

No. 21-1309

---

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

Wendy Marie Meigs,  
*Petitioner*

v.

Todd Zucker and Bohreer & Zucker, LLC.  
*Respondents*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit**

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

Wendy Meigs  
*Pro-se*  
3131 Blackcastle Dr.  
Houston, Texas 77068  
281-798-0780  
wmeigs2@gmail.com

---

**ORIGINAL**

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

JUN 15 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

TKS

**Table of Contents**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... ii-iii**  
**GROUND FOR REHEARING..... 1**  
**BASIS FOR REQUEST ..... 7**  
    **A. COURT CLERK FAILURE..... 7-8**  
    **B. EQUITY IN COURTS ..... 8-9**  
**CONCLUSION ..... 10-11**  
**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL .....12**

Table of Authorities

**CASES**

*Johnson v. Zerbst*,  
304 U.S. 458, 462–463, 58S.Ct. 1019, 82  
L.Ed. 1461 (1938), .....Page 9

*Morrissey v. Brewer*,  
408 U.S. 471, 481 ..... Page 8

**RULES**

Equal Protection Clause..... Page 5  
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.2..... Page 1

**STATUTES**

28 U.S.C. § 1654 .....Page 8

**OTHER:**

Hassel, J. (August 20, 2020). *Getting to "There": Inter/Intra City Solidarity and Lawyering for Right to Counsel Movements*. Harvard Law & Policy Review, Forthcoming, Available at SSRN:  
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=4009321> Page 9

Shanahan, C. & Carpenter, A (2019). *Simplified Courts Can't Solve Inequality*.  
doi:10.1162/DAED\_a\_0054 ..... Page 9

**Table of Authorities (continued)**

Wallat, K. (March 15, 2019). *Reconceptualizing Access to Justice* . Marquette Law Review, Vol. 103, No. 2, 2019, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3549511>....Page 9

Pursuant to Rule 44.2, Wendy Meigs, Petitioner, respectfully petitions for rehearing of the Court's order denying certiorari in this case. Petition falls within the 25 day timeline due June 16<sup>th</sup>.

----- □ -----  
**GROUNDS FOR REHEARING**

**THE ORIGINAL certiorari petition in this case presented two vital questions:**

- 1. Does this Country contribute to Court Bias, Violations of Due Process and all by ignoring the utilization of technicalities, manipulations of weaknesses in the e-File system, failing to address Pro-se discrimination and refusing to create strict, accountable guidelines against court officials corruptive actions, corruptive actions that require attention on a National level to Protect the People in all courts from judicial bias?**
- 2. Should the US Supreme Court take steps to universally protect the discriminated and suppressed class of Pro-se who come to the courts as a final reprieve for aid in times of duress, only to be forced to unfairly compete on "equal " terms with skilled lawyers whilst the Pro-se lacks court knowledge and experience?**

**TWO SIGNIFICANT EVENTS occurred since presenting the petition in March.**

- 1. The most significant event includes the improper early release of the US Supreme Court's decision on Roe v Wade by a court official clerk's corruptive action for what appears to be an**

attempt to encourage another insurrection against Judicial processes by an organized group to subvert judicial decisions as occurred on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021. In this case, the Capital is not threatened, but the Justices in their homes are, and the Court building as indicated by the fencing. What makes the Court Clerks actions more devious lies in this insurrection does not occur in one day as on January 6<sup>th</sup>, but will continue to create fear even after the decision is passed by the Justices and set precedence for public response against issues.

The deception from a trusted court official, and the attempt to subvert justice for self-interest that the US Supreme Court Justices feel parallels with what EVERY unrepresented citizen, going against a lawyer, feels when they realize courts are not a safe place to seek righteousness and court officials manipulate eFile and technicalities as methods of abuse and corruption to dismiss valid cases.

2. The second significant event relies upon a much needed analysis of public opinion regarding self-representation and as to whether the public understands the limitations for self-representation that lead to dismissal, a dismissal of even valid cases. No legal malpractice cases found that were won by a Pro-se. Cases found indicated dismissal for technical reasons / lack of expert witness.

The results of the survey question as to the knowledge of the impossibility of successfully representing oneself.

