rehearing, Rajput v Fogg. SCV 200081</i>	<i>31.b.</i>

RENEWED UNDER SCV 191598 - Appendix A

<u>Appendix C</u> - To General District Court City of Richmond Virginia	19
<i>Two pages Judgement 7/18/19; <u>In Re: Promila Rajput</u>; No number assigned ...</i> 32.c. & 33.c.	
<u>Appendix D</u> - To The General District Court of Henrico, Virginia	18
<i>Judgement 4/4/16; <u>In Re: Promila Rajput</u>; No number assigned...</i> ...	<i>34.d.</i>
<u>Appendix E</u> - To The Circuit Court of City of Fredericksburg, Virginia ...	17
<i>Two pages Judgement 7/20/15; <u>UMFS v Promila Rajput</u>; CL-16-388</i> ...	<i>35.e. & 36.e.</i>
<u>Appendix F</u> - To The General District Court of Arlington, Virginia	16
<i>Seven pages Judgement 2/6/12; <u>Et al v. Promila Rajput</u>; No # assigned ...</i>	<i>37.f. to 43.f.</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page #s</u>
<u>CASE LAWS</u>	
<i>Caldwell v. Texas : "...no State can deprive particular persons or classes of persons of equal and impartial justice under the law."...</i>	... 14
<i>Chilton-Belloni v. Angle</i> Virginia Supreme Court ruled all remedies were not exhausted thus was an error by abuse of judge's discretion...	... 7
<i>Gamble v. United States</i> :: for double jeopardy stare decisis is rejected	... 7
<i>Thornton v. Commonwealth</i> Virginia Supreme Court held judge abused discretion in denying continuance after the party found out fact concealed by Commonwealth	... 7
<i>Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</i> , 129 S.Ct. 365 (2008) injunction vacated for failure to meet all four threshold factors	... 6
<i>Stone v. Alley</i> , 240 Va. 162, 392 S.E.2d 486 (1990) it was an error for circuit court not to hear evidence	... 9

STATUTES & RULES

CANONS

<i>Canon 1.A. biased egregiously abused his discretion and office</i> ...	6,9,10
<i>Canon 2.A. failing to apply law</i>	6,8,9
<i>Canons 3C(b) failing to disqualify in Terrell's case</i>6,9

CONSTITUTION

<u>Article III courts adjudicate actual controversies</u>	
<i>not act on hypothetical</i> 8,13
<u>1st Amendment restricts carte blanche doctrine to abuse ethics</u>	
<i>and partisan abuse of process, coordination; and those opinions</i>	
<i>that are translated into writings in legal court documents are</i>	
<i>not protected speeches</i> 13
<u>1st Amendment protects speech and to petition to government</u>	
<i>for redress of grievances...</i> 1,4,5,8,11,12,16
<u>14th Amendment protecting due process to all persons</u>	... 4,5,7,8,11,12,16,19

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES

<u>15.3 - Any 9+ million Virginia entities taking any position to or</u>	
<i>for denial of this petition must file a response with this court,</i>	
<i>and copy to me, failing which will not qualify for relief,</i>	
<i>mandating this court to quash all rulings below</i> 23
<u>29 - Notice to the clerk of this court regarding fraudulently presented</u>	
<i>and maliciously misused 9+ million Virginia entities by respective</i>	
<i>petitioners of injunctive rulings</i> attached
<u>39 - Petitioner is proceeding in part for \$200 with in forma pauperis</u>	attached

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT STATUTES

<u>28 USC §1251 (b)(3) USSC's original jurisdiction by virtue of alien ...</u>	1,2,4,8,15
<u>28 USC §1253 USSC's jurisdiction from 3 justice panel of the last state court...</u>	4
<u>28 USC §1746(2) Declaration</u> 24

VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT RULES

<u>1:1(b) requires to conclude all matters for the order to be a final order...</u>	7
<u>1:6(a) res judicata applies only IF a matter is decided on merits</u>	... 7
<u>7B:3 bars alternate parties</u> 12
<u>Professional Conduct Part 6 § I(2) prohibits to submit legal documents affecting rights of others</u> 12

VIRGINIA STATUTE CODES

<u>§2.2-3900 Human Rights Act</u> 1,2,14,15,23
<u>§.01-4 cannot create rules to abridge secured rights and privileges</u>	... 12,22
<u>§§.01-40 Privacy violation</u> 12
<u>§§.01-249(1) deception mislead & concealing exculpatory evidence</u>	... 1,6,14
<u>§§.01-249(3) deceit to cause me to accept true jurisdiction to contrary.</u>	1,4,6,14
<u>§16.1-69.40 district clerk duties; and civil liability</u> 21
<u>§17.1-105(B) no circuit judge had any authority to preside</u> 8
<u>§18.2-420 extrajudicial/clandestine activity depriving due process</u>	... 10,18
<u>§19.2-153 mandated by Virginia Supreme Court to designate judge</u>	... 8
<u>§54.1-3904 mandates law license</u> 11

OTHER

ARTICLE

The Federalist No. 78, 464 (C. Rossiter ed. 2003) (A. Hamilton) ... 12

DOCTRINES

Carte blanche - freedom to speak what you want to abuse the
ethics process involving deliberate and partisan abuse of process... 13

Equal Justice Under Law - for power of judicial review, who have the
power to deny equal application of law by ignoring rule of law ... 14

