NO. 20-7880

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 18 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

SCOTT PETERS
PETITIONER

- VS -

MTGLQ INVESTORS LP
Respondants

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

APPELLATE COURT STATE OF ILLINOIS 2ND DISTRICT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Prepared By SCOTT PETERS M52851
711 KASKASKIA ST
MENARD, ILLINOIS
62259

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the Appellant was Denied his constitutional Rights of Due Process.

II. Whether the Appellees Followed the Foreclosure laws and loss management laws and if not are guilty of Perjury and Subornation of Perjury.

III. Whether the Appellants constitutional Rights of Disclosure Enably him to Persue a Defense was violated by the Appellees.

IV. Whether the Appellees committed Fraud by conveyance and False certification. Original Bank note unendorsed by original bank Blank endorsement, then endorsed after multiple assignements later, by last bank.

V. Whether the Appellees obstruction of Discovery Documents concealed the Appellants Ability to Determine whether the unlicenced Entities were in compliance of state and Federal Banking Regulations in alledging standing.

VI. Whether Appellees unaccounted and unexplained attorneys fees, Expenditures without Justification and the courts Justification of Attorneys fees can be considered Reasonable and Justifyable.

VII. Whether Appellees and Previous Agents had the Ability to Acquire Appellants Instruments in original Form, or sign and Represent the other agents in there behalf without previous proof of Possession, and without the court allowing Appellant to attend his In-camera Inspection as Prose Attorney for Identification. (Before any Alterations).

In the end whether the Appellate Court of the Second District answered these questions or Ignored them just as they have Ignored the Evidence Provided by "Peters" in the case, at Appeal, at Rehearing and now at this PLA.

LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] ALL PARTIES APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE

[X] 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 JUDGEMENT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS PETITION IS AS FOLLOWS:

WORLD BANK FSB, WAchovia Bank FSB, Wells Fargo BANK N.A.

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

TABLE of AUTHORITIES CITED

QUESTIONS Presented

STATUTES And RULES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

QUESTIONS Presented

STATUTES AND RULES

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 JUDGEMENT BELOW:

OPINIONS BELOW

THE OPINION OF THE HIGHEST STATE COURT TO REVIEW THE MERITS APPEARS AT APPENDIX A EXHIBITS A + B TO THE PETITION AND IS:

X UNPUBLISHED

JURISDICTION

FROM CASE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

THE DATE ON WHICH THE HIGHEST STATE COURT DECIDED MY CASE WAS 30 SEPTEMBER 2010 A COPY OF THAT DECISION APPEARS AT APPENDIX B

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1257 (a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Questions Presented	Page Number
#I.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2.	5
United States Constitution, Amendment V (1791)	5
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868)	5
#II.)	
None Cited	
#III.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2.	9
United States Constitution, Amendment V, (1791),	9
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868),	9
#IV.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2	10
United States Constitution, Amendment V (17.91)	10
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868).	10
(#V.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2	12
United States Constitution, Amendment V (1791)	12
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868)	12
#VI.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2	13
United States Constitution, Amendment V (1791)	13
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868)	13
#VII.)	
Illinois Constitution of 1970, Article I, Section 2	14
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV (1868)	14

STATEMENT OF CASE

Early in the morning of October 16, 2014 McHenry County Sherriff's Deputies Dwight Maness, Kaalia Szatkiewicz and Eric Lunia were dispatched to the home at 1313 West Northeast Shore Drive to conduct an alledged, well being check. The unraveling of that action caused the appellant to be arrested and convicted of crimes he still asserts his lawful innocence. Appellates family was left with family savings while attempting to obtain benefits. In May 2015 with benefits applied for and family savings depleted appellants wife began to attempt to obtain help from their mortgage co. Wells Fargo. Appellant in county jail and cell phone listed to mortgage confiscated by police and no means or acceptance or available outgoing calls or incomming calls. Appellant received no letters from mortgage co., however sent letters that went unanswered. Attempting to move the payments to the rear or obtain government assistance. To no avail. There was sufficent equity to do so. On December 2, 2015 at Stateville appellant was served with foreclosure notice. Although appellees state appellants whereabouts are unknown. Appellante filed an answer to the complaint as he was not being brought to court for an appearance, on 6 January 2016. It also was ignored by the clerk and the court. Appellant with no expirence in forclosure, his first home, and at severe legal disability attempted to file numerous actions by motion to make the clerk file them or even acknowlodge them, all ignored. On approximately 3 March 2016. Appellant again received his second notice from Wells Fargo Bank N.A. A notice for default attempting to relieve the home from appellant without litigation, by not allowing the appellant to attend court, appear, or file any answer or motion. Appellant attempted each and denied all. On 19 August 2016 after the court and clerk could no longer ignore appellant they found a

