

No. 20-7875

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 27 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Lisa Truong - As a pro se PETITIONER

VS.

UTC Aerospace Systems – RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Lisa Truong

6232 Vincent Ave So

Richfield, MN 55423

952-652-3141

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

With a goal of addressing the facts in this case, Petitioner asks if the Supreme Court of the United States will authorize the release of Petitioner's "complete" Personal File so that reason and legitimacy of job termination can be determined.

Petitioner also asks the United States Supreme Court to provide a ruling on the dismissal of discrimination and harassment at UTC which does not match the facts of the case on the lower court.

UTC has caused petitioner years of emotional damage. She developed depression, anxiety and migraine dealing with the harassment and now petitioner on prescription medicate daily. What will the court do to hold UTC accountable for the damage they have caused the petitioner?

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:

Lisa Truong- Pro Se-Petitioner

UTC Aerospace Systems Inc. – Respondents

C/o Allyson L. Johnson

Seyfarth Shaw LLP

700 Milam Street, Suite 1400

Houston, Texas 77002-2812

C/o Julia A. Pozo

Seyfarth Shaw LLP

700 Milam Street, Suite 1400

Houston, Texas 77002-2812

C/o Kyle A. Peterson

Seyfarth Shaw LLP

233 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 8000

Chicago, IL 60606

RELATED CASES

- Truong vs. UTC Aerospace Systems, REF: 66750, Minnesota Department of Human Rights. Commissioner entered July 21, 2016.
- Truong vs. UTC Aerospace Systems, 0:18-cv-00941-PJS-BRT, U. S. District Court District of Minnesota. Judgement entered October 21, 2019.
- Truong vs. UTC Aerospace Systems, No: 20-1769, U. S. Court of Appeals for The Eighth Circuit. Judgement entered January 20, 2021.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	8
JURISDICTION.....	10
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	11
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	12
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	14
CONCLUSION.....	15

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

APPENDIX B. U.S. DISTRICT COURT U.S. DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

APPENDIX C. FEES FOR TRANSCRIPTS

APPENDIX D. U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

APPENDIX E. MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
	N/A
STATUTES AND RULES	
	N/A
OTHER	
	N/A

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

(X) For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court appeals appears at Appendix A. to the petition and is

(X) Reported at U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT; 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 B. to the petition and is

(X) Reported at U.S. District Court. U.S. District of Minnesota; or
() has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
() is unpublished.

For cases from **states courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix E. to the petition and is

Reported at Minnesota Department of Human Rights; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

The opinion of the _____ court,

Appears at Appendix _____ to the petition is

reported at _____; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

(X) For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was December 17, 2020.

() No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

(X) A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: January 20, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

() An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Appendix No._____.

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 _____

A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

() A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____ and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

() An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Appendix No. A_____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. &1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

N/A

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

As a Pro So Petitioner has no experience in the Rule of the Law and Constitutional Law. Petitioner is pursuing justice and exposing the mistreatment of majorities within UTC Aerospace Systems. Petitioner experienced years of harassment, discrimination and abuse. Petitioner seek help among management and Human Resources as they looked the other way to protect the company.

Petitioner wonder how many cases claimed of Harassed and discrimination without lawyers has opportunity represents on The United States Supreme Court?

Respondent violated the UTC policies by presenting Petitioner a written Plan of Action and NOT following that document. Appears at Appendix E.

Since 2015 to 2019 Petitioner was brought to Human Resources office more than 35 times where Petitioner was harassed and verbally abused by Supervisor and Human Resource office. Appears at Appendix E.

Dec 19, 2015 after Petitioner was criticized by Sylvia P in her Performance Feedback and was graded 2 out of 4. An investigation provided by UTC Aerospace was demanded by MN Department of Human Rights and discovered that Petitioner was third-best inspector of 41 based off her performance. Appears at Appendix E.

On July 3, 2018 Petitioner received Written Warning- Attendance/unplanned absences. According to protocol, Petitioner should have received a verbal warning, but never did. The written warning indicated a pattern of calling in sick on days that had been previously requested as vacation and denied by supervisor. Petitioner disagree and asked respondent to provide that date evidence. That information has never been shared with the Petitioner. Appears at Appendix E.

On July 12, 2018 upon which the termination was changed to a suspension. Petitioner has repeatedly requested her personal file and reason for termination, but previous decisions were denied the right to know. Appears at Appendix B.

Petitioner received her “personal file” from respondent, but that file included only personal “hire on” information and all the UTC policies. This personal file showed a clean record that did not include any written warnings or notes of any violations. During Petitioners Appeal for the United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit petitioner requested to see the complete employee profile.

UTC has caused petitioner years of emotional damage. She developed depression, anxiety and migraine dealing with the harassment and now petitioner takes prescribed medication daily.

While this case is still active, Petitioner does not want to pay the respondents transcript fee. Appears at Appendix C. Can this fee be waived for Petitioner?

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Judge never gave a direct reason for UTC treatment of petitioner. Petitioner arrived to this stage using the best of her knowledge and on her own as she does not have the means to have the support of a lawyer. Petitioner does not have experience nor an educational background regarding law. Petitioner feels that this case was dismissed, because Petitioner lacks the proper knowledge to present this case. There are facts to represent the petitioner's case, but no facts have been shared by lower courts for their decisions. Not only does petitioner request that the harassment and discrimination be address, but I also request that the facts from the decisions be shared.

To this day petitioner does not understand how she violated any of UTC policies and yet was repeatedly mistreated for those accusations. Petitioner came to UTC with high level skill and years of good experience. Petitioner was a victim of harassment and discrimination at UTC.

Everywhere in the whole world petitioner believes every single case at the Courts must showed evidence on both side no matter what.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Truong



Date: April 24, 2021