One person one vote consent, proof of service to each
9+ million Virginia residents and businesses to extract injunction ... 24

Rule of Law to eliminate 'inequality' everyone is bound to the
same laws for deeds done in body 4,5,8,11,15

Tort of Conversion claiming ownership of other people 1,2,13

JURISPRUDENCE

Mitchie's Jurisprudence 1:1 ineffective orders are void ab initio ... 5,21

**I. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO TRANSFER OR QUASH INJUNCTIVE RULINGS BELOW**

Rules 14.1(c); 33.1(d); & 33.1(g)(i); and 39 in forma pauperis (in part)

UNDER authority and power of this honorable court as protector of fundamental rights and privileges, otherwise it has no meaning, your undersigned petitioner, an uninterrupted alien since 1995 in Virginia, and her son, a biological natural born U.S. Citizen, requests review of rulings by courts below for stripping us of family unit, sovereignty, human dignity, education, livelihood, peace, be secure in our homes, normal human development, and pursuit of happiness. Such secured rights and privileges cannot be curtailed because they are constitutionally protected, unless in an emergency, that there was none. For such reason constitution punishes the actors by analyzing failure of secured due process mandatory in civil proceedings, a violation of Amendment 14, by trickery interfere in Amendment 1 for redress with intent to silence us by hiding exculpatory evidence, invalidate reporting, exploitation being unrepresented, and no legal knowledge that these public and related officers would not apply if in our place:-

- a. Deceitful 'Conflict', 'Exceeding', 'Lack', 'Unconstitutional' jurisdiction of judges.
- b. Deceptive 'Lack' of standing of petitioners void of any one of four mandatory factors to extract injunctive relief used as weapon of deflection to tamper with us.

Opinions from conspiratorial rhetoric applied to wilfully create false legal court documents are not protected by 1st Amendment speeches made with all efforts to claim ownership over my son by Tort of Conversion, a constitutional fraud to invade our home by exceeding duty and abuse of discretion, requiring higher degree of discretion.

For such compelling reasons:-

- ★ Judgements below are illegal, obligating this court to command below (a) transfer records for review of violation of natural justice; or (b) quash all rulings below, for malicious prosecution cases ended by Arlington DHS 5/13/11, misusing 9+ million entities by *Tort of Conversion* claiming their ownership by fraud of concealing injunctive motion/petition from 9+ million entities, against their own welfare affecting their secured rights, because it is particularized for personal interest and political benefits of injunctive petitioners; or (c) remand for full trial on merits.
- ★ Restore our secured rights and privileges to redress, due process, equality in application of law, to travel, sovereignty, economic development, be secure in our homes, 2nd amendment, vote, pursuit of happiness, normal human development, family nurturing, and immigration, purge crimes PLANTED by ABC/CNN's Soledad O'Brian's agents to seize our rights and privileges by trickery, making a HATE CRIME due deep bias exploiting my alien status.

II. OPINIONS

1. SCV 191598 - Rajput v Terrell; & Wake - Richmond Circuit - Appendix A

<i>Two GDC 6/5/19 disqualification order hon Judge Cann</i>	1.a. & 2.a.
<i>Two GDC 6/5/19 Clerk Blount deceived Hon Justice Lemons</i>	3.a. & 4.a.
<i>Two SCV 6/11/19 flawed orders extracted deceiving Hon Justice Lemons...</i>	5.a.	&	6.a.	
<i>GDC 6/24/19 receipt \$3 review, copy concealed request, 6/5&11/19 orders</i>	...	7.a.		
<i>GDC 7/1/19 procedurally flawed letter to hon judges to fix designation</i>	...	8.a.		
<i>CC 8/15/19 Recusal order of then chief judge Taylor - in Wake...</i>	9.a.	

<i>CC 8/20/19 Disqualification of hon judge Rupe - in Wake...</i>	<i>10.a.</i>
<i><u>CC 8/23/19 Injunctive Order in controversy</u></i>	<i>11.a. to 12.a.</i>
<i><u>CC Deletes disclosure Pt.5 Amends 8/23/19 Order 9/3/19 in controversy</u>... 13.a.&14.a.</i>	
<i>Two CC 9/4/19 orders dismissing with prejudice</i>	<i>15.a.</i>
<i>CC 9/25/19 recusal order of judge Jenkins</i>	<i>16.a.</i>
<i>Two CC 9/30/19 orders dismissing rehearing</i>	<i>17.a.</i>
<i>CC 10/15/19 disqualification order of all circuit court judges</i>	<i>18.a.</i>
<i>SCV 10/1/20 Order refusing appeal</i>	<i>19.a.</i>
<i>SCV 2/5/21 Order deny rehearing</i>	<i>20.a.</i>
2. SCV 200081 - <u>Rajput v Fogg - Richmond Circuit - Appendix B</u>	
<i>Two pages GDC 3/7/19 order</i>	<i>21.b. & 21.1.b.</i>
<i>Five pages GDC 5/10/19 order</i>	<i>22.b. To 26.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 8/7/19 orders continuing to 9/3/19</i>	<i>26.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 10/17/19 dismissal orders</i>	<i>27.b. & 27.1.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 11/25/19 denying rehearing</i>	<i>28.b. & 28.1.b.</i>
<i>Two CC 12/9/19 orders to file Fogg's matter proves injunction applied... 29.b. & 29.1.b.</i>	
<i>SCV 10/5/20 order refusing appeal, Rajput v Fogg. SCV 200081</i>	<i>30.b.</i>
<i>SCV 2/5/21 order denying rehearing, Rajput v Fogg. SCV 200081</i>	<i>31.b.</i>
3. No # assigned - <u>In Re Promila Rajput Richmond GDC Appendix C</u> 7/18/19...32.c.,33.c.	
4. No # assigned - <u>In Re: Promila Rajput - Henrico GDC - Appendix D</u> 4/4/16... 34.d.	
5. CL-15-388 - <u>UMFS v P.Rajput, Fredericksburg Circuit, Appendix E</u> 7/20/15...35.e.,36.e.	
6. No # assigned - <u>Et al v. Promila Rajput, Arlington GDC, Appendix F</u> 2/6/12...37.f. - 43.f.	