Expert witnesses depend on winning cases for referrals. Lack of wins, prevents representation of Pro-se by expert witnesses. Questions asked in ongoing survey used only for demonstration:

1. Are you aware that the U.S Courts promote the term "equality" in dictating how Unrepresented People, those without lawyers, must compete with the knowledge, timelines, technicalities, processes, and more in the same manner as professional lawyers?

Yes: 63.64% No: 36.36%

2. Did you know that People without lawyers cannot equally compete against lawyers in courts as most people enter the courts lacking the skill, knowledge and court "buddy" advantage of professional lawyers?

Yes: 81.82% No: 18.18%

3. Do you believe that the skills and capabilities of a regular Person, not lawyer, are equivalent to the skills of a professional lawyer in court procedures, technicalities, and all?

Yes: 27.27% No: 72.73%

4. ...do you believe the courts may be discriminating against Unrepresented People under the falsehood of "equality"?

Yes: 90.91% No: 9.09%

5. ...should the people immediately demand "equity" in court to balance the discrimination?  
Yes: 90.91% No: 9.09%

6. Are you aware that the number of unrepresented people entering court is growing?  
Yes: 72.73% No: 27.27%

7. Did you know that the U.S., through the foundation of the Constitution, allows for an individual, with or without a lawyer, to address their claims in a court of law?...  
Yes: 81.82% No: 18.18%

8. Did you know that unrepresented people cannot meet all demands required of the court...  
Yes: 72.73% No: 27.27%

9. Did you know that expert witnesses will not represent the unrepresented individual in court ...?  
Yes: 35.36% No: 63.64%

10. If not having an expert witness, due to NO Fault of the unrepresented individual, allows the judge to dismiss the case, a valid case brought before the court, is that discrimination and violation of "Due Process" as is happening in every court in all states?  
Yes: 72.73% No: 27.27%



11. Should the People allow this discrimination against someone seeking righteousness just because they cannot retain a lawyer?

Yes: 0% No: 63.84% Other:36.36%

Sample Responses:

a. Help me and my son because our rights are violated by the court since 2019

b. Return to Common Law Courts as prescribed by our founding fathers.

c. An individual should be given the chance to discuss the facts to the judge. Regardless of the standards or or representation . Because if the individual is not allowed to explain then it's not fair . The standards should be changed if this is truly happening.

d. Not break the law to begin with.

12. Should the US Supreme Court create Federal standardized, accountable and enforceable rules for handling of court documents to prevent document tampering?

Yes: 91.91% No: 9.09%

13. Should the US Supreme Court create Federal rules over the electronic filing of important documents? Yes: 90% No: 10%

14. Should civil judges be denied judicial immunity and held accountable, currently and retroactively, for participating in the manipulation of the court system including mediation, and against the unrepresented individual...?

\*\*\*Yes: 90.91% No: 9.09%

15. ...should the US Supreme Court immediately suspend dismissal of cases presented by Unrepresented Individuals...?

\*\*\*Yes: 63.64% No: 36.36%

16. have you or do you know of any unrepresented individual, not a lawyer, who sued a lawyer for legal malpractice, forgery and such.... and won as an unrepresented individual?

\*\*\*Yes: 0% No: 100%

17. Should the ability to determine malpractice and conflict be removed from the State Bars and Judicial commission and placed under a Federal Oversight Committee ...?

Yes: 72.73% No: 0% Other:

Maybe increase accountability and stronger guidelines limiting the freedom of inconsistent decisions. 27.27%

This survey requires longer duration; however, the results indicate the unrepresented expectations for a fair court does not mean equal, and that most public individuals would be shocked to learn that self-representation fails by requirements of the court, which cannot be met. That court officials and judges knew. And that the public was blindly and intentionally led into a false sense of trust in self-representation costing loss of time, money, property, sometimes children, and more.

**BASIS FOR REQUEST FOR REHEARING FROM  
THE TWO EVENTS:**

**A. COURT CLERK CHARACTER FAILURE**

1. You, as Justices, currently deal with unprecedented turmoil triggered by the breakdown in the character and fidelity of court clerks.

2. The fidelity and character of the court clerks remain the foundation of the execution and procreation of corruption, as you can see in your situation as well as in mine.

3. "Justice Clarence Thomas — the conservative leader of the court — told an audience... that justices are now looking over their shoulders, shaken by the breakdown of their institution." He compared the leak to an "infidelity."

