

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. NO RESPONSE BY ANY OF THE APPELLEES IN THIS CASE TO THE LAWSUIT REGARDING THE ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUD, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND THE FACT THAT THE APPELLEES, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING AND U S BANK ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDERS, CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE AND THAT HER HOME SHOULD BE EXPUNGEMENT OF HER MORTGAGE DEBT IN WHICH THERE ARE "DOCTORED" DOCUMENTS AND THE APPELLEES, HAVE REFUSED TO INTENTIONALLY ANSWER BUT YET HAVE CONTINUED TO VIOLATE THE BANKRUPTCY CASE FILED IN ACTIVE BANKRUPTCY AND HARASS HER IN THE LOWER COURTS AS WELL AS THE HIGHER AND APPEALS COURTS. NO RESPONSE SHOULD EQUATE TO THE ENTIRE MONETARY SANCTIONS PER PERSON OF \$4,350,000.00.
2. DOES THE NO RESPONSE FROM THE APPELLEES COJNSTITUTES THAT A DEFAULT JUDGMENT HAS OCCURRED AND THE MONETARY SANCTIONS REQUESTED PER PERSON AND PROFESSIONALLY IS DUE IMMEDIATELY AND PAYABLE TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, AKA BRIDGET BROWN PARSON. FAILURE TO RESPOND TO THE LAWSUIT IN THE APPEALS COURT HAS SHOWWN THE LACK OF RESPECT FOR FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE AND DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE IN WHICH THE MONETARY SANCTIONS ARE DUE THAT HAVE BEEN PENDING SINCE 2014 THAT IS SOME SEVEN YEARS.
3. THE "BOGUS " LETTER GIVEN TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON IN BAD FAITH TO DECEIVE A BLACK AMERICAN AND FEMALE AND TO DISALLOW FAIR ND EQUAL JUSTICE IN WHICH THE MANY ATTEMPTS TO STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY IS STILL ON-GOING NOW IN WHICH APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON HAS RESIDED INSIDE HER HOME FOR SOME THIRTY-TWO YEARS AND HER SPOUSE DIED INSIDE OF THE HOME IN WHICH THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON IS A WIDOW.
4. THE ACTIONS AND INACTIONS OF THE APPELLEES, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING AND U S BANK TO DISALLOW IN THE MANY LAWSUITS FILED AND PENDING THAT THEY ARE SEPARATE AND NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE LOAN SERVICER, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING DOES THAT CONSTITUTE FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION AND DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTIC;E? U S BANK, APPELLEE USES AND CONTINUES TO USE THE FALSE DOCUMENTATION AND FACTS FROM THE LOAN SERVICER, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICER BUT CONTINUES TO ON SOME LAWSUIT DOCUMENTS IN THE ORIGINAL PETITION TO "INTENTIONALLY" NOT LIST THE LOAN SERVICER, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVIXCING WHO HAS MANY INACCURATE ACCOUNTING THAT HAS BEEN MENTIONED SINCE 2014. THE "BOGUS" LETTER MENTIONED ABOVE CONTINUES TO STATE THAT NO FEES ARE DUE AND THAT NOTHING SHOULD BE WORRIED ABOUT FROM THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON BUT THEY CONTINUE TO THROUGH DECEPTTION, FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE.
5. CAN THE APPELLEE, U S BANK MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS IN THE 2014 LETTER THAT IS "BOGUS" AND STATE THAT EVERYTHING IS O.K. AND NOTHING IS OWED

MONETARILY AND THEN CHOSE TO FILE MANY LAWSUITS AND MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS BEFORE THE MANY JUDGES.?

6. CAN THE APPELLEE, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING NOT APPEAR IN THE BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING AND YET LATER STATE THAT THEY ARE OWED MONEY SINCE 2014?
7. THE AGREED ORDER IN BANKRUPTCY COURT WAS SIGNED IN 2015 BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE BARBARA HOUSER WHEN THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING FAILRED TO APPEAR IN COURT IN 2016 IN WHICH A FALSE CLAIM WAS MADE THAT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE “BOGUS” LETTER MENTIONED ABOVE THQAT STATES THAT NO MONEY IS OWED AND THAT THE ACCOUNT IS IN GOOD STANDING.
8. DO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON BELIEVE THE “BOGUS” LETTER THT HAS BEEN PROVEN TO BE FRAQUDULENT IN WHICH THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAVE BROUGHT THE SAME IDENTICAL CLAIM TO MANY COURTS SEEKING TO CONTINUE TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST A BLACK AMERICAN AND FEMALE.?
9. CAN THIS COURT MAKE A RULING ON THE “BOGUS” LETTER SIGNED IN DECEMBER 2014 AND DISALLOW THE CONTINUED INCONSISTENT TACTICS OF APPEARINJG IN BD FAITH AND STATING TO THE MANY JUDGES AND JUSTICES THAT THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON IS IN ARREARAGES IN HER HOME MORTGAGE.
10. CAN THIS COURT MAKE A RULING THAT THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDERS CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE IN WHCH THERE HAVE BEEN MANY “DOCTORED” DOCUMENTS FILED OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN WHICH THE ABUSE OF POWER OF THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE HAVE JOINED IN WITH THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND HAVE IGNORED THE AGREED ORDER SIGNED BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE BARBARA HOUSER WHO HAS SINCE RETIRED AND THE APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE HAVE BEEN SELECTED AS THE NEW CHIEFJUSTICE IN THE BANKRUPTCY COURT ALTHOUGH THE FILED JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT AND PENDING MOTIIONS FOR EXPUNGEMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT IS STILL PENDING.
11. CAN THIS COURT MAKE A RULING TO ALLOW THE PENDING MOTONS IN LIMINE REGARDING HER MORTGAGE DEBT TO BE GRANTED IN WHICH THE APPELLEES FAILED TO FILE A RESPONSIVE PLEA AND HAVE THEREFORE COMMITTED DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN WHICH THERE IS A PER PERSON MONETARY JUDGMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00
12. CAN THE JUDGE, HARLIN HALE STATE TO THE TYPING COURT REPORTER, A YOUNG BLACK FEMALE TO STOP THAT TYPING AND TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE BY REFUSING TO ALLOW A FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE HEARING REGARDING THE OBJECTIONS MAKE BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON?
13. HAVE THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING COMMITTED AGGRAVATED PERJURY BY STATING THAT THE .NOTICE OF DEFAULT WAS SENT OUT TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON WHEN ACTUALLY N O NOTICE WAS EVER SENT TO

HER REGARDING HER MORTGAGE? THIS FALSE STATEMENT CONTINUES TO BE PLACED WITHIN MANY COURT DOCUMENTS.

14. HAVE THE JUDGE HARLIN HALE JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OF A "CD" BE USED IN WHICH THE REQUEST WAS MADE BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON THAT HAS BEEN PENDING SINCE 2018?
15. CAN THE JUDGE HARLIN HALE TELEPHONE THE POLICE AND/OR SECURITY TO THE COURT ROOM WHEN HE DOES NOT LIKE THE OBJECTIONS MADE BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, IN AN IMPROMPTU HEARING WITHOUT ANY NOTICE NOR A RIGHT TO ILLEGALLY DETAIN HER?
16. IS THE JUDGE HARLIN HALE AIDING AND ABETTING THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING WHEN HE REFUSES TO ALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE AND TO CONTINUE WITH AN IMPROMPTU HEARING "AFTER" THE POLICE AND/OR SECURITY HAS BEEN CALLED SO THAT THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON WILL NOT BE INSIDE THE COURT ROOM TO ALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE.
17. IS IT ILLEGAL FOR THE APPELLEES, U S BANK TO USE FAKE DOCUMENTS WITHIN A COURT SETTING THAT IS OBJECTED TO BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON WHO HAS STATED THAT NO "REQUIRED" ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING AND THE FACT THAT THE CONTINUED "DOCTORED DOCUMENTS CONTINUES TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTIC.
\
18. HAVE THE APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING VIOLATED THE BANKRUPTCY STAY BY CONTINUING TO FILE THE SAME DOCUMENTS WITHIN THE MANY COURTS SEEKING FRIENDSHIP RATHER THAN JUSTICE.?
19. WITHOUT THERE BEING A COURT REPORTER RECORD IN THE LOWER COURT, THE DISTRICT COURT IN 2014 THAT LED TO THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT ALTHOUGH AN ANSWER WAS FILED BE A VIOLATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY STAY AS WELL AS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE THAT THE DECISION WAS ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY DONE.?
20. CAN THERE BE A FAIR TRIAL WITHOUT A REPEATED REQUEST FOR A COURT REPORTER RECORD?
21. WITHOUT A COURT REPORTER RECORD DOES THAT MAKE THE APPELLEES, U S BANK SELECT PORTFOLIO HARLIN HALE, JUDGE, ETAL IN VIOLATION OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE REGARDING THE MORTGAGE HOME BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.?