STATEMENT OF CASE

WAY TO EXPLAIN AWAY THE IGNORANCE. By Stating Documents WERE Incorrectly Filed And Insuring All Filings went to the Judge. Wells Fargo BANK N.A. SEEING this Immediately Dismissed themselves 2/8/17. From the CASE, complaint. THE COURT Filed only Back Documents to THE Point of EXCUSE, EVEN though the Previous DOCUMENTS WERE Tendered to the court BY Appellant numerous times, with as well Proof By Institutional legal card. All Ignored. AFTER continues Striking of Documents And OBSTRUCTION of DISCLOSURE BY the court. A SUMMARY Judgement was leveled Against Appellant. THEN Incessive Whining By the Appellees caused the court to change Its Decision And Appellant to Loose. Appellant Appealed 0d-18-0975. It was Denied By This court. Reasoning the sale was not Final THE SALE IS NOW FINAL And Appellant Appeals From That ORDER AND MALFEASANCE of Justice.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. BASED ON EVIDENCE AND DOCUMENTS Presented In THE TRIAL RECORD IN CASE 15CH1145 AND EVIDENTIARY Exhibits Presented to the court; lays Bare Violations of Appellants Fundamental constitutional Rights Including Due Process, Access To the courts And notice And Hearing. Where Previous Plaintiff And current Appellee violated Appellants Rights of the Constitution of the state of ILLinois And UNITED States;

STATES Standard of Review

Whether A TRIAL Court Correctly Enters Judgement on THE Pleadings or Dismisses A Complaint Is Subject to THE SAME Denovo Standard of Review on Appeal. SEE Gillen -V- State Farm Mutual Insurance Co. 215 ILL.2d 381 Addressing Judgement on the Pleadings, Olivera -V- Amoco Oil Co. 201 ILL.2d 134, 147-88

Due to "PETERS" (Appellants) legal Disabilities of the situation at Hand the Appellees and courts took advantage of the situation untill Exposed, However, Appellants Constitutional Rights are not Lost as are applicable to Illinois Article I, Section two of the Constitution, stating "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or Property without Due Process of law nor be denied the Equal Protection of Laws." This does not mean only if caught. It means from Inception to Finality. Significantly, the Evidence is clear it was only to be instituted after the clerk and the Appellees could no longer perpitrate the wrong on the Appellant. From 2 December 2015 to 17 August 2016. Additionally the United States Constitution states the same in Amendment XIV as it states; "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process of law; nor deny any person within its Jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the laws. Further, That the clerk obstructed Appellant from the court by not filing Appellants Documents or providing notice if Deficiencys existed, Obstruction is defined as follows; (a) A person obstructs justice when, with intent to prevent the apprehension or obstruct the prosecution or defense of any person, He or she knowingly commits any of the following;

(1) Destroys, alters, conceals or disguises physical evidence, plants false evidence, furnishes false information.

Proof that on at least six ocasions documents went to the clerk of the mcHenry court and were destroyed or concealed as having been received by the clerk. In Appellants Defense of His Property.

Likewise, a clerk of the court is under oath by virtue of there position to tell the truth as a government officer. Denying, concealing or destroying physical evidence in making false statements as too its whereabouts is Perjury and the

Previous Appellees would have committed Perjury By Attesting They completed the tasks associated with Foreclosure And Subornation of perjury when they contradicted the previous statement By now saying under oath they were unable to Locate Appellant, And the clerk would have Also Had to Be complicit As THE Filer of THE Documents And the Receiver of the Documents. such As the Subpoena, Requires the clerk to File A "Return." A Return IS (Record) Filed when the complaintant Is served. THE Clerk knew the Appellant was served And Filed it to the case. Three months later the Appellee Files A Motion For Default, Based on No Appearance or (Exhibit G-2) Answer. However, Appellant Sent Answer By legal mail And it was mailed out of the Institution 9 December 2015. (SEE Exhibit 12) with Additional copies mailed on 7 January 2016 By legal mail. (See Exhibit 12) However, Both knowing where Appellant was located neither Puts Forth Any Evidence they Attempted to contact Defendant other than too serve original complaint or serve notice of Default. Deceptive Practice. 720 ILCS 5/32-2 Perjury; A person commits perjury when, under oath or Affirmation, in a proceeding or in Any other matter where By law THE oath And Affirmation IS Required, He or she makes A False statement, Material to the issue or point in question, knowing the statement is false.