III. JURISDICTION

On Oct 1 & 5, 2020 Supreme Court of Virginia refused reviews from circuit court's rulings, which renewed rulings from Arlington, Fredericksburg, Henrico, and GDC of City of Richmond, denying both rehearings on February 5, 2021.

Per clerk of this honorable court, petition is postmarked within 150 days.

This court has jurisdiction under 28 USC Sections - 1251 (b)(3) original jurisdiction for alien; and 1253 three justice panel of the last state court.

IV. STATUTORY PROVISIONS

At bar 8/23/19 injunctive order, at bar amended on 9/3/19 in SCV 191598 Rajput v Terrell, to circuit court of Richmond, for review of *Equal Application of Law, 1st & 14th Amdts*:-

1 BASIS TO HOLDING OFFERED - Appendix A, pages 1.a to 20.a.

On 8/15/19 then chief judge Taylor & judge Rupe on 8/20/19 recused themselves from Wake's case, but deceitfully did not from Terrell's case, also their mandatory duty, because both Wake & Terrell are deputy clerks.. establishing judge Jenkins lacked jurisdiction. Thus exceeded his authority with intent to injure my rights secured by 1st Amendment for redress.

These recusals came prior 8/23/19 injunctive order judge Jenkins entered violating jurisdiction knew petitioners lacked standing because he deleted Pt 5 amended 9/3/19, violating 14th Amendment depriving due process to favor people in same field mooting all orders *ab initio* ending controversy with inequality in rule of law.

AT BAR RENEWED 2/6/12 injunctive order *Et al v. Promila Rajput*

To Arlington GDC to review gross fraud of conflict, inequality due bias in *Equal application of Law; 1st Amendment and 14th Amendment; filing fee extortion.*

2 BASIS TO HOLDING OFFERED - Appendix F, pages 37.f. to 43.f

Judge Hanenberg¹ now substitute judge in District Courts in Virginia, Facilitator Judge in Virginia Judicial Performance Evaluation Program, and Virginia Supreme Court certified mediator manifests a history of corrupt behavior. In context, judge Hanenberg concealed conflict from Fairfax presiding over my 1997 divorce proceedings. In 2012 in Arlington presided by usurping authority of Supreme Court designate judge because defendants are public officers, renders 2/6/12 injunctive order void *ab initio* by *Mitchie's Jurisdiction 1:1* fraud orders, injuring my secured rights and privileges for redress by 1st & 14th Amdts to due process. Even paid claims did not get trial to favor people in same field corroding Equal Application of Laws due to mal-adaptive behaviors by violating Canons : 3C(b) mandating disqualification; 2.A. failing to apply laws; 1.A. allowing prejudice to interfere and any scant care for me.

¹ QUOTE : The professional relationship between Falls Church City Manager David R. Lasso and his wife, who is now an Arlington County district judge - Karen Hanenberg, is being investigated by a special prosecutor after Commonwealth's Attorney Richard E. Trodden concluded that there are "*significant questions*" about a possible conflict of interest, served as a part-time instructor for the Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy trains Northern Virginia police officers. Trodden also asked a county judge to appoint an independent prosecutor to examine allegations that Falls Church police officers may have defrauded the city by filing inaccurate time-cards about two years ago. : UNQUOTE

Congress's attention is cited to judicial constitutional misconduct by violations of :-

- VA Code 8.01-249(1) deception to mislead me to their lack of jurisdiction, knowingly hiding lack of standing of petitioners, and propagating political agenda.
- VA Code 8.01-249(3) deceit to cause me to accept true their jurisdiction to contrary.
- Professional conduct to exploit us unrepresented, and escalate exploitation by taking advance of my son with no legal knowledge.
- Canons 3C(b) failing to disqualify from cases for lack of jurisdiction.
- Canon 2.A. failing to apply laws of disqualification, refrain from deception, deceit, exploiting us.
- Canon 1.A. egregious abuses of discretion and office by exceeding their duty, as a result maliciously harass me to date, interfering in natural justice this court guards.

U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council Inc.*, a party seeking a preliminary injunction must satisfy all four of the traditional tests; thus injunction was vacated.