LIST OF PARTIES

ALL PARTIES DO NOT APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE. **AL LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGMENT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS PETITION IS AS FOLLOWS:**

APPELLANT-PLANITFF	COUNSEL
BRIDGET BROWN PARSON	BRIDGETBROWN PARSON
AKA	AKA
BRIDGET PARSON	BRIDGET PARSON
	508 GRADY LANE
	CEDAR HILL, TEXAS 75104
	214 962-9508
APPELLEES-DEFENDANTS	COUNSEL
SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING	MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM
	14160 DALLAS PARKWAY
	DALLAS TEXAS 75254
	LORI LONG-HAMBY LEAD ATTORNEY
	STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT,, CJHELSSEA SCHNEIDER, ATTORNEY'S
U S BANK	MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM
	14160 DALLAS PARKWAY
	DALLAS, TEXAS 75254
STEPHEN WU JESSICA HOLT	UNKNOWN NO RESPONSE TO LAWSUIT
CHELSSEA SCHNEIDER	
HARLIN HALE, JUDGE	MICHAEL CONNER
	1415 LOUISIANA STREET
	HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
	, KENNETH COFFIN,
	1100 COMMERCE STREET

BANKRUPTCY COURT

DALLAS TEXAS 75242

KENNETH HORD

1100 COMMERCE STREET

DALLAS TEXAS 75242

UNKNOWN, NO RESPONSE TO LAWSUIT

FACTS OF THE CASE

APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON WHO FILES IN GOOD FAITH HER **WRIT OF CERTIORARI**, **PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI IS NEEDED** DUE TO THE FACT THAT HER CASE NO. 19-10277 WAS DISMISSED WITHOUT EVER HEARING THE CASE ON THE MERITS. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENTS WERE NOT MET AND THE DISMISSAL WAS DONE BY THREE JUDGES AND LATER A MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION WAS FILED BY THE APPELLANT, THAT WAS DENIED. APPELLANT, LATER FILED AN ENBANC MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DENIED CLARIFICATION, AND LATER A MOTION FOR ENBANC RECONSIDERATION OF THE DENIED MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION THAT WAS TIMELY FILED. APPELLANT, REQUESTED AN ENBANC RECONSIDERATION DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE CASE WAS DENIED A PUBLICATION THAT INVOLVES A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ALONG WITH A BANK THAT INVOLVES MOST TAX PAYING CITIZENS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SHOULD BE PUBLISHED. APPELLANT, REQUESTED ORAL ARGUMENTS, AND FILED AN AFFIDAVIT OF INABILITY TO PAY COST THAT VIOLATES HER CIVL RIGHTS AND A RIGHT TO FILE AN APPEAL THAT HAS FALLEN UPON DEAF EARS THAT WAS UNOPPOSED. CONSEQUENTLY, A DEFAULT JUDGMENT OCCURRED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 APPELLEE, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER NEVER FILED A "REQUIRED" RESPONSIVE BRIEF TO THE LAWSUIT THAT CONSTITUES A DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN WHICH MONETARY SANCTIONS WAS REQUESTED BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON HAS FILED IN GOOD FAITH HER A TIMELY SUFFICIENT APPELLANT BRIEF. APPELLANT, DO REQUEST A REVIEW OF THIS CASE THAT IS STILL UNHEARD AND NEEDS TO BE HEARD INVOLVING APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, AND THE BANKRUPTCY COURT. APPELLEES, SELECT PORTFOLIO

SERVICING, U S BANK, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, BANKRUPTCY COURT, THROUGH AN ABUSE OF POWER HAVE ALL GANGED UP ON THE APPELLANT AND ARE TRYING TO STEAL HER HOMESTEAD PROPERTY. APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDERS, CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE AND YET HAVE APPEARED "AGAIN" IN BAD FAITH TO STEAL THE HOMESTEAD PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON HAVE BEEN RESIDING AT HER PROPERTY LOCATED AT 508 GRADY LANE CEDAR HILL, TEXAS FOR SOME THIRTY PLUS YEARS. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, FILED A STILL PENDING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT AGAINST THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, A VISITING JUDGE, FOR THE CHIEF JUDGE BARBARA HOUSER, WHO HAS NOT RESPONDED AND THE CASE HAS BEEN "PENDING" FOR SOME SIX YEARS. APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE HAVE RECEIVED A HIGHER JOB RECENTLY AS THE "NOW" CHIEF JUSTICE FOR THE BANKRUPTCY COURT. THE FAILURE OF THE JURSTICE DEPARTMENT TO FOLLOW UP ON THE COMPLAINT MADE BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, SHOWS A LACK OF RESPECT FOR PRO SE LITIGANTS AS WELL AS FOR BLACK AMERICANS AND WOMEN. THE LACK OF CONCERN AND TO MAKE A REPORT TO DETER OTHERS FROM ENGAGING IN THE SAME UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR THAT VIOLATES THE BOND AND OATH OF OFFICE TAKEN FOR THE JOB AS A JUDGE. APPELLEE , HARLIN HALE WILL NOW HAVE EVEN A MORE INCREASING DESIRE TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE WITHIN A COURT ROOM SETTING. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE FILED A JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BUT IT HAVE TO BE HEARD IN ORDER TO DETER JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON HAVE BEEN DENIED AN AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY WHEN SHE HAD BEEN GRANTED IN OTHER CASES WITH THE IDENTICAL SAME DOCUMENTS. THEREFORE, THE APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE WILL NOT ONLY STATE "STOP THAT TYPING" TO A COURT REPORTER BUT WILL CONTINUE TO "STOP" APPELLANT CASE FROM BEING HEARD. THE APPELLEE, U S BANK CONTINUE TO "REQUEST" THE APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE, BARBARA

HOUSER IN ORDER TO GAIN FRIENDSHIP AND TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. THIS HAVE OCCURRED TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN MANY COURTS IN WHICH THERE IS MISCONDUCT FROM THE JUDICIAL BENCH THAT DISALLOWS THE APPELLANT TO ALONE BE ABLE TO STOP THE REOCCURRING MISBEHAVIOR AND VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON DOES SEEK PROTECTION FROM THE COURT TO STOP THE SPREADING OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE REQUESTED THE MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 TO DETER SUCH MISBEHAVIOR AND TO DETER OTHERS FROM ENGAGING IN THIS BEHAVIOR. THE MAYBE NEW OR PRECEDENT CASE MENTIONED IN THIS CASE SHOWS THAT THERE IS A LONG HISTORY OF THE APPELLEE, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING TO STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY FROM THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON AND TO TAKE KICK-BACKS THAT CONTINUES TO HARM THE HOME OWNERSHIP OF BLACK AMERICANS AND TO DISALLOW THE ONGOING MISTREATMENT OF THE BLACK AMERICANS THROUGH CIVIL CONSPIRACY AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. THERE IS A RAMPANT NEW SIGNS ON JUST ABOUT EVERY STREET CORNER IN THE BLACK AMERICANS NEIGHBORHOODS THAT ARE SEEKING TO BUY THE HOMES FROM THE BLACK AMERICANS. THE TREND MENTIONED CONTINUES TO INCREASE MOST RECENTLY WITHIN THE LAST SIXTEEN YEARS IN THE DALLAS TEXAS AREA. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, HAS BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST ALSO AS A HOMEOWNER IN WHICH THE APPELLEE, U S BANK HAVE ENGAGED IN MISCONDUCT BY GIVING A LETTER DATED DECEMBER 23, 2014 TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON "AFTER" MAKING A TELEPHONE CALL TO HER STATING THAT EVERYTHING IS OK AND THAT NO MONEY IS STILL BEING OWED AND/OR BEING PURSUED AND THAT SHE OWES NOTHING AND THAT HER HOME WOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE UPCOMING FORECLOSURE SALE IN JANUARY 2015. HOWEVER, THIS SAME LETTER DATED DECEMBER 23, 2014 STATES THAT IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS IN 2014 THAT THE APPELLEE, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING WOULD SEEK