4. What you are experiencing, lies at the root of the fight that I present to you. I presented clear evidence of document tampering on the docket through e-File by the court clerks causing dismissal of my case. I ask that you address these concerns.

5. The desperation of the people expounds when people of this country believe that no one in our government cares about strict and controlled voting rights, fear of state denial of abortion, fear of Roe vs Wade not being overturned, and fear of dissolution of the basic Constitutional Rights.

6. What I request is not substantial, but very defined as the right to self-represent as allowed in this Country without impossible unjust, demands.

7. In the Justices situation, the court clerk manipulated the confidentiality of documents for the self-serving goal of ensuring an insurrection and prevention of the Justice's decision to change *Roe v. Wade*.

In my case, the court clerk appearingly manipulated the documents on the docket to force summary judgment dismissal for failure to respond to an amended summary judgment, never seen for response, to prevent the progression of a valid case. The amended and original summary judgment contain much the same information so hiding the document served to prevent response to allow summary judgment dismissal.

#### B. THE PEOPLE REQUIRE EQUITY IN COURTS OVER THE DISCRIMINATION OF EQUALITY.

Even though 28 U.S.C. § 1654 provides: "In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct causes therein," But what happens when the courts fail to create guidelines to prevent dismissal of valid cases when a Pro-se cannot meet the demands required due to no fault of their own? "[D]ue process is flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands," *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 48. The nation of Pro-se require procedural protections.

1. The knowledge of the discrimination of Pro-se has existed for decades among court officials, but not among the public. The knowledge and failure to address the deficiencies resemble a breach of implied covenant of faith and fair dealings. Multiple articles attempt to address this issue as listed. (Hassel, 2020) (Shanahan, 2019) (Wallet, 2019)

2. "The Equal Protection Clause demands "equal justice under law," a venerable principle etched on the building of the Supreme Court. Equal justice requires fairness which requires equity.

3. Justice "Breyer quoted from *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458, 462-463, 58S.Ct. 1019, 82 L.Ed. 1461 (1938), stating with emphasis:

([T]he average defendant does not have the professional legal skill to protect himself when brought before a tribunal with power to take his life or liberty, wherein the prosecution is presented by experienced and learned counsel (emphasis added))... Neither do we address what due process requires in an unusually complex case where a defendant can fairly be represented only by a trained advocate". Such applies to civil Pro-se.

Justice Black read the following excerpt aloud to the Court: "The right to be heard would be, in many cases, of little avail if it did not comprehend the right to be heard by counsel. Even the intelligent and educated layman has small and sometimes no skill in the science of law. ... He requires the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him." The time to address discrimination against Pro-se is now.

## CONCLUSION

This honorable court should grant the request for rehearing as the significant events of the court clerk in the premature exposure of the Justice's opinions in Roe v Wade correspond with the court clerk issues presented in the petition for writ. Based on the survey, the People enter courts as Pro-se unaware of the courts geared against them.

Currently, the People look to the US Supreme Court to protect disparages in the discrimination of the People. Without knowledge of the barriers to a fair court experience for Pro-se, the Pro-se will research, study and pay to achieve what cannot be achieved. This disparity, a breach of implied covenant of faith and fair dealing, can no longer continue. Dismissal from technicalities /summary judgment must stop to secure fairness with only a jury verdict until a better alternative arises.

Question of Discrimination: How many Pro-se have successfully won a legal malpractice case? How many Pro-se lost their legal malpractice case due to failure to meet the demands of the court's requirement of an expert witness, a feat impossible for a Pro-se? In a fair court, do the numbers make sense?

The inevitable result for Pro-se in courts today is a system that is distorted in ways that concentrate power and influence towards court officials and the wealthy, and away from the unrepresented seeking righteousness. Please help bring fairness to the courts for the growing number of Pro-se. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,



---

/s/ Wendy Meigs,  
*Pro-se*  
3131 Blackcastle Dr.,  
Houston, Texas 77068

June 15, 2022

## CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Pursuant to Rule 44.2, I hereby certify that this petition for rehearing is restricted to the grounds specified in the Rule with substantial grounds not previously presented and is presented in good faith and not for delay.



---

/s/Wendy Meigs,  
*Pro-se*  
3131 Blackcastle Dr.,  
Houston, Texas 77068  
281-798-0780