In context, no petitioner in any Arlington, Fredericksburg, Henrico, Richmond's district or circuit courts, satisfied any one of four mandatory factors, further grossly failed in standing to affect secured rights and privileges of 9+ million Virginia entities, nor did any judiciary met jurisdictional authority to address the case before them, under false pretense of 9+ million entities, denying us due process by concealing exculpatory evidence, doctoring evidence, hijacking trial on merits to conceal egregious misconduct of Sherri Brothers, Deborah Olin, Nader Hasan, Veronique Grice and Sheila Furey, Jason

McCandless, Kamia McKenzie, Martha Stewart, malicious harassment prosecution; egregious robbery of family and sovereignty by Arlington's attorney Devanshi Patel [now director of Bar Council] : *"SIGN and give up your son to them in exchange for dropping the case"*. Heather Stowe : *"We will never return your son."* Thus this court will quash, or commands transfer, or remand for full trial on merits, with exemplary damages.

In Thornton v Commonwealth withheld material fact. In context district judges below withheld material fact of their lack of jurisdiction, injunctive petitioners withheld lack of standing, lawyers exculpatory evidence, manifesting constitutional misconduct.

In Chilton-Belloni v. Angle all remedies were not exhausted, thus abused discretion was determined by the Supreme Court of Virginia. But did not hold the same for us - judge Hanenberg, judge Feeley, judge Wiggins, judge Hewitt, judge Chuckers, judge McCleaney, judge cann, judge Carrico, judge Jenkins did not conclude matters and exhaust all remedies. Thus verifies constitutional violation of 14th Amdt of process.

In addition, supreme court of Virginia Rule 1:6(a) res judicata applies only IF a matter is decided on merits. In context, in Mr. Fogg's case Section 4 of my bill was not addressed by judge McCleaney for conflict, lacked jurisdiction, failure to defer. Judge Carrico lacked jurisdiction, thus failed objective trial in Terrell & Wake cases.

Furthermore, supreme court of Virginia Rule 1:1(b) also mandates : IF ALL causes are addressed then it is a final order. In context, not a single order is a final order from Arlington to Richmond, as they relate to objectively addressing the merits.

In Gamble v. United States, the case on the scope of double jeopardy, there, Thomas rejects stare decisis for both, constitutional/statutory cases, so must this court.

In context, Arlington conspired with UMFS conspired with Fredericksburg. Arlington conspired with Henrico conspired with Richmond for unworthy injunctive reliefs in controversy in a DERANGED SPREE to conceal egregious misconduct with defective stare decisis originating in Arlington by corrupt judge Hanenberg who put a nail in our foreheads, lacking interpretation of written laws, caused a domino jeopardy upon us, which were decided incorrectly by assault on the constitution of our secured rights, protection to redress, and equal application of law, exploitation of your petitioner for being alien, clearly manifests supporting RICO activity for CNN/ABC's perversion.

Courts have traditional equitable discretion but just cannot do so by violating our constitutionally secured duties, obligations, rights and privileges by *1st Amendment to redress from government, protected by 14th Amendment through due process, and by protection of 'Equal Application of Laws'*, less, raises 'inequality', because of being alien.

In context this court analyzes constitutional validity of a) jurisdiction b) standing c) entry of orders on hypotheticals, and d) failure of equal application of laws below.

A. SCV 191598 - Jurisdiction of hon judge Jenkins, Richmond circuit court

Appendix A, pages 1.a.-20.a.

1. At bar Hon Judge Jenkins violated Canon 3C/b) mandating disqualification; and Canon 2.A. for failing to follow and apply the law of disqualification.

1.1. *See lack of jurisdiction established under '# 1 Basis for holding offered'.*

1.2. *Pursuant to VA Code §17.1-105(B) judge Jenkins lacked designation because the respondents are clerks of same jurisdiction; thus under such liability.*

1.3. VA Code 19.2-153 mandated the Supreme Court to designate judge, thus did not authorize judge Jenkins to enter orders, mooting all orders void *ab initio*.

2. At bar Ms. Hensley and Ms. Terrell failed to produce a standing for which 8/23/19 order was amended 9/3/19, proving 8/23/19 order should not have been entered until standing was established, verifying corrosion of rule of law, manifesting no justice.

3. Legislators prohibit modification of 8/23/19 injunctive order without due process.

4. In Stone v. Alley it was an error for circuit court not to hear evidence.
In context, at bar Judge Jenkins hastily entered injunctive order on 8/23/19, without continuing to get evidence for standing from Ms. Terrell, Ms. Hensley, 9+ million Virginia residents and businesses; thus usurped authority of designate judge.

5. The above proves at bar judge Jenkins violated :-

5.1. Canon 3C(b) of Virginia judiciary conduct by failing to disqualify for conflict and allowed bias and prejudice to influence his decision.

5.2. Canon 2.A by carrying out proceedings, hastily reaching a verdict without admitting an important threshold factor of standing that had a different outcome, and a fair trial, instead detoured my complaints and mandamus.

6. At bar Judge Jenkins violated Canon 1.A. admitted independence failure. He announced judgment prior to opening the proceeding, voice recorded extrajudicial comments on 8/23/19 : "I AM TOLD to enter order today; I will enter order today" and that : "If you file anything I will put me in jail", terrorizes and threatens physical violence. Therefore, Judge Jenkins violated Canon 2.A for

failure to apply law to refrain from violating VA Code 18.2-420 clandestinely entered into agreement to enter 8/23/19 prefiling order, prior proceeding.