ILLEGAL TACTICS TO SEND LETTERS OF FRAUD TO BLACK AMERICANS AND PEOPLE OF COLOR TO DISALLOW FAIR HOUSING AND TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THEM BECAUSE OF THE COLOR OF THEIR SKIN. APPELLEE, US BANK HAVE IN MANY CASES TRIED TO DISSASOCIATE THEMSELVES FROM THE OTHER PARTY, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING. THE APPELLEE, U S BANK HAVE ALSO TRIED TO DISSASOCIATE THEMSELVES FROM THE LAW FIRM MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM IN WHICH MANY ATTORNEYS AND LAW FIRMS HAVE BEEN USED TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE AND TO REORGANIZE WITHOUT FILING A BANKRUPTCY. THE APPELLEE, U S BANK WOULD NOT BECOME BANKRUPT DUE TO THE FACT THAT THEY ARE TRYING TO STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON BUT MANY OTHER BLACK AMERICAN HOMEOWNERS AS WELL. APPELLEES, US BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAVE MAINTAINED INACCURATE ACCOUNTING AND HAVE CONTINUED TO DO SO IN WHICH THERE ARE FALSE AFFIDAVITS FILED BY THEM IN THIS CASE. THE LEAD ATTORNEY, LORI LONG-HAMBY WAS DISBARRED IAS STATED IN THE FIFTH COURT OF APPEALS IN DALLAS TEXAS IN WHICH THERE ALSO IS A PENDING CASE INVOLVING THE SAME PARTIES AND ISSUES, IF THE LEAD ATTORNEY IS DISBARRED FOR MISCONDUCT IN THE FIFTH COURT OF APPEALS THEN THAT MAKES THE ENTIRE APPELLEE, LAW FIRMS BE ALSO CORRUPT AND GUILTY OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. THE APPELLEE, AFFIDAVITS FILED BY LORI LONG-HAMBY SHOULD BE DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE IN THIS CASE. THE PENDING MONETARY SANCTIONS REQUESTED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 IN WHICH THE APPELLEE, U S BANK HAVE REFUSED TO FILE AN ANSWER IN THIS CASE AND THE LAST COURT DISMISSED THE CASE AND/OR DID NOT HEAR THE CASE ON THE MERITS. THE APPELLEE, U S BANK LAST COURT DID NOT EVEN ALLOW THE PENDING ORAL ARGUMENTS AND NEVER CONTACTED THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON TO DO SO. THE MONETARY SANCTIONS REQUESTED BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 PER PERSON BOTH PROFESSIONALLY AND INDIVIDUALLY WAS NEVER RESPONDED TO IN WHICH A DEFAULT IS APPROPRIATE TO SEND A MESSAGE TO DETER ALL LITIGANTS AND APPELLEES TO HAVE TO PAY THE MONETARY

SANCTIONS THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN PAID BY THE APPELLEES, U S BANK WHO ALSO NEVER RESPONDED TO COUNTER-CLAIMS IN THE MANY COURTS AND JUDGES IN THIS LAWSUIT. THE MEMORANDUM, OPINION, AND ORDER FILED BY THE FEDERAL JUDGE LINDSEY HAVE STATED IN THE OPINION IN CASE NUMBER _____ THAT THE NEW CASE FILED BY THE APPELLEE, U S BANK SHOULD BE REMANDED TO THE LOWER COURT IN DALLAS TEXAS COUNTY TO FILE A FORECLOSURE PROCEEDING. THE APPELLEES, U S BANK DECIDED TO FILE THE EXACT SAME IDENTICAL DOCUMENT TO THE SAME U S FEDERAL COURT IN WHICH ANOTHER U S DISTRICT JUDGE GODBEY WHO DECIDED TO REVERSE WHAT HE PREVIOUSLY SAID ALONG WITH THE SAME U S MAGISTRATE JUDGE RUTHERFORD WHO ALSO DECIDED TO REVERSE THE PREVIOUS RULLINGS AND DECISIONS AND TO ENGAGE IN A NEW CASE FILING THAT DOES NOT HAVE EVEN A SIMPLE "REQUIRED" CIVIL COVER SHEET. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE EXPERIENCED THE RAMPANT TAMPERING WITH THE RECORDS IN THE MANY CASES FILED THAT FAVORS KICK-BACKS IN WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN A SENSE OF URGENCY TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. THE PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION HAVE LED TO THE APPELLEES CONTEMPT OF COURT AND HAVE SHOWN THE LACK OF RESPECT FOR FOLLOWING THE KNOWN ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT HAVE SHOWN THAT THE APPELLEE, U S BANK LEAD ATTORNEY LORI LONG-HAMBY HAVE SHOWN THAT THERE ARE MANY "DOCTORED" DOCUMENTS AND FALSE DOCUMENTS AND FACTS THAT DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. APPELEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, HAVE FILED MANY DIFFERENT SIMILAR VERSIONS OF THE "DOCTORED" DOCUMENTS IN WHICH THEY ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDER CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE AND THEY CONTINUES TO FILE IN THE SAME COURTS BUT HAVE ALSO BEGAN FILING IN THE WRONG JURISDICTION. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, SHOWS THAT THE APPELLEES U S BANK SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING AND THE MANY OTHERS WHO ARE PARTICIPANTS IN THIS SCHEME TO DEFRAUD THE BLACK AMERICANS AND WOMEN AND VULNERABLE WIDOWS SUCH AS THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON IS UNFAIR AND DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. THE DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND SAME "DOCTORED"

SANCTIONS THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN PAID BY THE APPELLEES, U S BANK WHO ALSO NEVER RESPONDED TO COUNTER-CLAIMS IN THE MANY COURTS AND JUDGES IN THIS LAWSUIT. THE MEMORANDUM, OPINION, AND ORDER FILED BY THE FEDERAL JUDGE LINDSEY HAVE STATED IN THE OPINION IN CASE NUMBER _____ THAT THE NEW CASE FILED BY THE APPELLEE, U S BANK SHOULD BE REMANDED TO THE LOWER COURT IN DALLAS TEXAS COUNTY TO FILE A FORECLOSURE PROCEEDING. THE APPELLEES, U S BANK DECIDED TO FILE THE EXACT SAME IDENTICAL DOCUMENT TO THE SAME U S FEDERAL COURT IN WHICH ANOTHER U S DISTRICT JUDGE GODBEY WHO DECIDED TO REVERSE WHAT HE PREVIOUSLY SAID ALONG WITH THE SAME U S MAGISTRATE JUDGE RUTHERFORD WHO ALSO DECIDED TO REVERSE THE PREVIOUS RULLINGS AND DECISIONS AND TO ENGAGE IN A NEW CASE FILING THAT DOES NOT HAVE EVEN A SIMPLE "REQUIRED" CIVIL COVER SHEET. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE EXPERIENCED THE RAMPANT TAMPERING WITH THE RECORDS IN THE MANY CASES FILED THAT FAVORS KICK-BACKS IN WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN A SENSE OF URGENCY TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. THE PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION HAVE LED TO THE APPELLEES CONTEMPT OF COURT AND HAVE SHOWN THE LACK OF RESPECT FOR FOLLOWING THE KNOWN ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT HAVE SHOWN THAT THE APPELLEE, U S BANK LEAD ATTORNEY LORI LONG-HAMBY HAVE SHOWN THAT THERE ARE MANY "DOCTORED" DOCUMENTS AND FALSE DOCUMENTS AND FACTS THAT DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. APPELEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, HAVE FILED MANY DIFFERENT SIMILAR VERSIONS OF THE "DOCTORED" DOCUMENTS IN WHICH THEY ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDER CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE AND THEY CONTINUES TO FILE IN THE SAME COURTS BUT HAVE ALSO BEGAN FILING IN THE WRONG JURISDICTION. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, SHOWS THAT THE APPELLEES U S BANK SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING AND THE MANY OTHERS WHO ARE PARTICIPANTS IN THIS SCHEME TO DEFRAUD THE BLACK AMERICANS AND WOMEN AND VULNERABLE WIDOWS SUCH AS THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON IS UNFAIR AND DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE. THE DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND SAME "DOCTORED"

DOCUMENTS WITH AN INTENT TO COMMIT FRAUD AND DECEIVE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON IN THE LETTER WRITTEN BY THE APPELLEE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM IN WHICH THE UNBELIEF OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON HAVE LED TO THIS LAWSUIT IN WHICH THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, HARLIN HALE, VISITING JUDGE, ETAL SHOULD BE MADE TO PAY THE MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350.000.00 THE PRECEDENT CASE HAVE BEEN OCCURRING OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN WHICH THERE ARE MANY HOMEOWNERS WHO ARE BEING FACED WITH THE SAME IDENTICAL REOCCURRING FRAUDULENT ACTS IN WHICH A MORTGAGE COMPANY AND BANK SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO JUST SAY FALSE STATEMENTS TO A HOMEOWNER IN DISTRESS AND DURESS OF NOT ONLY BANKRUPTCY, BUT BEING A RECENT WIDOW IN DECEMBER 23, 2014, AND THEN HAVING TO RAISE KIDS IN AN ENVIRONMENT WHEN THEY WILL NOT TRUST THE BANKS AND LAW FIRMS AND ATTORNEYS WHO ARE HERE TO SERVE AND NOT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE WEAK AND DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE BLACK AMERICAN AND FEMALE IN THIS CASE. APPELLEE, U S BANK HAVE GIVEN "INTENTIONAL" FALSE STATEMENTS OVER THE TELEPHONE AND THEN LATER IN WRITING THAT THEY SHOULD BE MADE ACCOUNTABLE OF THE KNOWN LETTER DATED DECEMBER 23, 2021. AND PAY THE MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350.000.00 THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM AND THEIR ATTORNEYS, STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, AND CHELSEA SCHNEIDER HAVE CONTINUED TO NOT ANSWER THE LAWSUIT AND ALSO ARE MADE TO BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS AND INACTIONS AND ARE IN DEFAULT OF THE MONETARY SANCTIONS OF THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350.00.00 THE APPELLEES, HAVE PUT THE SAME LYING TACTICS OVER THE TELEPHONE ONTO PAPER AS WELL AS IN THE MAIL AND HAVE AIDED AND ABETTED THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING. THE APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE HAD A ROLE TO PLAY IN WHICH THERE ARE PEOPLE IN HIGH PLACES TO HELP DEFRAUD THE HOMEOWNERS, ESPECIALLY THOSE WHO ARE BLACK AMERICANS AND PEOPLE OF COLOR. LACK OF RESPECT FOR APPELLANT, WHO IS A HOMEOWNER AND A RECENT THE

