


ORIGINAL

21-5390
No.



**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Jeanette S.R. Lipinski — PETITIONER

VS.

Yolanda Castaneda et al,— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

**Jeanette S. R. Lipinski ProSe
14121 S. Green bay Avenue
Burnham, IL 60633
773-240-7701**

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The committees on Codes of Conduct and Judicial Conduct and Disability held a public hearing on the proposed changes to the Code and JC&D Rules on October 30, 2018 in Washington, D.C. Watch the video on demand below:



Watch the Public Hearing: [Review the witness statements.](#) [Witness List](#) (pdf)
Committee on Codes of Conduct The Honorable Ralph R. Erickson, Chair
Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability The Honorable Anthony J. Scirica, Chair
Public Hearing on Proposed Changes to Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges and Rules for
Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, October 30, 2018, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
(Lunch Break: 12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)¹.

Witness List 2.

- The Honorable Lawrence J. O'Neill, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California
- Charles Gardner Geyh, John F. Kimberling Professor of Law, Indiana University Maurer School of Law
- Arthur D. Hellman, Professor of Law Emeritus, Distinguished Faculty Scholar, University of Pittsburgh School of Law
- Renee Newman Knake, Joanne and Larry Doherty Chair in Legal Ethics & Professor of Law, University of Houston Law Center
- Carol A. Needham, Emanuel Myers Professor of Law, Saint Louis University School of Law
- The Honorable Julie A. Robinson, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, District of Kansas
- Jaime Santos, Law Clerks for Workplace Accountability
- Kendall Turner, Law Clerks for Workplace Accountability
- Andy DeGuglielmo, Student, Yale Law School

- Rita Gilles, Student, Yale Law School
- Lisa Hansmann, Student, Yale Law School
- Chandini Jha, Student, Yale Law School
- Alyssa Peterson, Student, Yale Law School

1 All times are approximate.

2 The order of witnesses is subject to change based on hearing logistics:

- Serena Walker, Student, Yale Law School
- Megan Yan, Student, Yale Law School
- Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., Judicial Discipline Reform
- Charles Fournier, JD, Type 1 Diabetes Defense Foundation
- Jan B. Hamilton, Public Witness
- Paul Horvitz, Public Witness
- John C. Love, Public Witness
- Cyrus Sanai, Public Witness

Plaintiff's statements can not say it better than the already addressed concerns by these honorable men and woman of the Judicial court system. Plaintiff asks the highest court Judges in the land, the Supreme Court of the United States of America to take 5:34:22 of their time to hear the very important questions addressing the issues plaguing our court system today.

QUESTIONS

HIBBLER PRO SE

Wednesday, January 15, 2020

1:16-cv-07153 Can I Ask A Judge To Recuse Himself If I Believe He Is Biased?

a.) Recusal is a request for the judge of the presiding case to excuse himself from the case so that a new judge may be chosen. Although an attorney or pro se litigant may ask a judge to recuse himself from the case, there should be substantial evidence for judicial conflict of interest because the judge in question has the right to sustain or dismiss the motion. The recusal motion may have to be appealed when the trial is over.

b.) How can Judges Break the Law Inside the Court Room?

There are some ways a corrupt judge may abuse the law he or she is suppose to uphold:

- Lying under oath. Remember a judge is always under oath in the courtroom.
- Citing invalid laws or precedents. This is extremely hard to catch if you're not prepared to discuss these topics.
- Ignoring certain laws or precedents. This is more unusual because a judge typically can't ignore a law without explaining why. The judge would have to break two rules in order to accomplish this one.

What is Judicial Misconduct?

Judicial misconduct is a serious deviation from the accepted practice of a judge in the judicial arena.

- Giving special treatment to friends or relatives,
- Placing their personal schedule before those of the parties,
- Accepting bribes, or
- Improperly discussing a case with an attorney.

28 USC §§ 351 - 364 allows any person to complain about a federal or appeals judge they believe has committed judicial misconduct.

CHAPTER 115 - EVIDENCE; DOCUMENTARY

Court record lost or destroyed generally.]