7. At bar Judge Jenkins violated Canon 1.A. due bias and reckless negligence aid and abet in fraud by Terrell and Hensley, knowing both lacked scope and authority to submit 8/9/19 motion for injunctive relief on behalf of 9+ million people, reason to amended order on 9/3/19, spinning me in frivolous defense verifying elder abuse.
8. At bar Judge Jenkins violated Canon 1.A. prohibiting bias by failing to uphold the well being of the undersigned victim as a priority and abused his power by tampering with me presenting as witness to court, causing great suffering & loss.
9. At bar Judge Jenkins violated Canon 1.A. prohibiting bias manifesting competence of his functions that judges do not operate in an impartial manner to the detriment of a victim who is suffering the consequences of his actions and RICO racket. In totality manifests violations of protection of equal application of laws by egregious abuse of judicial qualification policy, a serious concern for Congress.
10. Judge Jenkins on 8/23/19 voice recorded threatened me : "If you file anything I will put you in jail". The evidence is seen in Appendix B, pgs 28.b. & 29.b. orders of 12/9/19 to file documents; in this manner legal documents were and are currently not being filed in other matters by the clerk of circuit court in violation of records laws in defiance of notice from supreme court, because of widespread application of 9/3/19 [judge Jenkins] & 2/6/12 [judge Hanenberg] injunctive rulings.

11. This supports the fraud of 'Application for Leave' an evidence of tampering with me, by departing from normal due process with a different treatment towards me meant to be invalidated, an evidence of serious constitutional issue of "inequality".
12. Arlington UMFS & Henrico are in suit.

B. Standing of Ms. Terrell, deputy clerk of district court, and counsel Ms. Hensley

Next, this court will analyze the validity of the 8/9/19 motion submitted by Terrell for injunction on behalf of 9+ million entities in Virginia to act against their own welfare and interest, and filed by Ms. Hensley, corroding secured rights and privileges of these very 9+ million Virginia entities constitutionally protected by *1st Amendment* for redress of their grievances, and *14th Amendment* protecting due process rights, because such defective case law is at a risk of being fraudulently applied to any of these 9+ million Virginia entities acting against their own welfare and interest - just like CNN/ABC, Deborah Olin, Robin Williams, KIF & UMFS made my son to act against his own welfare and interest. Thus constitutional assault on the court system by public and related officers, a matter of serious concern for this court and congress to fix it with punishment and fines and exemplary damages.

Arlington UMFS & Henrico are in suit.

1. Terrell & Hensley did not serve their motion to 9+ million entities, or allow their response - see notice to the clerk of this court in this regard.
2. At bar Code §54.1-3904 mandates law license Terrell did not produce license to represent 9+ million Virginia entities in her 8/9/19 motion for injunction.

3. At bar vscr Part 6 § I(2) prohibits Terrell from submitting 8/9/19 pre-filing motion affecting rights of 9+ million Virginia entities.
4. At bar Terrell did not pay bond nor filing fee, nor filed an Application for Leave, to submit her 8/9/19 motion with her law license and agreement from district court.
5. At bar district's deputy clerk Terrell and Hensley violate VA Code §§.01-40 The Privacy Act by exploiting my son, to incite the courts illegally without certification [mandated by law] using as exhibits to their 8/9/19 motion for injunction for their own personal interest, political benefit.
6. At bar deputy clerk Terrell & Hensley violates vscr 7B:3 which bars alternate parties in matters before court. Thus Terrell & Hensley are barred from using 9+ million Virginia entities for their own personal and political benefits to favor RICO agents, because it affects their [9+ million] secured rights, privileges, duties & obligations.
7. In this manner, Terrell and Hensley violated secured duties, obligation, rights and privileges by the 1st & 14th Amendment by misusing and exploiting us.

The above pattern shows how the petitioners and judiciary violate VA Code 8.01-4 by creating their own rules and laws as they go along, because there are no measures in place for "abridging substantive rights and privileges".

Such actions are prohibited by this court acting as a guardian, "invalidating orders" on the basis that : "no civil action be dismissed with prejudice for any rule created." This court has a mandatory duty to quash all orders because they are civil proceedings prohibiting 'dismissal without trial, or 'dismissal with prejudice', because civil proceedings are secured by the constitution of "Equal application of Law".

C. This court then analyzes that the judiciary was not intended to settle hypothetical disagreements. The Framers designed Article III courts to adjudicate actual controversies brought by plaintiffs who suffer real-world harm, as your petitioner and her son present to this court. This reflects the Framers' intent that the judiciary :

"May truly be said to have neither force nor will but merely judgment."

The Federalist No. 78, 464 (C. Rossiter ed. 2003) (A. Hamilton).

In context, the objections of the petitioners' from Arlington, Fredericksburg, Henrico and Richmond, must be aimed towards themselves, not 9+ million Virginia entities because this would be fraud by Tort of Conversion affecting their secured rights and privileges, and primarily because hypothetical or future allegations that somehow harm as a whole, even if they could prove so, does not support standing, thus constitutionally wrong done to us with multi-jeopardy in its domino effect.

Thus this court considers :-

1. 1st Amendment restricts carte blanche doctrine to abuse ethics processes involving deliberate and partisan abuse of process, and apparent coordination manifesting as RICO activity for the reason of involvement of ABC/CNN's agents are street thugs.
2. The courts below did not give serious consideration to the balance of equities and public interest to the extent they rely upon the guidance from defendants' egregious misconduct involving sexual attacks for character assassination and public humiliation on made up delusional narratives converted in legal court documents by reducing into writing are not protected by *1st Amendment of speech* for the reason of such 'conversion' and reduction into writing in legal court documents.