PROMOTION TO CHIEF JUSTICE SHOWS THAT THE JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT CASE NUMBER PENDING WANT BE HEARD UNLESS THIS COURT INTERVENES. THE PROMOTION HAS SHOWN THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON THAT THE PENDING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT WILL NOT BE HEARD ON THE MERITS. THE CD HAS NEVER BEEN HEARD FROM THE COURTREPORTER BEING TOLD TO "STOP THAT TYPING" DURING ANOTHER IMPROMPTU HEARING IN WHICH THE APPELLANT, WAS LEFT OF THE INSIDE COURTROOM AND SHOWN AND HAPPEN AND THAT THE PENDING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT WILL NOT DETER OTHER JUDGES TO HAS FA E. . THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE FILED IN GOOD FAITH BUT THE APPEALS COURT AND THE JUDICIAL COMPLAINT COMMITTEE THAT IS ALSO LOCATED AT THE SAME LOCATION IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT IN NEW ORLEANS LOUISIANA. THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE IS ALSO FROM THE GREAT STATE OF NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA THAT MAY HAVE SOMETHING TO DO WITH THE DELAY OF JUSTICE. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, FILES IN GOOD FAITH HER PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND DO REQUEST THAT HER CASE IS HEARD FOR THE FIRST TIME ON THE MERITS IN WHICH A CLARIFICATION MOTION WAS DENIED AND THE REASON GIVEN FOR NOT HEARING THE CASE DOES NOT MATCH THE "UNOPPOSED" EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE. THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON ARE VIOLATED DUE TO DISCRIMINATION OF RACIAL AND GENDER, FAIR HOUSING, AGGRAVATED PERJURY, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, HARASSMENT, INTIMIDATION. THE COURT HAVE ALSO REFUSED TO ALLOW THE APPELLANT, TO PROCEED ON THE AFFIDAVIT OF INABILITY TO PAY COST AND THE ORAL ARGUMENTS REQUEST HAVE BEEN "IGNORED" THAT WERE BOTH TIMELY MADE TO THE COURT. THE APPEARANCE OF TWO SETS OF RULES BY THE COURT CONTINUES TO PREJUDICE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON BEFORE THE COURT AND THE FAILURE OF THE COURT TO HEAR THE CASE AT ALL AND TO HEAR THE CASE ON THE MERITS OF THE CASE DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE THAT SHOWS BIAS. ALL STEPS REQUIRED TO FILE AN APPEAL IN THE COURT WERE MET.

REASON FOR GRANTING

APPELLANT, FILED A TIMELY AND SUFFICIENT APPEAL APPELLANT'S SUFFICIENT BRIEF WAS ACCEPTED BY THE COURT. THERE WAS NO "REQUIRED" OPPOSED APPELLEE BRIEF AND/OR RESPONSES FILED IN THIS CASE THAT CONSTITUTES A DEFAULT JUDGEMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, REQUESTED MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 IN THE UNOPPOSED LAWSUIT. THEREFORE, THE ACTIONS AND INACTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT LOCATED IN NEW ORLEANS LOUISIANA ARE PROCEDURALLY INEFFECTIVE. THE ISSUES UNDISPUTABLE ISSUES ARE:

1. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, REQUESTED ORAL ARGUMENTS IN THIS APPEAL THAT WOULD REQUIRE THE COURT TO INTERPRET THE LIMITTIONS ON AN APPELLANT, PLAINTIFF, RECOVERY IN WHICH EXPUNGEMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT IS REQUESTED ALONG WITH THE MONETARY SANCTIONS OF \$4,350,000.00 TO PREVENT OTHERS FROM CONTINUING TO BREAK THE LAW AND NOT FOLLOW THE RULES OF COURT AND TO WITHOUT CONSEQUENCES CONTINUE TO BREAK THE LAW OVER AND OVER AGAIN WITHOUT ANY WORRY OF THERE BEING ANY CONSEQUENCES THAT SHOWS A BLATANT DISREGARD FOR EQUAL TREATMENT AN VIOLATIONS OF A PERSONS CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES WHILE ENTERING A COURT SYSTEM THAT IS SUPPOSED TO BE EQUAL TREATMENT FOR ALL. THE DETERMINATION OF THE "THIN LINE" BETWEEN A CIVIL CASE THAT IS ALSO A CRIMINAL CASE IN WHICH STATEMENTS ARE MADE VERBALLY IN THE COURTROOM OF "STOP THAT TYPING" AND EVEN AFTER THE INCIDENT INVOLVING THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE WHO LEFT THE BENCH AND BEGAIN STANDING OVER THE COURT REPORTER A YOUNG BLACK FEMALE SHOWS NOT ONLY INTIMIDATION BUT APPEARED TO BE POSSIBLE AGGRAVATED ASSAULT IF THE YOUNG BLACK FEMALE DID NOT STOP TYPING INSIDE THE COURTROOM. THE APPELLEE, HARLIN HALE WHILE STANDING IN THE BLACK ROBE FOR JUSTICE FOR ALL HAD JUST COMMITTED AN OFFENSE THAT IS IRREPREHENSIBLE AND

THAT SHOWS THAT FULL IMMUNITY DOES NOT COVER ACTIONS OF SUCH IRRATIONAL BEHAVIOR. THIS BEHAVIOR VIOLATES THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON WHO HAS FILED THE APPEAL AND FILED A "PENDING" JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT IN THIS CASE THAT HAS FALLEN UPON DEAF EARS. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, STUDENTS WHO SHE TAUGHT WHO ARE MOSTLY CHILDREN OF COLOR WOULD THINK THAT "OF COURSE" NOTHING IS GOING TO BE DONE IN THIS MATTER BECAUSE OF THE COLOR OF ONES SKIN. THE CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS NEED TO HEARD IN THIS MATTER. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT THE SAME OUTCOME WOULD EXIST AND WOULD HAVE OCCURRED IF THE APPELLANT, WOULD HAVE BEEN ANOTHER COLOR OF SKIN. THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON DID REPORT THE INCIDENT TO THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE LOCATED INSIDE OF THE SAME BUILDING AS THE BANKRUPTCY COURT WHERE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE WORKED AND WHO SETS THE STANDARD OF BEHAVIOR FOR THE OTHER ATTORNEYS INSIDE OF THE COURTROOM. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, HAS EVIDENCE OF THE INCIDENT THAT HAS NOT BEEN HEARD IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE, EQUITY, DUE PROCESS OF LAW, PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND THE PREVENTION OF MANIFEST INJUSTICE. THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, LATER FILED THE "REQUIRED" JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT AGAINST THE VISITING JUDGE HARLIN HALE WHO WAS "TEMPORARILY" REPLACING THE CHIEF JUSTICE JUDGE BARBARA Houser WHO HAD TEMPORARILY LEFT TO ASSIST THE CITIZENS IN PUERTO RICO STORM RELATED ISSUES. APPELLEES, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, U S BANK ATTORNEY STEPHEN WU REQUESTED THE VISITING JUDGE HARLIN HALE THAT WAS OBJECTED TO BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON. IT IS OBVIOUS WHY THE REQUEST WAS MADE IN ORDER TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND TO CONTINUE TO TRY AND

STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY AND HOMESTEAD PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON. THERE IS EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE OF ONE SIDED JUSTICE IN WHICH THE APPEALS COURT HAVE REFUSED TO HEAR THE CASE ON THE MERITS IN WHICH THERE IS "UNOPPOSED" EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE TO SUPPORT THAT THIS CASE NEEDS TO BE HEARD. THIS CASE IS LIKE NO OTHER CASE AND WOULD SET A PRECEDENT OF "INTENTIONAL" BAD FAITH BEHAVIOR AND WHEN APPEALED TO THE HIGHER COURT THE COURT TURNS A DEAF EAR. THERE IS A CONTINUATION OF MAIL FRAUD IN THIS CASE IN WHICH THE APPELLEE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM HAVE HAND DELIVERED TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AFTER SHE DROVE SOME FORTY FIVE MILES TO PICK UP HER REQUESTED LETTER VERIFYING WHAT SHE HAD BEEN TOLD OVER THE TELEPHONE BY THE APPELLEE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM. APPELLEE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM STATED IN DECEMBER 14, 2014 THAT APPELLANT, CASE WAS IN GOOD STANDING AND CLOSED BECAUSE SHE DID NOT OWE ANY MORE MONEY AND THAT HER ADDRESS WOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE UPCOMING FORECLOSURE DATE IN JANUARY 2015. THIS DID NOT HAPPEN AND APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON DECIDED TO DRIVE TO THE LOCATION OF THE MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM IN DALLAS, TEXAS AND TO RETRIEVE SOMETHING IN WRITING STATING WHAT SHE HAD JUST BEEN TOLD OVER THE TELEPHONE PRIOR TO HER GOING TO THE MACKIE WOLF LAW OFFICE. APPELLEE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM WHO REPRESENTED AT THE TIME, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAVE CREATED A PATTERN OF STEALING THE HOMESTEAD PROPERTIES OF PEOPLE OF COLOR AND WAS ATTEMPTING TO DO THE SAME THING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON. APPELLANT, BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, HOME WAS NEVER REMOVED FROM THE "UP COMING" FORECLOSURE DATE IN JANUARY OF 2015 THAT LED TO THE FILING OF THE BANKRUPTCY CASE TO SAVE HER HOME. THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAVE CONTINUED TO

FILE MISREPRESENTATION, FRAUD, IN MULTIFARIOUS COURTS BY STATING FALSELY THAT THEY ARE THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDERS, CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE AND WITHOUT AN IMMEDIATE COURT INTERVENTION MANIFEST INJUSTICE WILL CONTINUE TO OCCUR. APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, JUDGE HARLIN HALE AND THE MANY ATTORNEYS HAVE CHOSEN TO SEEK HARASSMENT, INTIMIDATION, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, AGGRAVATED PERJURY OVER JUSTICE. THE CONVERSATIONS PRIOR TO THE APPELLATE, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, REQUEST FOR THE WRITTEN "AFTER" THE VERBAL LIE WAS STILL HANDED OVER TO HER WITH A SMILE IN WHICH THE SIGNATURE ON THE DOCUMENT FROM DECEMBER 14, 2014 IS NOT WRITTEN WITH A FIRST AND LAST NAME THAT IS "INTENTIONALLY" ILLEGIBLE. THIS IS FRAUD AND THE CONTINUATION TO IGNORE WHAT HAPPENED IS A TRAVESTY TO JUSTICE IN WHICH EQUAL JUSTICE DOES NOT EXIST AND THAT THERE ARE TWO SETS OF LAWS WITHIN THE COURT SYSTEM. THIS COURT DESERVES TO GET TO THE BOTTOM OF THE UNTRUTHS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS AND THE FACT THAT THE NO RESPONSE IS A SIGN OF GUILT. SILENCE IS GUILT IN THIS CASE. THE APPELLEE DID NOT FILE A "RESPONSIVE" BRIEF IN THIS MATTER. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, ASSUMED THAT MAYBE THE APPELLEES, WOULD SHOW FOR THE ORAL ARGUMENTS THAT WERE REQUESTED IN THIS MATTER THAT HAVE BEEN DENIED AND NOT EVEN LISTED AS TO WHY NO ORAL ARGUMENTS WERE SCHEDULED AND/OR ALLOWED TO BE DONE IN THIS CASE. TWO BANKRUPTCIES HAVE BEEN FILED AND THE "BOGUS" LETTER DATED DECEMBER 2014 CONTINUES TO HARASS, DISTORT THE TRUTH, SHOWS FRAUD, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY THAT HAS CONTINUED TO OVER LOAD THE FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT IN DALLAS TEXAS, FEDERAL, BANKRUPTCY, DISTRICT, AND NOW THE COURT OF APPEALS FIFTH CIRCUIT IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, ETAL. ALL PERSONS ARE SUPPOSED TO ABIDE BY THE SAME RULES OF COURT AND NOT MAKE UP NEW RULES THAT IS NOT EQUAL

JUSTICE. THERE SHOULD BE NO BIG I'S AND LITTLE U'S IN THE COURT SYSTEM. FRIENDSHIP THAT RESULTS IN ILLEGAL KICK-BACKS NOR BEING INDIGENT IS NOT SUPPOSED TO OVERLOOK EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL. THE TRUTH SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED WITHOUT REGARD TO RACIAL AND ECONOMIC DISPARITY DUE TO ONES FINANCIAL INABILITY TO PAY FOR COURT COST. THAT IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THIS CASE AND MANY OTHER PEOPLE OF COLOR. THIS WILL CONTINUE TO OCCUR AND REOCCUR OVER AND OVER AGAIN UNLESS THIS COURT INTERVENES AND PREVENTS MANIFEST INJUSTICE. THERE ARE SIGNS ON EVERY STREET CORNER IN DALLAS TEXAS SAYING "WE BUY HOUSES" THAT ARE NOT ALSO IN PREDOMINATELY WEALTHY AREAS AND/OR PEOPLE OF COLOR OR BLACK AMERICANS. IT APPEARS THAT THE COURT SYSTEM ARE PREYING ON THE POOR, BLACK AMERICANS, WIDOWS, AND PEOPLE OF COLOR WHO USUALLY HAVE NO WHERE ELSE TO TURN AND ARE PLACED ON THE CURBS OF NEIGHBORHOODS DUE TO FALSE FORECLOSURE AND END OF ENTERING HOMELESSNESS. WHEN ATTORNEYS ARE COURT APPOINTED THEY TEND TO JOIN IN WITH THE OTHER SIDE AND THEN GANG UP ON THEIR OWN CLIENT FOR KICK-BACKS AND GREED AND OF COURSE TO STEAL HOMES AND MAKE THREATENING PHONE CALLS AND SEND "FALSE" LETTERS WITH NO REGARD FOR THE TRUTH TO SCARE THE RACIALLY DEPRIVED AND ADD MORE FEAR IN WHICH YOU CANNOT EVEN ENJOY YOUR AMERICAN DREAM WHICH IS YOUR HOME.

2. THERE ARE STILL PENDING APPEALED MOTIONS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINE THAT INVOLVE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON EXPUNGEMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT TO HER HOMESTEAD PROPERTY LOCATED AT 508 GRADY LANE CEDAR HILL, TEXAS 75104.
3. APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLOIO SERVICING, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, ATTORNEYS HAVE ON DECEMBER 14, 2014 BY "ROBBERY BY CONVERSATION, HAVE ENGAGED IN ILLEGAL CONVERSATION, FRAUD, WITH THE INTENT TO STEAL THE HOMESTEAD PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN

JUSTICE. THERE SHOULD BE NO BIG I'S AND LITTLE U'S IN THE COURT SYSTEM. FRIENDSHIP THAT RESULTS IN ILLEGAL KICK-BACKS NOR BEING INDIGENT IS NOT SUPPOSED TO OVERLOOK EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL. THE TRUTH SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED WITHOUT REGARD TO RACIAL AND ECONOMIC DISPARITY DUE TO ONES FINANCIAL INABILITY TO PAY FOR COURT COST. THAT IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THIS CASE AND MANY OTHER PEOPLE OF COLOR. THIS WILL CONTINUE TO OCCUR AND REOCCUR OVER AND OVER AGAIN UNLESS THIS COURT INTERVENES AND PREVENTS MANIFEST INJUSTICE. THERE ARE SIGNS ON EVERY STREET CORNER IN DALLAS TEXAS SAYING "WE BUY HOUSES" THAT ARE NOT ALSO IN PREDOMINATELY WEALTHY AREAS AND/OR PEOPLE OF COLOR OR BLACK AMERICANS. IT APPEARS THAT THE COURT SYSTEM ARE PREYING ON THE POOR, BLACK AMERICANS, WIDOWS, AND PEOPLE OF COLOR WHO USUALLY HAVE NO WHERE ELSE TO TURN AND ARE PLACED ON THE CURBS OF NEIGHBORHOODS DUE TO FALSE FORECLOSURE AND END OF ENTERING HOMELESSNESS. WHEN ATTORNEYS ARE COURT APPOINTED THEY TEND TO JOIN IN WITH THE OTHER SIDE AND THEN GANG UP ON THEIR OWN CLIENT FOR KICK-BACKS AND GREED AND OF COURSE TO STEAL HOMES AND MAKE THREATENING PHONE CALLS AND SEND "FALSE" LETTERS WITH NO REGARD FOR THE TRUTH TO SCARE THE RACIALLY DEPRIVED AND ADD MORE FEAR IN WHICH YOU CANNOT EVEN ENJOY YOUR AMERICAN DREAM WHICH IS YOUR HOME.