SUMMARY, WHY DID THE JUDGE, ATTORNEY'S AND DEFENDANTS DO THESE THINGS?

1. Judge, attorney's, defendants, and their police friends, knowingly and willingly repeated lies that plaintiff poured bleach on the fence line to kill dog, taking criminal defendants side and ignoring Plaintiff's truthful evidence, while defendants evidence is all hearsay?
2. Why did Judge say, plaintiff filed her case shortly after acquittal, it's not true? 2014-2016
3. Why did Judge say, plaintiff has a long list of defendants. He dismissed them all except Alonso Castaneda, Yolanda Castaneda's husband who did not file the complaint?
4. Why did Judge say this case is not on the murder of plaintiff's mother. Yet he brings it up in his Memorandum, Opinion and Order?
5. Federal building manager's name is Castaneda.
6. Federal Chief Judge at the time was Hispanic.
7. When plaintiff first filed her case. A male Hispanic desk clerk David assigned plaintiff to Hispanic judge Alonso, at the height of the Hispanic problems in USA 2016. The same name as defendant Alonso Castaneda. When plaintiff asks to change the judge, he smiled deceitfully and said no! Plaintiff prayed for the best, but the nightmare began for 5 long years.
8. Why did Judge Alonso embarrass plaintiff in court who was going through hearing loss, and said, you can't hear the attorney next to you? Plaintiff is a disabled senior citizen who is going through a change of life and suffering from the wrongful death of her beloved mother through the sinful lies of all the defendants.
9. Why wouldn't the Judge give plaintiff a chance for a jury trial?
10. Why wouldn't the Judge allow her an attorney, knowing she couldn't afford one to help her?

11. Why did Judge Alonso write in his locked docket entry's negative comments that caused other judges to turn against plaintiff when seeking help in other courts?

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows: Alonso Castaneda, Lt. David Bonner, Officer Andrielle Cap.

RELATED CASES

- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda, Del Real Yolanda & Castaneda Alonso* No. 2021CH03379 District 1 Daley Center, July 28, 2021.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda, Del Real Yolanda & Castaneda Alonso* No.20216001858 District 6 Municipal Civil Markham, April 8, 2021, Rm 208.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Village of Burnham, IL.* No. 19-cv-6154 U.S. District Court Northern District of IL., ongoing May 2021.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda Alonso* No. 21-M6-001858, U.S. Sixth District Court Municipal Markham, IL. ongoing May 27, 2021 Rm 208.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda Yolanda Del Real* No. 210P60536 May 11, 2021.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda Alonso* No. 210P40085 Denied March 2, 2021.
- ī *Lipinski Jeanette v. Castaneda Alonso* No. 1-19-1226 U.S. First District Appellate Court. ongoing January 2021.
- ī *Castaneda Alonso v. Lipinski Jeanette* No. 20MC6002608 U.S. Sixth District Court Municipal Markham, IL. 3rd False arrest, Dismissed March 10, 2021.

-
- ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Castaneda Alonso* No.21OP4008504 Circuit Court of Cook County, Denied. March 2, 2021.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Castaneda Alonso* No. 2020OP74903, Cook County Circuit Court 555 West Harrison Chicago, IL. Denied August 14, 2020.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Castaneda Alonso* No. 2019OP60548 U.S. Sixth District Court Municipal Markham, IL. Vacated June 13, 2019.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Castaneda Yolanda* No. 2017OP7498, Cook County Circuit Court 555 West Harrison Chicago, IL. Denied Jan.16, 2018.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Chavez Yesenia* No. 2017OP497 Cook County Circuit Court 555 West Harrison Chicago, IL. Denied Jan.16, 2018.
 - ĩ *Chavez Yesenia v. Lipinski Jeannette* No.17MC6006891 Village of Burnham, IL. 2nd False arrest, "Not Guilty" January 9, 2018.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette v. Chavez Yesenia, Irma, Emanuel*, No.17OP60417,16,15, Dismissed April 28, 2017.
 - ĩ *Castaneda Yolanda v. Lipinski Jeannette* No.14G00558901 U.S. Sixth District Court Municipal Markham, IL. 1st False arrest, "Not Guilty" July 23, 2015.
 - ĩ *Lipinski Jeannette Guardianship (Fraud) Mother Helen Rector* No.14P1197 Clerk of the Circuit Court Richard J. Daley Center Chicago, IL. Murdered February 1, 2015.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS.....	A
AFFIDAVIT OR DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS.....	B-F
PETITION FOR A WRIT CERTIORARI-RULE 34.....	COVER
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
LIST OF PARTIES AND RELATED CASES.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
INDEX TO APPENDICES.....	vii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	xi
OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	6
CONCLUSION.....	13
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	16
PROOF OF SERVICE.....	END