3. No one has provided any persuasive justification to enter any injunctive order for the above natured grievances, but to conceal sexual misconduct of like people.
4. Absent of totality, courts below appear a repudiation under Virginia law of 4th circuit's rule that failure to prove all four traditional factors is sufficient to require a denial of a request for injunction before this court today.
5. **My, my son's, my family's legal conditions cannot be put back the way they were.**
This court thus restores by transfer or quashing rulings, with exemplary damages.

D. **Then this court will see the factors around equal application of laws.**

1. *Doctrine of 'Equal Justice Under Law'* is applied to review misconduct. Not embodied in the constitution, is a societal ideal, creating real life controversy because it sets boundaries, calling for this court's attention for failure of adequate measures to punish culpability, even if they are public and related officers in our direct contact inflicting intentional destruction by weaponizing court system by flagrant abuse of false legal documents, deceit, and deception.
2. *In Caldwell v. Texas*, Chief Justice Melville Fuller wrote :: "*The powers of the States in dealing with crime within their borders are not limited, but no State can deprive particular persons or classes of persons of equal and impartial justice under the law.*" Your petitioner calls for this essence. *In context*, the application of injunctive relief to punish to silence me does not fit your petitioner for the unspeakable horrific abuses inflicted upon us, terminating education, our livelihood, socio, psychological scars, loss of normal human development, sovereignty, as proof of evidence thereof. Therefore, this court has to look into the merits, the 'severity' of

false court documents that has destroyed our lives in totality, and not the 'number' of actions filed emerging from RICO racket, which prove abuse of your petitioner, her family by invalidating my reporting wrestling in profound harms, and reckless negligence of those failing to prevent when responsible people were informed only because it involves gang assault by McCandless, Brothers, Olin, Grice, Furey, Hasan.

3. *Doctrine of 'Rule of Law'* - Suffrage is caused in the absence of the rule of law, as a result of apparent 'inequality', implying that every person is subject to the law. If I or my family were to do what they have done, courts would bring their army at my door. Because of the inequality of being alien, there is different treatment.

The above statutory facts supported by evidence calls for justice.

V. STATEMENT OF THE CASES

Asserted errors consists of flagrant abuse of the constitution :-

1. Affecting our secured rights and privileges to redress, due process, equality in application of law, to travel, sovereignty, economic development, be secure in our homes, 2nd amendment, vote, pursuit of happiness, normal human development, family nurturing, and pushing out immigration by design since 12/30/2013.
2. Affecting secured rights of, depriving notice to, misusing 9+ million Virginia entities, anyone could be a subject if this erroneous case law is placed.
3. Affecting integrity of the process and the process in of itself by :-
 - a. failing to meet threshold of legal standing to submit on behalf of 9+ million;
 - b. failing to meet thresholds of jurisdiction, in addition to conflict thereof;
 - c. absence to show any cause of action by any entity;

- d. failure to conduct mandatory evidentiary hearings to meet due diligence;
- e. a civil action mandates a trial on merits.
- f. civil action prohibits dismissal by prejudice as a constitutional error.

The wide majority in the spectrum of society seem to agree that the cases were wrongly decided because of the 'severity' of culpability, lack of standing of petitioners, and jurisdiction of judges.

Every person that came along threw their dirt on our faces and it continues.

The wide majority in the spectrum of society thus, did not share the view that these incorrect decisions are required by the Supreme Court precedent, reasoning that injunctive relief is particularized, could have allowed the Supreme Court of Virginia to save meritorious ruling this way to protect secured 1st & 14th Amendments' rights.

Et al v. Promila Rajput - Arlington GDC - no #assigned, Judgement 2/6/12 - Appendix F

Around 2008-2009, this originated in Hartford, Connecticut; in 2010 got formulated in Fairfax; in Dec 2010-2011 followed to Arlington where ABC/CNN PLANTED State Department's agent - (a) drug addict Matthew Douglas harassing by stealing internet modem to deprive communication; (b) alcoholic drug addict Katherine Donnelley with hostility, threats: "*You will be out of this house within 30 days.*" Dec 2010.

Resulting in false court documents, continued malicious prosecution TO DATE by MENTALLY DERANGED PHYSICALLY VIOLENT assist county attorney, prosecutor # 1 Jason McCandless, prosecutor # 2 Deborah Olin, prosecutor # 3 Nader Hasan, prosecutor # 4 judge Esther Wiggins because they were caught, in failure to provide emergency

Housing and meet 90-day mandatory law, despite cases closed on 5/13/11.

At bar, in 2012 judge Karen Hanenberg entered a fraud injunction, after presiding over my divorce case from 1997 in Fairfax, then in jurisdictional violations because cases involved public & related officers, e.g. Sanjay Altekar threatened to break my son's legs. Geeta Dubey, babysitter neglected my son by leaving him on the street in hot scorching summer month from 3 pm to 5:30 pm waiting to be picked up without food or water. Kidnapping & trafficking my son by their own written account : "*We could not protect her son; we don't have a place for him.*" Why did they falsify documents? Why did they fail to return when cases closed on 5/13/11. Why did they fail to return when it was agreed to occur at 6/29/11 dispositional hearing, because McCandless/ABC/CNN/Henrico PD waited until after my son was 18, as Ohio Rep Jim Jordan puts it. For these reasons, this court will quash 2/6/12 ruling or transfer or remand to Supreme court for full objective trial on merits under their original jurisdiction. Appendix F.