720 ILCS 5/32-3 Subornation of Perjury; (a) A person commits subornation of perjury when He or she knowingly procures or induces Another to make A statement in violation of Section 32-2 which the person knows to Be False.

II. Based on Evidence And Documents Presented In the Trial Record In case 15CH1145 And Evidentiary Exhibits Presented to the court, lays Bare violations of Appellants Fundamental Rights under national And Illinois Mortgage Law, Available Had THE wrong not Been Perpetrated By original Plaintiff Wells Fargo Bank N.A. Against Him;

STATES STANDARD OF REVIEW

WHETHER A TRIAL COURT CORRECTLY ENTERS JUDGEMENT ON THE PLEADINGS OR DISMISSES A COMPLAINT IS SUBJECT TO THE SAME DENOVO STANDARDS OF REVIEW ON APPEAL, SEE Gillen-V- State FARM MUTUAL INSURANCE CO. 215 ILL. 2d 381 ADDRESSING JUDGEMENT ON THE PLEADINGS, Oliviera-V- Amoco oil Co. 201 ILL. 2d 134, 147-88.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE CASE AT BAR IS WHETHER Appellants Rights under THE ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION AND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION HAVE BEEN VIOLATED AFFECTING APPELLANTS DUE PROCESS. APPELLANT STATES THE ORIGINAL LENDER UNDER SECTION 15-1208 OF ILLINOIS MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE LAW WAS TO EXTEND LOSS MITIGATION UNDER SECTION 15-1209 "THE SUBJECT MORTGAGE LOAN WAS ELIGIBLE FOR THE MAKING HOME AFFORDABLE AVOIDANCE OPTION (SEE EXHIBIT B) INSTEAD THE APPELLEES DECIDED BECAUSE OF THE INVESTMENT POTENTIAL OF THE PROPERTY THEY WOULD PERJURE THEMSELFS TO OBTAIN THE PROPERTY, CREATING A DEGRADATIONAL DOWNWARD SPIRAL. KNOWING THE DIRE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPELLANTS FAMILY. IT CREATED AN UNRECOVERABLE SITUATION, FURTHER AND SIGNIFICANTLY BESIDES ITS HARDSHIP ON THE FAMILY. GENERATED ADDITIONAL 8 MONTHS OF ADDITIONAL ALLEDGED EXPENDITURES LEVELED AGAINST APPELLANT. APPELLANT SHOULD NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR BECAUSE HAD THE NORMAL PROCESS BEEN OBSERVED THE ADDITIONAL TIME WOULD NOT BE ASSESSED. THE APPELLEES COMMITTED PERJURY WHEN THEY SWORE UNDER OATH TO THE AFFIDAVITS AND FAILED TO PRESENT PROOF WHEN ASKED FOR. APPELLANT WAS IGNORED. IT WAS KNOWN BY THEM PROOF COULD NOT BE PRODUCED. THEY KNEW POLICE HAD APPELLANTS PHONE AND IT WAS OFF/DISCONNECTED FOR SEVEN MONTHS, AND KNEW WHERE APPELLANT WAS TO SEND LETTERS.