INDEX TO APPENDIX

<i>U.S.C. of Appeals Seventh Circuit Order..Case 19-3395..Doc:#58..Filed:12/08/2020.....</i>	<i>Pages 3...A</i>
<i>U.S.C. of Appeals Appellant's Motion Extension of Time To File Petition For Rehearing En Banc-Order..Denied..Case 19-3395..Doc:# 61..Filed:12/23/2020.....</i>	<i>Pages 1...B</i>
<i>U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Memorandum Opinion and Order. Case:....</i>	
<i>1:16-cv-07153 Doc:#159 Filed: 09/13/19..PageID #:1300.....</i>	<i>Pages 1 of 8...C</i>
<i>U.S.C. of Appeals Final Judgement..Case: 19-3395...Doc:#00713740128....Filed: 12/30/2020..</i>	
<i>.....</i>	<i>Pages 1...D</i>
<i>U.S.C. of Appeals Notice of Issuance of Mandate..Case:19-3395 Doc:#00713740129..Filed:</i>	
<i>12/30/2020.....</i>	<i>Pages 2...E</i>
<i>U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Record of Appeal Case:1:16-07153 Doc:#182</i>	
<i>ENTERED IN ERROR DOCKET SHEET Filed: 06/23/20 PageID# 1423.....</i>	<i>Pages 1 of 4...F</i>
<i>MODIFIED ON 06/29/2020 (rc). (Entered 06/25/2020)....U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL</i>	
<i>Eastern Division Notice of Correction...Case:1:16-cv-07153...Doc:#184....Filed:06/29/20.....</i>	
<i>PageID.#:1427 Page 1 of 1.</i>	
<i>U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Notice of Appeal..Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:</i>	
<i>#164...Filed: 12/03/20 Page ID# 1344.....</i>	<i>Page 1 of 1...G</i>
<i>U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Docketing Statement Case: 1:16 cv-07153..</i>	
<i>Doc:#165..Filed: 12/03/19..PageID #:1345.....& Copy #173 - #189.....</i>	<i>Page 1 of 1...H</i>

U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Order.Plaintiff's motion [163] for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is granted. Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 169.. Filed: 12/06/19...PageID #:1376.....Page 1 of 1...I

U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Order.Plaintiff's motion [170] for waiver of fees for transcripts on appeal-Denied-without prejudice...Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 172.... Filed: 12/12/19...PageID #:1381.....Page 1 of 2....J

U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division Order.Plaintiff's motion [178] for appointment of counsel is-Denied-...Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 181.... Filed: 03/10/20....PageID #:1422.....Page 1 of 1....K

Petition For A Writ of Certiorari-Rule 34.....cover.. ..L

U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER OR FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGEMENT..Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 161..Filed: 10/11/19...PageID #:1309..(DOCUMENT included - RESPONSE TO CASTANEDA'S ET AL. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT, NOTED ON DOCKET # 140, 10/31/2018. submitted). (Note on bottom of pages two alternating different docket stamp on all 12 pages.) Two documents submitted by plaintiff, Summary & Memorandum. Summary Judgement was not stamped back on top to plaintiff only on the bottom. But, it is NOT in the docket # 140? Neither documents! A warning message page from CM/ECF LIVE, VER 6.3.3 - U.S. DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN ILLINOIS-CONFIRM REQUEST 8/9/21, 11:23PM PAGE 1 OF 1 SAYS: (THE LINK TO THIS PAGE MAY NOT HAVE ORIGINATED