UMFS v Promila Rajput CL16-388 Fredericksburg circuit Judgement 7/20/15 Appendix E

Judge Hewitt in Fredericksburg did not have authority over the UMFS case because they occurred in Arlington & Henrico, and my son was a 19 year old adult. Judge knew UMFS's Greg Peters lacked jurisdiction and saw UMFS lacked standing and maliciously pursued us from Henrico to Fredericksburg through their attorney Steven Brown to trespass my residence, I was renting for a 3 month vacation. Judge also saw the petition was never served to me because private server Kenneth Condrey never drove from Chesterfield to Fredericksburg and was not in surveillance camera entering the courthouse building, entrance door, scanner, or clerk's office, instead Steven Brown

was captured in the surveillance video of the courthouse submitting a forged made up proof of service impersonating as private process server Condrey.

Knowing all this fraud by UMFS, judge still entered an injunctive ruling on 7/20/15 manifesting hate crime emerging from deep racial bias, by exploiting me unrepresented and knowing I was leaving Fredericksburg by then.

Judge Hewitt's actions place him under liability of corroding protection of Equal Application of Laws, malicious prosecution by violating Canons 2.A. for failure to apply law; and 1.A. exploitation of an unrepresented party prohibited by professional code.

For such reasons this court will quash the 7/20/15 order, and grant exemplary damages of \$9,000,000 from UMFS.

In Re: Promila Rajput no # assigned - Henrico GDC Judgement 4/4/16 - Appendix D

I don't know the reason or the petitioner, whether it was the assistant county attorney or AG's office who clandestinely violate VA Code 18.2-420 pursued and extracted a fraud 4/4/16 order because it was concealed until renewed 8/9/19 by Terrell.

Arlington closed the cases again on 1/7/14 because my son turned 18 until which time they withheld my son by fraudulently falsifying court documents. Henrico police actively shielded ABC/CNN's agents falsifying spinning narratives and destroying evidence stating : "*We know who they are but we will not do anything about it.*"

I was never served with any petition, justification, jurisdiction, standing, my response, or a hearing, nor the order, manifesting malicious prosecution barred by the

constitution under 14th Amendment to be informed of charge; and protection of Equal Application of Laws.

For such reasons, this court will quash 4/4/16 order or transfer records, and grant exemplary damages as this court deems proper.

In Re: Promila Rajput - Richmond GDC - no #assigned, Judgement 7/18/19 - Appendix C

One morning on 7/18/19 Richmond Sheriff's Sgt Trotter suddenly trespassed upon me and at my residence with the injunctive order terrorizing me and making me insecure in my home. This is all I know about this ruling, on similar lines of Henrico GDC.

On 9/3/19 judge Cann in open court tells me AG's office asked for 7/18/19 injunctive ruling, manifesting egregious abuse of discretion and office.

I was not served with any petition, nor my response allowed, nor a hearing, manifesting malicious prosecution barred by the constitution under 14th Amendment to be informed of charge; and protection of Equal Application of Laws.

For these reasons 7/18/19 order be quashed *nunc pro tunc* or transferred with exemplary damages from the petitioner as this court deems proper.

Rajput v Fogg - Richmond circuit - SCV 200081 Judgement 2/5/21 - Appendix B

In 2017 I started working for Mr. Fogg, where I was stalked and harassed by ABC/CNN's agents interfering in my employment, sent a russian stating : "*I don't like Indians.*" In this pattern my son and I are constantly harassed by Arlington DHS agents.

This case originated with tortuous termination of employment as a result of city's finance inspector's appearance, and racially charged verbal assaults by Mr. Fogg. Judge

McCleaney presided in October 2018 over battery charge, she dismissed because of 2011 false cases from Arlington that I must not get justice. Mr. Fogg refused to pay my dues.

A Warrant in Debt was filed in Dec'18 in district court for - 1099, 2 days' pay, overtime, \$50 for each install to compensate \$9 per hour wage, and professional services for acquisition of real estate, and Section 4 for socio economic factors severance pay.

Judge McCleaney concealed her conflict and lack of jurisdiction over the matter from me for three months with full intent to injure me, until the day of trial began in court on 3/7/19 refusing to address Section 4, and required me to contact IRS for 1099 - *[calling me a fool to my face]*, dates for overtime, and bank statements for \$50 install to match the of money deposited in bank account by Mr. Fogg. This required continuation that the judge failed and hastily shut the claim out in violation of statute requiring all matters be addressed.

I followed for Section 4, with overtime dates, bank statements be addressed by a different judge. The clerk gave a separate number to the claim that was a continuation of unaddressed matters. Judge Cann applied *res judicata*, denying trial against statute, or any scant care for my loss of livelihood.

Tenell inserted herself and applied an illegal injunction from the window when I went to appeal that you cannot file anything any more, in a conspiracy to deflect judge McCleaney's misconduct concealed by then chief judge Cann.

My research revealed Mr. Fogg had 68 filings but no injunction. I filed for an injunction in district court that judge Cann stated he will look into it. Circuit court stated

they don't know if they are similar cases when in fact Mr. Fogg admitted they were all employment related claims he filed.