2. THERE ARE STILL PENDING APPEALED MOTIONS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINE THAT INVOLVE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON EXPUNGEMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT TO HER HOMESTEAD PROPERTY LOCATED AT 508 GRADY LANE CEDAR HILL, TEXAS 75104.
3. APPELLEES, U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLOIO SERVICING, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, ATTORNEYS HAVE ON DECEMBER 14, 2014 BY "ROBBERY BY CONVERSATION, HAVE ENGAGED IN ILLEGAL CONVERSATION, FRAUD, WITH THE INTENT TO STEAL THE HOMESTEAD PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN

PARSON, AND TO ILLEGALLY STATE THAT THEY ARE THE ORIGINAL NOTE HOLDER, CANNOT PRODUCE THE NOTE, AND HAVE “INTENTIONALLY” MISREPRESENTED WHO THEY ARE FOR PURPOSES OF HARASSMENT, THEFT, FRAUD, IN WHICH THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, THROUGH AN ABUSE OF POWER HAVE ENGAGED IN ILLEGAL EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS IN WHICH HE ACTED AS THE JUDGE, JURY, AND THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY SIMULTANEOUSLY THAT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS OF LAW, EQUITY, PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND SHOWS CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, AND VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON WHO EVEN “AFTER” THE CHIEF JUDGE BARBARA HOUSER SIGNED AN AGREED ORDER IN 2016 THAT STATED THAT \$14,000,00 HAD BEEN PAID ON TIME IN A BANKRUPTCY CASE. THE FINAL ACCOUNTING SHOWED THAT APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAD RECEIVED FROM THE YEARS OF 2015 UNTIL 2018 \$14,000.00 APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON WAS SUBJECTED TO THE TEMPORARY AMNESIA AS WELL AS THE BLATANT DISREGARD FOR PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW THAT WITHOUT AN IMMEDIATE COURT INTERVENTION MANIFEST INJUSTICE WILL CONTINUE TO OCCUR. APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, ATTORNEYS STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, HAVE CONTINUED TO COMMIT FRAUD ON THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, BANKRUPTCY COURT, IN THE ABSENCE OF THE CHIEF JUDGE BARBARA HOUSER, AND ALL BLACK AMERICANS AND PEOPLE OF COLOR WITH MORTGAGES WHO BELIEVE THAT “YOUR WORD IS YOUR BOND” HAVE BEEN TARGETED AND LIED TO AND “AGAIN” COMMITTED AGGRAVATED PERJURY. APPELLEES, HAVE FILED FALSE FIGURES WITH FALSE AMOUNTS OF MONEY OWED IN ASTRONOMICAL FIGURES THAT ARE STATE BARRED IN WHICH THE FIGURES KEEP CHANGED AND DON’T “INTENTIONALLY” ADD UP THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED IT TO THE BANKRUPTCY

COURT AND HAVE THROUGH EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VISITING JUDGE HARLIN HALE ILLEGAL KICK BACKS HAVE OCCURRED. APPELLATE, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO FIND A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL JUDGE IN THIS MATTER IN WHICH THE APPELLEES, JUDGE HARLIN HALE LEFT THE BENCH IN HIS BLACK ROBE, BEGAN STANDING OVER THE COURT REPORTER AND BEGAN HOLLERING "STOP THAT TYPING." THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE THEN TOLD THE COURT POLICE AND/OR SECURITY TO PUT THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, OUT OF THE COURT ROOM IN AN IMPROMPTU HEARING AND LATER CONTINUED WITH AN ILLEGAL HEARING THAT RESULTED IN CONTINUED EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS WITH STILL TO THIS DAY "UNKNOWN" CONCLUSIONS. CONSEQUENTLY, A COMPLETE RECORD WAS NEVER MADE IN THIS CASE DUE TO THE FACT THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED IN WHICH THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE ORDERED THE CSO OFFICERS TO STAND NEXT TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON TO "INTIMIDATE" HER SO THAT SHE COULD NOT SPEAK FREELY AT AN IMPROMPTU HEARING WITHIN AN "ILLEGALL" COURTROOM PROCEDURE. APPELLEES, JUDGE HARLIN HALE ABUSED HIS POWER IN THE ABSENCE OF THE CHIEF JUDGE BARBARA HOUSER AND HAD NO FEAR OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF A JUDICIAL COMPLAINT AND APPEALS FILED THAT HAVE "OF COURSE" FALLEN UPON DEAF EARS. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE IS NOT IMMUNE IN THIS CASE IN WHICH HE HAS VIOLATED AND COMMITTED FRAUD, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY IN WHICH THERE IS A PENDING JUDICIAL COMPLAINT FILED. THE JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT HAVE NEVER BEEN HEARD. THE PRE-FILING PREREQUISITES WERE FILED PRIOR TO FILING THE LAWSUIT IN WHICH THE "STRIKING" OF THE RECORD OF DOCUMENTS FILED BY HER WERE MADE ILLEGALLY DUE TO THE FACT THAT HE DID NOT WANT THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON TO FILE AN APPEAL AND TO EXERCISE HER RIGHT TO DO SO. APPELLEE JUDGE HARLIN HALE HAS TAMPERED WITH THE RECORD ON APPEAL AND DID NOT

ALLOW THE SOME 200 DOCUMENTS FILED BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON TO BE SENT UP TO THE FEDERAL COURT IN DALLAS TEXAS AND/OR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN ORDER FOR HIM TO PREVENT FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE AND TO HIDE THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE. APPELLANT, BRIDGET PARSON, AKA, BRIDGET PARSON FILED FOR A COMPLETE CLERK AND REPORTERS RECORD IN THIS CASE AND/OR APPEALED IN THIS MATTER THAT NEEDS TO BE HEARD DUE TO THE UNOPPOSED EVIDENCE AND FOREGOING STATEMENTS MADE IN

4. THE "BOGUS" LETTER DATED DECEMBER 23,2014 AS WELL AS THE MOTION TO "PRODUCE THE NOTE" AND "MOTION FOR EXPUNGEMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT HAVE NOT BEEN HEARD AND IS STILL PENDING WITH THE OTHER MOTIONS IN LIMINE. THIS IS STILL MISSING FROM THE COMPLETE RECORD SENT BY THE BANKRUPTCY COURT TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THIS LAW SUIT THAT WAS REQUESTED BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.
5. THE DEFAULT JUDMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 SHOULD BE GRANTED IN THE UNDISPUTED UNOPPOSED NON RESPONSE BY THE APPELLEES, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, U S BANK, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, ATTORNEYS STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, AND CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, BANKRUPTCY COURT.
6. THERE IS AN ABUSE OF POWER IN WHICH THERE WERE MOTIONS FOR RECUSALS NEVER HEARD AND NEVER SET FOR A HEARING AGAINST THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE IN WHICH NOW EVEN THE JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT IS "PENDING" AFTER A FEW YEARS. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE HAVE CONDUCTED ILLEGAL IMPROMPTU HEARINGS IN WHICH THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, WAS "THROWN" OUT OF THE COURTROOM WHEN SHE MADE A VERBAL OBJECTION SO THAT THE "UNFAIR" ONE SIDED ILLEGAL EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS COULD CONTINUE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.

7. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON DID MAKE AN OFFICIAL IN PERSON COMPLAINT WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE IN THE SAME BUILDING LOCATED AT 600 COMMERCE STREET DALLAS TEXAS.
8. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE MADE TESTIMONY WITHIN THE IMPROMPTU HEARING THAT MAKES HIM A WITNESS IN THIS CASE. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE MADE TESTIMONY FOR THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, AT THE SAME TIME THAT HE “ORDERED” THE COURT REPORTER TO “STOP THAT TYPING.” HE ALSO DECLARED HIMSELF NOT GUILTY OF ANY CRIME OF THE FILED RECUSALS WITHOUT HAVING A LEGAL “HEARING” IN AN ATTEMPT TO INTIMIDATE, HARASS, DISTORT THE TRUTH, THREATEN, TORTURE, AND TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE FOR THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.
9. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE BEGAN “GANGING UP” ON THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, WHILE ACTING AS THE JUDGE, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, AND JURY ALL SIMULTANEOUSLY THAT IS NOT ONLY ILLEGAL AND BIASES AND PEJUDICIAL WITH AN ABUSE OF POWER, BUT, THIS BEHAVIOR DISALLOWS A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL HEARING. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE ALLOWED THE ATTORNEY OF RECORD TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT A NOTICE AND/OR A LAWFUL HEARING THAT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND SHOWS THAT THE APPELLE, MAKES DECISIONS WITHOUT FOLLOWING THE LAWS AND GUIDELINES OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION THAT ALSO VIOLATES HIS OATH OF OFFICE AS A JUDGE.
10. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, WAS THREATENED WITH VIOLATIONS DURING AN IMPROMPTU HEARING OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND THREATENED TO LOOSE HER FREEDOM ALONG WITH HER FREEDOM OF SPEECH BY ILLEGALLY CALLING THE “CSO” OFFICERS TO THE COURT ROOM TO ILLEGALLY DETAIN AND TO “ILLEGALLY” MUFFLE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON. APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE CONTINUED TO ACT


CONCLUSION

IN DUAL ROLES AS THE JUDGE AND PROSECUTING ATTORNEY AS WELL AS THE JURY THROUGHOUT THE IMPARTIAL IMPROMPTU HEARING IN WHICH HE CONTINUED TO ENGAGE WITH THE OTHER APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, ATTORNEYS WU, HOLT, AND SCHNEIDER TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND TO DISALLOW FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE IN A PLOY TO STEAL THE REAL PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.

11. APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM AND ATTORNEYS WU, HOLT, AND SCHNEIDER HAVE MADE ILLEGAL WRITE OFFS WITH THE IRS AND HAVE CONTINUED TO APPEAR IN THE BANKRUPTCY COURT AGAINST THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, IN MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS WITHIN THE BANKRUPTCY COURT AS TO HOW MUCH MONEY IS OWED THAT CONTRADICTS FROM THE ILLEGAL "BOGUS" LETTER SUBMITTED IN EVIDENCE DATED DECEMBER 14, 2014 THAT HAVE CONTINUED TO GO TO MULTIFARIOS COURTS AND ATTORNEYS.

APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE FILED A PETITION FOR REHEARING IN GOOD FAITH TO BE HEARD AND NOT TO BE TOSSED OVER INSIDE OF A BASKET OF NO RETURN. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, PRAYS THAT HER PETITION FOR REHEARING IS GRANTED AND THAT THE UNOPPOSED MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,000.00 IS GRANTED ALONG WITH THE EXPUNGEMENT OF HER MORTGAGE DEBT DUE TO THE FACT THAT THERE IS A DEFAULT JUDGEMENT IN WHICH NO RESPONSE AND/OR OPPOSED RESPONSIVE PLEADINGS WERE ACCEPTED IN THIS CASE. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, PRAYS THAT HER MOTION FOR REHEARING IS GRANTED IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, EQUITY, DUE PROCESS OF LAW, PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND THE PREVENTION OF MANIFEST INJUSTICE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



BRIDGET BROWN PARSON

AKA

BRIDGET PARSON

508 GRADY LANE

CEDAR HILL TEXAS

75104

214 962-9508

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, APPELLANT, PLAINTIFF, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON DO HEREBY DECLARE THAT A TRUE COPY WAS SENT OF THE FOREGOING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO ALL OF THE PARTIES OF RECORD. JUDGE HARLIN HALE LOCATED AT THE BANKRUPTCY COURT #2 LOCATED AT 600 COMMERCE STREET DALLAS TEXAS 75202; ATTORNEY MIKE CONNER LOCATED AT 600 COMMERCE STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75202; MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM ATTORNEYS STEPHEN WU, JESSICA HOLT, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, ALL LOCATED AT 14160 DALLAS, PKWY DALLAS TEXAS 75254 SENT BY CERTIFIED MAIL AND/OR BY FAX # 214 635-2686 ON MAY 30, 2021.



BRIDGET PARSON

AKA

BRIDGET BROWN PARSON

Supplemental Exhibit
To motion filed on 07-09-15
Mackie Wolf Zientz & Mann, P. C. Cause No:
Attorneys at Law
Phone (214) 635-2650 Fax (214) 635-2686 05-14-01586-CV

PARKWAY OFFICE CENTER, SUITE 900
14160 NORTH DALLAS PARKWAY
DALLAS, TEXAS 75254
* PLEASE RESPOND TO DALLAS OFFICE

UNION PLAZA
124 WEST CAPITOL, SUITE 1560
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201

December 23, 2014

BRIDGET PARSON
508 GRADY LANE
CEDAR HILL, TX 75104

RE: SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, INC.
Loan No.: 0015070311
Current Borrower(s): BRIDGET PARSON
Property Address: 508 GRADY LANE, CEDAR HILL, TX 75104
File No: 14-000362-850

FILED IN
5TH COURT OF APPEALS


2015 JAN 14 PM 5:06
USA MATZ, CLERK

Dear BRIDGET PARSON:

Per our client's instructions, the above referenced matter has been removed from the 01/06/2015 foreclosure sale. Our file is closed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,



Mackie Wolf Zientz & Mann, P. C.

Pursuant to the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, we advise you that this firm is a debt collector attempting to collect the debt referred to above and any information we obtain from you will be used for that purpose.

NITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

600 SOUTH MATRIX PLACE

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

BRIDGET BROWN PARSON

CASE NO. 19:10277

APPELLENT

VS.

SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING

U S BANK

JUDGE HARLIN HALE

BANKRUPTCY COURT #2

MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM

STEPHEN WU,

CHELSEA SCHNEIDER

JESSICA HOLT

Appellant Bridget Parson motion to
APPELLEES Stay further proceedings pending Appeal and Writ
of Certiorari.

APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET

PARSON FILES IN GOOD FAITH HER MOTION's FOR: Stay of further
proceedings pending Appeal and Writ of Certiorari.

1) CLARIFICATON OF THE OPINION DATED OCTOBER 27, 2020

THAT SHE OBJECTS TO AND SEEKS A CLARIFICATION OF AN
UNOPPOSED "SUFFICIENT AND TIMELY APPEAL FILED IN
GOOD FAITH ON JULY 09, 2019.

2) DENIAL OF THE "ISP, AND/OR AFFIDAVIT OF INABILITY TO
PAY COSTS.

3) DENIAL OF THIS OPIINION AND/OR CASE BEING PUBLISHED.
THE OPINION AND/OR CASE SHOULD BE PUBLISHED AND THE
MERITS OF THIS CASE HEARD. APPELLANT, BRIDGET
PARSON FILES THIS MOTIN FOR CLARIFICATION DUE TO:

MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION IS FILED IN GOOD FAITH
OBJECTING TO:

- 1) OBJECTING TO THE OPINION DATED OCTOBER 27, 2020 FROM A PANEL HEARING OF 3 JUSTICES WHO NEVER HEARD THE MERITS OF THIS “UNOPPOSED” “SUFFICIENTLY” FILED APPEAL
- 2) OBJECTION OF PANEL HEARING OF THREE JUSTICES RATHER THAN AN EN BANC HEARING IN WHICH EXHIBITS ARE ATTACHED.
- 3) OBJECTIONS OF A PANEL HEARING THAT DENIED SIMULTANEOUSLY AN UNOPPOSED “ISP” AND AN “UNOPPOSED” “SUFFICIENT” AND “TIMELY” FILED APPEAL FILED ON JULY 09, 2019.
- 4) REASON OR REASONS ARE REQUESTED FOR THE “UNOPPOSED” “UNHEARD” SUFFICIENT APPEAL WITHOUT HONORING THE REQUESTED ORAL ARGUMENT “PRIOR” TO AN OPINION THAT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS OF LAW, PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, THAT WAS ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY DONE IN WHICH THE REASON GIVEN DOES NOT SUPPORT THE EVIDENCE IN THIS “UNOPPOSED” CASE IN WHICH THE RELIEF REQUESTED OF \$4,350,000.00 WAS ALSO UNOPPOSED. BY THE APPELLEES.
- 5) THERE IS A “PENDING” JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OF THE JUDGE HARLIN HALE WHO STOOD OVER A COURT REPORTER AND STATED “STOP THAT TYPING” AFTER LEAVING THE BENCH DURING A HEARING HELD IN WHICH THERE HAD BEEN EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS AND THE “TAPE” OF THE INCIDENCE HAVE NOT BEEN HEARD BY THE JUSTICES THAT “SHOWS” NOT ONLY JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BUT CIVIL AND ALSO CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. THERE IS EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE IN WHICH THE PENDING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT HAVE NOT BEEN HEARD. THE APPELLEE, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, BANKRUPTCY COURT #2 JUDGE, IS ALSO FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA THAT APPEARS TO BE PART REASON FOR THE DELAY FOR JUSTICE.
- 6) REASONS REQUESTED AND OBJECTIONS TO THE “UNHEARD” OPINION THAT STATED “FRIVOLOUS” WHEN THERE IS EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL FILED IN A TIMELY MANNER THAT HAVE BEEN JUDGES AND

MULTIFARIOUS COURTS WHO HAVE WRITTEN ORDERS ATTACHED AS EXHIBITS SINCE THE “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL WAS FILED ON JULY 09, 2019.