However sent none. Clearly Perjury and Subornation of Perjury as the Appellees Attorney knew it as well But Choose to Procure the Statement and Present it as Truth. 720 ILCS 5/32-2 And 720 ILCS 5/32-3, Its Just that simple, plaintiff Felt Because of the position Appellant was in, They got the opportunity to Just swoop in and steal prime RealEstate And the Clerk would Help, to Vindicate McHenry County. Simple, MTLGQ States They contacted Defendants "Attorney", First, if there is a call its documented by the institution there are none. Letters as well. (Last Defendant is His Attorney its Plain False Hood (Exhibit D)

III. Based on Evidence And Documents Presented in trial Record in Case 15CH1145 And Evidentiary Exhibits Presented to the Court. lays Bare Violations of Appellants Fundamental Constitutional And Statutory Rights of the Illinois compiled statutes of civil Procedure And Illinois Supreme Court Rules in the conducting of Proceedings And trial Process. when the Plaintiff was able to Deny Appellant Evidentiary Discovery The Court turned a Blind Eye to it And neglected the procedural Process By not Managing the Judicial Process By case managment;

States Standard of Review

Whether A Trial court correctly Enters Judgement on THE Pleadings or Dismisses A Compliant Is subject to the same Denovo Standard of Review on Appeal, SEE Gillen-v- State Farm Mutual Insurance co. 215 Ill.2d 381 Addressing Judgement on the Pleadings, Oliviera-v- Amoco oil co. 201 ILL.2d 134, 147-88

Reasons For Granting The Petition

THE Appellees Decided what Discovery they would Produce And Failed to Produce Any Discovery to Appellant whatsoever THIS IS in contradiction to THE Due Process Clauses of Both the Illinois And united states Constitutions of Full Disclosure. It is also in violation of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 214

And States "Discovery in Relation to the cause of Action" The Discovery Asked For By the Appellant Related to the "Chain of title" And Previous Holders to determine legal origin as asserted By The Appellees and All other supporting Documents. Instead because of Appellants He was given nothing and Allowed to Examine nothing. As a prose Attorney He is Entitled to see Everything, under the Illinois constitution of 1970 Article I, Section 2 Has Allowed Due Process meaning, Fundamental Fairness, same as United States Constitution Amendment XIV, Due Process. The Question is Had Appellant Been a BAR Attorney would He Have Been Denied Everything as well: Appellant Believes not. This court should not.

IV. Based on Evidence and Documents Presented in the Trial Record in case 15CH1148 And Evidentiary Exhibits Presented to the court, Restrained Discovery and Concealment, Committed Fraud in transfer of Real Property without Proving chain of title By Presenting a Fraudulent conveyance, without Proof From World Savings Bank, FSB By Wells Fargo Bank N.A. or MTGLQ or of certification;

States Standard of Review

Whether a Trial court correctly Enters Judgement on The pleadings or Dismisses a Complaint is subject to the same Denovo Standard of Review on Appeal, see Gillen v- State Farm Mutual Insurance Co. 215 Ill.2d 381 Addressing Judgement on the Pleadings, Olivera v- Amoco oil co. 201 Ill.2d 134, 147-48.

Reasons for Granting the Petition

When a copy of a note which Had never Been Inspected By Appellant. When Appellant Requested an In-Camera

Inspection. And Still was not Allowed to Inspect It was Produced. It Had no Stamp or Endorsement on It, If thats what Its called when a Stamp Is Affixed to A Document Asserting By unconfirmed Allegation It Allegedly Represents previous parties. Then Appellant was issued a (735 ILCS 5/2-13(b)) copy of an Instrument or A copy of A copy of an Instrument with said Stamp Affixed. Appellant significantly Asserts That A Third Party Aquires no Rights Under a contract Entered into By others unless the Provision at Issue was Intentionally Included for the Direct Benefit of the third Party. Weil, Kreiburg + Thomas P.C. -V- Sara Lee Corp 213 Ill App. 3d 383. Further, the Above Process violates the Due Process Clauses of the Illinois Constitution Article I, Section 2 And the United States Constitution of XIV Amendment And Due Process By Fundamental Fairness.

V. Based on Evidence and Documents Presented in Trial Record in case 15CH1145 And Evidentiary Exhibits presented to the courts, the Appellees obstruction of Requested Discovery documents concealed the Ability to Determine whether the unlicensed Entities and Previous complainants conveyances were void Based solely on the Licensing violation of 205 ILCS 635/1-3(a)(i) or multiple other violations, which significantly also includes contravention of the nationwide Multistate Licensing system And Registration, Also Federal Secure And Fair Enforcement Act for Mortgage Licensing. (Note the Record Reflects the Appellee Has never Denied lack of Licensing nor provided Proof.)