From 5/10/19 circuit court withheld until after *at bar* 9/3/19 injunction was placed. This is seen in Appendix page 26.b. 8/7/19 order evidencing a RICO act by Mr. Fogg who was asked to continue for Terrell's injunction to be applied, thus dismissed on 10/17/19, denying rehearing by trickery. Injunction applied is also in Appendix pages 29.b. & 29.1.b.

Supreme court did not find any reversible error. Now this court reviews constitutional violations by the judiciary below. See Appendix B.

Rajput v Terrell & Wake - Richmond - SCV 191598, Judgement 2/5/21 - Appendix A

This relates to Terrell, deputy clerk in district court, from the window announcing an injunctive order, exceeding her duty, and falsified court records in violation of her duties under VA Code 16.1-69.40 & VA Codes 18.2-472. In combination at the window besides Terrell is Wake's case also a deputy clerk who falsified court documents, verbally humiliated me when I went to appeal Fogg's matter, insulted, personally attacked me to alter the events in the courtroom to tamper with me presenting as witness that I must keep quiet when I was in my turn and Fogg cut me off assaulted me with false testimony to judge Cann that I want to harm Fogg when he inflicted battery on me.

Judge Carrico failed to fix her flawed designation because hon Chief Justice Lemons of Virginia Supreme Court was defrauded that the entire district court recused when only one judge Cann had, voids orders *nunc pro tunc* Mitchie's Jurisprudence 1:1.

These matters were filed in circuit court as complaints for ill treatment in district.

Ms. Hensley attorney for, and Ms. Terrell filed at bar a motion for injunction on 8/19/19 and renewed all the above injunctions from Arlington, Fredericksburg, Henrico, and district court of Richmond. Circuit entered at bar injunctive ruling which proves that on 5/10/19 in district court there was no injunction permitting Terrell to block my appeal.

Supreme Court did not find any reversible error because injunction is a national problem deferring to this court for review of flagrant abuses in district courts. See Appendix A.

VI. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This court recognizes deep jurisprudential tension.

This court in conflict, with the decisions on important secured protections of petition for redress, speech, equal application of law, and due process, has decided such important federal questions, in a way that conflicts with a decision by courts below who have so far departed in a manner that conflicts with the decision by another states especially in terms of civil matters, trial is mandatory by law VA Code 8.01-4, jurisdiction and standing, affecting rights of 9+ million entities at stake, in order to crush their substantial rights without being served with the petition or publication, as to call for an exercise of this court's supervisory power to be settled by this court by :-

- ★ restoring our abridged rights and privileges, with exemplary damages;
- ★ either by transfer of records to this court;
- ★ or quash improper injunctive rulings;
- ★ or remand for trial on merits.

Supreme Court of Virginia and district courts below have decided an important question of federal law of protections of equal application of laws, redress, and due process that has not been, but should be settled by this court, so as not to be in conflict.

The above reasons are compelling :-

1. To submit a current petition for writ of certiorari to restore our secured rights and privileges to redress, due process, equality in application of law, to travel, sovereignty, economic development, be secure in our homes, 2nd amendment, vote, pursuit of happiness, normal human development, family nurturing, and immigration.
2. Sanction a departure by AG's office, lawyers, district courts below, so as to call for an exercise of this court's supervisory power; because 9+ million entities were not notified whose rights are affected, nor have any interest in outcome of this petition.
3. Respondents Ronald Fogg & 9+ million entities filed no document, prohibiting injunctive relief by USSC Rule 15.3 mandating this court to quash all rulings below.

VII. STANDARD

One person one vote doctrine dictates one petitioner cannot extract injunctive relief misusing the entire population - a fraud prohibiting legal representation without information or consent. How can one human body have 9+ million heads on their neck?? It's mental derangement, necessary to eliminate injunctions.

Rap sheets have no injunctions for varied misconduct on different occasions, necessitating equality in application of law because no one must be placed above law because actions of public & related officers emerge from a very high degree of discretion.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Respondents failed to establish cause of action, nor could explain how 9+ million entities have been affected by me or my 'particularized' claims. Judiciary amplifies lawyers' claims defending their clients, is an illegitimate way for respondents to excuse their own behavior. The Constitution punishes the actors. Lawyers are consumed by the desire to alter us as monsters for letting criminality of the actors and perpetrators off the hook, by influencing the judiciary if they shift blame upon us, evidence of (a) tampering us; (b) need for separation of powers. Each be held responsible to the full extent of law, not 'devil did it' as an excuse. In a rush to condemn us, judges Feeley, Wiggins, Heweitt, Hanenberg, Chuckers, McCleaney, Cann, Jenkins & Taylor, took fundamental right from us, undermined legitimacy of process, robbed us of each of us, public of objective comprehensive trial on merits, by systematically using their judicial power to silence us.

I ask ABC/CNN/Arlington DHS/Renae Steels' agents to free my son and unify us than divide by constant harassment and abuse to gain more time to permanently divide.

In totality, the foregoing compelling reasons necessitates this court to review the fourth circuit's judgments for decisions made on lack of trial on merits in district courts, then quash all rulings below, or remand for trial on merits, or transfer records.

DECLARATION

28 U.S.C. Section 1746(2) - Rule 29.5(c)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted on February 16, 2021 by Promila Rajput
Promila Rajput, Self-represented Petitioner
Cell: 804 968 9026
Add: 3404 S Street, Richmond, VA 23223
Email: promila.rajput.11@gmail.com