- 7) OBJECTIONS TO THE “UNOPPOSED” DENIAL OF THE ISP IN WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE COURTS WHO HAVE RECEIVED THE SAME AFFIDAVIT OF INABILITY TO PAY COST AND HAVE APPROVED THE “EXACT” WORD FOR WORD “ISP.”
- 8) OBJECTIONS TO THE “UNOPPOSED” “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL FILED ON JULY 09, 2019 THAT DISALLOWS FAIR AND EQUAL JUSTICE, DISALLOWS AN UNOPPOSED “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL TO BE GRANTED IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, EQUITY, DUE PROCESS OF LAW, PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND WITHOUT AN IMMEDIATE COURT INTERVENTION MANIFEST INJUSTICE WILL CONTINUE TO OCCUR.
- 9) CLARIFICATION OF THE DECISION TO NOT PUBLISH THIS “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL THAT RELATES TO MANY BLACK AMERICANS, BANKS, PEOPLE OF ALL COLORS WHO HAVE MORTGAGES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD. THE OBJECTED TO APPEARANCE TO DISCRIMINATE AND VIOLATE THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON WHO HAVE OBJECTED TO THE ACTIONS OF THE APPELLEES, US BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, BANKRUPTCY COURT 2, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM , STEPHEN WU, CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, JESSICA HOLT, ETAL WHO HAVE RECEIVED OBJECTED TO IMMUNITY, AND/OR SPECIAL PRIVILEGES IN WHICH “NO” REQUIRED RESPONSE WAS SENT IN TO THE COURT BUT YET AN ADVERSE DECISION WAS DELIVERED THAT APPEARS TO BE ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY DONE THAT CONTINUES TO ADVERSELY AFFECT THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, THAT “SHOWS” HARASSMENT, INTIMIDATION, THAT VIOLATES HER CIVIL RIGHTS THAT SHOWS RACIAL AND GENDER DISCRIMINATION, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY THAT CONTINUES TO PREJUDICE THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON BEFORE THIS COURT. NONE OF THE “REQUIRED”

PREREQUISITES WERE MET BY THE APPELLEES, IN WHICH THE U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM, JUDGE HARLIN HALE, BANKRUPTCY COURT #2, ETAL HAVE CHOSEN TO FILE A "SUFFICIENT" RESPONSE BUT YET ARE BEING PROTECTED THROUGH IMMUNITY THAT HAS BEEN OBJECTED TO IN WHICH THERE ARE RAMPANT VIOLATIONS IN WHICH THE U S BANK, APPELLEE ALONG WITH THE SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING HAVE FAILED TO FILE THE "REQUIRED" ORIGINAL NOTE, NOR PRODUCE THE NOTE TO THE HOME MORTGAGE BELONGING TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA, BRIDGET PARSON, WHO RESIDES AT 508 GRADY LANE CEDAR HILL, TEXAS 75104 FOR OVER THIRTY YEARS.

10) OBJECTIONS TO THE CONTINUOUS ACTIONS AND INACTIONS OF THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING WHO HAVE FAILED TO FILE AN OBJECTION TO THE APPEAL AND WHO HAVE FAILED TO OBJECT TO THE MONETARY SANCTIONS OF \$4,350,000.00 THAT HAVE BEEN FILED IN MANY COURTS IN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT, THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT IN WHICH THE ORDERS ATTACHED SHOWS THAT THE APPELLEES, U S BANK, WITHOUT MENTIONING SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING ARE CONTINUING TO FILE "FRIVOLOUS" AND "FRAUDULENT" DOCUMENTS TO THE MANY COURTS IN WHICH THERE IS A LETTER SENT IN AN EXHIBIT FILED BY THE APPELLEE U S BANK AND SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING ATTORNEY LAW FIRM OF MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM THAT "FRAUDULENTLY" STATES ON DECEMBER 2014 THAT NO MONIES WERE OWED TO THEM AND THAT THEY HAD CLOSED ANY MONIES OWED TO THEM THAT FOLLOWED AN INTENTIONAL TELEPHONE CALL IN DECEMBER 2014 THAT LED TO THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA, BRIDGET PARSON TO DRIVE IN HER CAR TO THE MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM AND TO REQUEST SOMETHING IN WRITING OF WHAT WAS SAID ON THE TELEPHONE. THE APPELLEE, U S BANK, SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING WHO WAS REPRESENTED BY THE MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM IN AN ATTACHED EXHIBIT WROTE THE INTENTIONAL FALSE, FRAUDULENT DOCUMENT THAT HAS LED TO MANY COURTS, MANY ORDERS THAT ARE ATTACHED AS

EXHIBITS THAT SHOWS THAT THE “SUFFICIENT” APPEAL FILED BY THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON IS NOT “FRIVOLOUS” BUT IS FILED IN GOOD FAITH BY HER AND THAT HER AMERICAN DREAM HOME DOES EXIST THAT SHE BOUGHT WITH HER EARNED SUCCESS AS A PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER.


11) OBJECTIONS TO BEING DENIED AN “ISP” IN WHICH MANY COURTS HAVE APPROVED THE EXACT AFFIDAVIT OF INABILITY TO PAY COST THAT IS AN APPEARANCE OF VIOLATING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, WHO HAVE FILED IN GOOD FAITH A SUFFICIENT APPEAL BEFORE THE COURT AND THE FACT THAT HER FINANCES ARE TEMPORARILY NOT WHERE THEY SHOULD BE DUE TO THE EARLY DEATH OF HER SPOUSE IN WHICH SHE IS NOW A WIDOW. THERE SHOULD NOT BE A DISCRIMINATION TO THE FACT THAT SHE IS “POOR” AND OF COURSE BLACK AND UNABLE TO PAY THE FEES IN THIS CASE. THE PREREQUISITES WERE MET FOR AN “ISP” THAT VIOLATES THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON.

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES IN THIS CASE

COMES NOW, APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA, BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE FILED IN GOOD FAITH HER MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE OPINION ON OCTOBER 29, 2020 IN A TIMELY MANNER DUE TO THE FOREGOING REASONS ABOVE. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, HAVE OBJECTED TO THE OPINION OF AN ADVERSE DECISION IN WHICH THERE IS NO “RESPONSE” BY THE APPELLEES, IN WHICH THE DECISION APPEARS TO BE ARBITRARILY MADE AND CAPRICIOUSLY DONE THAT CONTINUES TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, WHO HAVE FOLLOWED THE PREREQUISITES AND FILED AN UNOPPOSED “SUFFICIENT, TIMELY APPEAL IN THIS MATTER. APPELLANT, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON, PRAYS THAT HER MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION IS GRANTED, THE “ISP” GRANTED, AND THE OPINION IS PUBLISHED

ON THE MERITS OF THIS CASE, APPELLANT, PRAYS THAT HER
"SUFFICIENTLY FILED APPEAL WILL BE HEARD ON THE MERITS IN
THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, EQUITY, DUE PROCESS OF LAW,
PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND THE PREVENTION OF
MANIFEST INJUSTICE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



BRIDGET BROWN PARSON

AKA

BRIDGET PARSON

508 GRADY LANE

CEDAR HILL, TEXAS 75104

214 962-9508

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, BRIDGET BROWN PARSON, AKA BRIDGET PARSON SENDS THE MOTION
FOR CLARIFICATION, DENIAL OF THE "ISP, AND OBJECTION TO THE
UNPUBLISHING OF THE OPINION IN WHICH THIS CASE SHOULD BE HEARD ON
THE MERITS ALONG WITH THE UNOPPOSED OBJECTIONS FILED IN GOOD FAITH
BY EMAIL ADDRESS: PRO_SE@CA5.U S COURTS.GOV LOCATED AT THE U S Ct OF
APPEALS 600 Sth MATRIX PLACE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130. ALL PARTIES
IN THIS CASE WERE SENT A COPY OF THIS MOTION BY CERTIFIED MAIL AND/OR
FAX TO THE APPELLEES, JUDGE HARLIN HALE LOCATED AT 600 COMMERCE ST.
DALLAS TX, U S BANK, SELECT Portfolio SERVICING, ATTORNEYS, STEPHEN WU,
CHELSEA SCHNEIDER, JESSICA HOLT, MACKIE WOLF LAW FIRM LOCATED AT
14160 DALLAS PKWY DALLAS Tx 75254 AND FAX # 214 635-2686 ON NOVEMBER 10,
2021.



May 30, 2021

BRIDGET BROWN PARSON,

AKA

BRIDGET PARSON