States Standard of Review

Whether A Trial Court Correctly Enters Judgement on The Pleadings or Dismisses A Complaint is subject to The Same Denovo Review, Standard of Review on Appeal See, Gillen -V- State Farm Mutual Insurance Co. 215 ILL, 2d 381 Addressing Judgement on Pleadings, Oliveira -V- Amoco Oil Co. 201 ILL, 2d 134, 147-48.

Reasons For Granting The Petition

THE Court Argued For the Appellees when the Appellees Produced no License or Even Attempted to Produce Licensing under Chapter 205 Financial Regulation, Residential Mortgage Act (Acts I-VII) of the Act. Stating THERE IS no need to Be Licensed In Illinois. However, Although Illinois may not Require its Mortgagors or mortgage companies Be Licensed, THE National And Other States Implications most likely Require It. Without Discovery chain of title cannot Be Proved, nor can The chain of THE Mortgage. Wherefore Appellant Believes not A connection Exist Between Him And Appellee And As Far As Appellant is concerned None Exists or Has Been Proved. Significantly, As Stated in the Record Appellant Believes Fraud in the Factum/or Fraud in transfers of Real And Personal Property Has occurred, A criminal offense. 720 ILCS 5/17-13(b) Acknowledgement of Fraudulent Conveyance. No officer Authorized to take the Proof And Acknowledgement of a conveyance of Real or Personal Property or other instrument shall knowingly certify that conveyance or other instrument was Duly Proven or Acknowledged By A party to the conveyance or other instrument when no such Acknowledgement or Proof was made, or was not made at the time it was certified to have Been made, with intent to Injure or Defraud or to enable any other person to injure or Defraud. THE Appellees Do Exactly This, They take an conveyance or/and instrument From A Decade Ago, Allege It to Be theres, put A stamp on It, By Numerous Hands its alledged to pass Through And Says its Theirs. When any Alleged Transfer would Have Taken place A Decade Ago.

THE Appellees Further Deny Discovery And Disclosure IN THE Proceedings. Contrary to THE Illinois And United States Constitutions, Article I Section 2, XIV Amendment. THE Facts ARE That Every Document presented IS merely A copy And unsubstantiated As certified By THE person, Agent or Agency Alledged to produce It. Nor Has Any conveyance or Instrument Been certified As Authentic By Any Person, Agent or Agency or Any Document Been Produced Showing the conveyance or Instrument Being Allocated to Anyone other Than Continuing to Be IN THE possession of the originator. whom the Appellant WAS A Sole contractee with And never Agreed to Any other Arrangement.

VI. Based on Evidence And Documents Presented ON THE Trial Record IN CASE 15CH1145 And Evidentiary Exhibits Presented to the court, THE Appellees Imposition of Unexplained And unaccounted for Attorneys Fees And Expenditures without Accountability or Justification when Brought to the attention to the court were Ignored and Stricken, THE Court Fabricating Its own Assessment of Attorneys Fees at one Point;

States Standard of Review

Whether THE Trial Court correctly Enters Judgement on THE pleadings or Dismisses A complaint IS subject to the same Denovo Review, Standard of Review on Appeal SEE Gillen -V- State Farm mutual Insurance Co. 215 ILL. 2d 381 Addressing Judgement on Pleadings, Oliviera -V- Amoco oil co. 201 ILL. 2d 134, 147-48.

Reasons For Granting THE Petition

Appellant Put Forth His objections multiple times About THE Spreadsheets Produced By Appellees And the Lack of Accounting And Explanation of the charges to the sheets, such AS (Exhibit A-E)

