

20-7819 ORIGINAL

No. _____

FILED

APR 12 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

THERESA A. LOGAN — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

TOWN OF WINDSOR["] ET AL["] — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THURGOOD MARSHALL UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MRS. THERESA A. LOGAN
(Your Name)

50 WILLIAMS ROAD
(Address)

WINDSOR, NEW YORK 13865
(City, State, Zip Code)

607-655-1853
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

APR 16 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. PETITIONER MRS. LOGAN ASK, "WHY ARE DEFENDANTS, ROBERT BRINKS, GREGG STORY AND ATTORNEYS O'BRIEN AND BOUMAN ALLOWED TO PERJURE THEMSELVES IN COURTS AND NOT BE HELD RESPONSIBLE?"
2. WHY DOES NEW YORK STATE FAVOR THESE INDIVIDUALS OVER THE VICTIMS?
3. WHY DID THE DEFENDANTS LEAVE THE SCENE?
4. HOW COME DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS AREN'T PAYING ATTENTION TO NEW YORK STATE LAW S(1103)B?
5. WHY HAVEN'T DEFENDANTS SHOWN PROOF OF ANY DRIVING VIOLATIONS, ACCIDENTS, FATIGUE, SPEEDING AND THE LIKE?

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. ROBERT BRINKS-SNOW PLOW TRUCK DRIVER
2. ^NGREG STORY-WINGMAN FOR SNOW PLOW BLADE
3. NEW YORK MUNICIPAL RECIPROCAL INSURANCE
COMPANY- FOR THE TOWN OF WINDSOR, NEW YORK

RELATED CASES

N/A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

N/A

PAGE NUMBER

N/A

STATUTES AND RULES

§ 1103(B)
VEHICLE & TRAFFIC LAW
FOR NEW YORK STATE

APPENDIX-C
page 28

OTHER PETITIONER, MRS. LOGAN STATES, "SHE HOPES THAT THE JUSTICES WILL TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION AND GIVE HER THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT, OF HOW LONG THE LOWER COURTS HAVE ALLOWED HER CASE TO GO PAST THE STATUTE, UNTIL SHE GOT HELP FROM THE "FEDERAL COURTS" IN BINGHAMTON, AND SYRACUSE, NEW YORK."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A- PAGE 20, 21, 22, 23

APPENDIX B- PAGE 24, 25, 26, 27

APPENDIX C- PAGE 28, 29, 30, 31

APPENDIX D- PAGE 32, 32-A, 33, 34

APPENDIX E- PAGE 35, 36, 37, 38

APPENDIX F- UNITED STATES FEDERAL COURT, BINGHAMTON NEW YORK
AND SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

APPENDIX F- THURGOOD MARSHALL COURT, NEW YORK CITY

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 F to the petition and is

☒ reported at UNITED STATES FEDERAL COURT; 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 F to the petition and is

☒ reported at THURGOOD MARSHALL COURT NEW YORK; 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 8-3-2020.

☐ 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: 8-03-2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix F.

☐ 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 1-25-2021.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix F.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 3-19-2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix F.

☐ 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

1. PETITIONER RIGHTS, SUCH AS THE
 - 1st AMMENDMENT
 - 14th AMMENDMENT
 - 15th AMMENDMENT
2. REGULATIONS SHOWING THAT, MR. BRINKS AND MR. STORY, TO A CERTAIN EXTENT ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS. THIS SHOULD BE CHANGED, ESPECIALLY WHEN THEIR RECKLESS DRIVING IS DONE ON PURPOSE. 1103B
3. TOO MANY PEDESTRIANS, YEARLY, ARE EITHER MAMED OR KILLED SUCH AS MRS. LOGAN, BY THESE INDIVIDUALS.
4. FOR NEW YORK STATE, FOR THE PUBLIC, FOR THE NATION. SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE ABOUT THE DRIVERS AND WINGMEN NOT BEING HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS.
5. A BILL NEEDS TO BE ENACTED TO HELP PROTECT THE VICTIMS, THE PUBLIC.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. PETITIONER STATES, "SHE WAS SEVERELY INJURED ON THE DAY IN QUESTION, AFTER DEFENDANTS MR. BRINKS AND MR. STORY RECKLESSLY AND NEGLIGENTLY AND AT A FAST RATE OF SPEED DROVE AND OPERATED THE 50 THOUSAND POUND, 20 TON SNOW PLOW TRUCK."
2. MRS. LOGAN STATES, "AFTER HER FORMER ATTORNEY WAS DISMISSED, BY THE JUDGE, FROM HER CASE NO ATTORNEY IN THE AREA WOULD REPRESENT HER. THIS IS WHY SHE IS PRO-SE."
3. WITH HER INJURIES FROM THE SNOW PLOW TRUCK, SHE WAS FORCED TO RESIGN FROM HER JOB IN THE MEDICAL FIELD AFTER OVER 40 YEARS. THIS WAS FOLLOWED BY 2 MAJOR SURGERIES, THAT HAS LEFT MRS. LOGAN, HOME BOUND.
4. MRS. LOGAN HAS HAD LOSS OF INCOME, 401K AND SHE IS PAYING 25 DOLLARS A MONTH ON UNPAID MEDICAL BILLS TO KEEP IT FROM GOING TO COLLECTIONS AND RUINING HER CREDIT. MRS. LOGAN'S HUSBAND FAMILY, FRIENDS, CO-WORKERS HAVE WITNESSED WHAT SHE HAS INCURRED.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. MRS. LOGAN STATES "THE MAIN REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION IS SO JUSTICE CAN PREVAIL" AS WELL AS COMPENSATION FOR HER INJURIES.
2. THE DECISIONS THAT WERE MADE BY THE LOWER COURTS, DOESN'T APPEAR TO BE BASED ON THE OVER WHELMING EVIDENCE MRS. LOGAN SUBMITTED TO THE COURTS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS.
3. NOW THAT THE DEFENDANTS HAVE SWITCHED ATTORNEYS, THE SUPREME COURT NEEDS TO SEE HOW ATTORNEY BOUMAN HAS STARTED OFF BY PERJURING HIMSELF STATING "MRS. LOGAN WAS LIVING HOMELESS ON THE STREETS, DOMICILE" SUBMITTED EVIDENCE SHOWS DIFFERENT.
4. AFTER OVER 40 YEARS IN THE MEDICAL FIELD, MRS. LOGAN WAS FORCED TO RESIGN FROM HER JOB, DUE TO HER INJURIES.
5. MRS. LOGAN PRESENTED HER CASE OVER A DOZEN TIMES TO THE LOWER COURTS. IN NEW YORK STATE, ALL SHE HAS RECEIVED WAS DISMISSED OR DENIED WITHOUT CONCRETE EXPLANATION.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa A. Logan

Date: April 12, 2021