LANDSCAPING FEES AND UPKEEP OF THE PROPERTY APPELLANTS FAMILY WAS PROVIDING AS THEY WERE LIVING ON THE PREMISES. ANOTHER FALSEHOOD PROVIDED BY THE APPELLEES FOR GAIN, OR THE MANY ENTRIES OF OTHER FEES WITHOUT EXPLANATION, OR AMOUNTS OF ATTORNEYS FEES NOT FROM AND IN ADDITION TO THE ORIGINAL REQUESTED REASONABLE ATTORNEYS FEES. THE ATTORNEY FEES AMOUNT TO AN EXCESS OF OVER TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS. APPELLANT STATES HIS ENTIRE LITIGATION IN HIS LIFE AND DEATH REPRESENTATION AMOUNTED TO A MERE $5000.00 DOLLARS. THATS WITH IMPOSITION OF A DEATH PENALTY ON HIM AND DESTRUCTION OF HIS FAMILY WITHOUT REASON. 725 ILCS 5/113-3.1. BASED ON THE OUTSTANDING QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION HE ALLEDGEDLY RECEIVED AS THE TRIAL COURT IN THAT INSTANCE PROCLAIMED, THE APPELLANT FINDS IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW MERELY STEALING HIS HOME COULD AMOUNT TO MORE. OR WHY IT SHOULD COST MORE, OR WHY BEING A DISABLED 100% SERVICE CONNECTED VETERAN HE SHOULD PAY TAXES FOR THE APPELLEES WHEN HES EXEMPT, IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANTS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER ILLINOIS AND UNITED STATE CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I, SECTION 2, AMEND XIV

VII. BASED ON THE EVIDENCE AND DOCUMENTS PRESENTED IN THE TRIAL RECORD IN CASE 15CH1145 AND EVIDENTIARY EXHIBITS PRESENTED TO THE COURT, THE APPELLANT HAS SHOWN THAT THE MORTGAGE AND NOTE AS ORIGINALLY PRESENTED TO THE COURT COULD NOT BE TRANSFERED NEITHER BY ITS WORDING AND ITS LACK OF ORIGINAL OR REQUISITE INDORSEMENTS AND TRANFERS OF PREVIOUS AGENTS.

FRAME -V- BM AUGUST + SONS 1878 88 ILL. 424

WEIL, FREEBURG + THOMAS P.C. -V- SARA LEE CORP 213 ILL APP. 3d 383

STATES STANDARD OF REVIEW

WHETHER THE TRIAL COURT CORRECTLY ENTERS JUDGEMENT ON THE PLEADINGS OR DISMISSES A COMPLAINT IS SUBJECT TO THE SAME DENOVO REVIEW, STANDARD OF REVIEW ON APPEAL SEE GILLEN V- STATE FARM MUTUAL INSURANCE CO. 215 ILL. 2D 381 ADDRESSING JUDGEMENT ON PLEADINGS OLIVEIRA V- AMOCO OIL CO. 201 ILL. 2D 134, 147-48.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THAT THERE WERE NO INDORSEMENTS of the PREVIOUS AGENTS, NOR DOCUMENTED TRANSFERS AND/OR (UCC 3-205(g)) ASSIGNMENTS UNTILL WELLS FARGO PRODUCES A FABRICATED STAMP ONLY AFTER IT WAS DISPUTED BY APPELLANT AND STAMPS THE DOCUMENT FOR ALL PREVIOUS AGENTS, (RECORD) THIS FRAUDLENT APPLICATION FAILS UNDER 770 ILCS 5/17-13(b) CANNOT CERTIFY A CONVEYANCE NOT MADE AT THE TIME IT WAS CERTIFIED to HAVE BEEN MADE. REGUARDING ASSIGNMENT OF NOTES FRAME-V- B M AUGUSTSON 1878 88 ILL. 424. SIGNIFICANTLY, EVEN HAD THIS CONDUCT HAVE BEEN LAWFULL, THE TRANSACTION FAILS STILL. BECAUSE THE MORTAGE SECURING THE NOTE DOSNT ALLOW IT, NEITHER DOES THE NOTE. WHERE "A THIRD PARTY AQUIRES NO RIGHTS UNDER A CONTRACT ENTERED INTO BY OTHERS UNLESS THE PROVISION AT ISSUE WAS INTENTIONALLY INCLUDED FOR THE DIRECT BENEFIT OF THE THIRD PARTY. AND IT CANNOT BE SAID ANY PROVISION WAS INTENTIONALLY INCLUDED FOR THESE PARTIES, AS THERE NOT IDENTIFIED AS SUCH. THIS VIOLATES THE APPELLANTS RIGHTS OF THE ILLINOIS AND UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 2 AND U.S.C.A AMEND XIV AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND RIGHT TO NOT HAVE HIS PROPERTY TAKEN WITHOUT REASON BY AN OPPRESSIVE GOVERNMENT THROUGH ITS OWN FAULT AND FAULT OF ITS AGENTS.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 18 December 2020