FROM WITHIN CM/ECE IF YOU CLICK THE CONTINUE LINK, YOU WILL BE BILLED
FOR THE INFORMATION PROVIDED.) (2 Docket Documents attached)...Page 1 of 1..Page
1 of 27.....M
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-ORDER- PLAINTIFF'S MOTION 161 FOR
RELIEF FROM JUDGEMENT IS DENIED..Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 162...Filed: 11/05/19..
PageID #:1336..... Page 1 of 2..N
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-PLAINTIFF JEANETTE S.R. LIPINSKI
ANSWER TO YOLANDA AND ALONSO CASTANEDA'S COUNTERCLAIMS Case:1:16-
cv-07153..Doc:# 120..Filed: 05/07/18...PageID #:981.....Page 1 of 10....O
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S JOINT
STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS ENTITLING THEM TO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.
Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:#140...Filed: 10/31/18..Page 1 of 5..PageID # 1253.....Page 1 of 5...P
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division ILLINOIS CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY CERTIFIED STATEMENT-NOT GUILTY-07/23/15.Case:1:16-cv-07153.Doc:#31-2
..Filed: 10/12/16...Page ID #:174.....Page 1 of 2....Q
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-EQUIP COURT REPORTING-Case:1:16-
cv-07153..Doc:#132-7...Filed: 10/01/18....PageID #:1075.....Page 16 of 44...R
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-LANSING VETERINARY LETTER.
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2014 -Case:1:16-cv-07153..Doc:# 161...Filed: 10/11/19..of 27...PageID
#:1321-23.....Page 13-15....S

U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-BURNHAM POLICE DEPARTMENT CASE#
14600558901 NO OBJECTION TO EXPUNGE CASE...Case:1:16cv-07153..Doc:#132-9...
Filed: 10/01/18...PageID #:1111.....Page 2 of 2...T
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-ILLINOIS STATE POLICE LETTER SEAL
RECORD AND EXPUNGEMENT-COURT ORDER...Case:1:16cv-07153..Doc:#31-1...Filed:
10/12/16....PageID #:172.....Page 1 of 1...U
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-EALSE BURNHAM POLICE DEPARTMENT
REPORT OFFICER LIED DOG DIED FROM BLEACH-LATER REPORT REDACTED DOG
DID NOT DIE Case:1:16cv-07153..Doc:#133-2...Filed: 10/01/18..PageID#:1130..Page 4 of 5...V
U.S.D.C. Northern District of IL Eastern Division-EXHIBIT 8, PLAINTIFF LIPINSKI'S
ANSWERS TO YOLANDA AND ALONSO CASTANEDA'S REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION TO JEANETTE LIPINSKI- Case:1:16cv-07153..Doc:#132-8...Filed:
10/01/18...PageID #:1105...(Please note stamped on the bottom of each page the same 1-5,
Lipinski's answers to Castaneda Requests for Admission.).....Page 2 of 6...W
Not so on Response by Plff. Summary Judgement submitted Doc. #140 not even docketed?

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Ammons v. Aranank Uniform Services, Inc.</i> , 368 F.3d 809, 817 (7 th Cir. 2004).....	
<i>Beaman v. Freesmeyer</i> , 131 NE 3d 488, Supreme Court 2019.....	
<i>Federal Trade Commission v. Bay Area, Business Council</i> 423 F.3d 727, 633 (7 th Cir. 2005).....	
<i>Gates v. Board of Education City of Chicago</i> 916 F.3d 631, 635 (7 th Cir. 2019).....	
<i>Johnson v. Advocate Health & Hosps. Corp.</i> 892 F.3d 887, 894, (7 th Cir. 2018).....	
<i>Keton v. Morning Star, Inc.</i> 667 F.3d 877, 884 (Cir. 2012).....	
<i>Strakes v. Board of Educ., City of Chicago</i> 599 F.3d 617, 622 (7 th Cir. 2010).....	

STATUTES

42 U.S.C.1983.....	
28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).....	

RULES

Rules 10-14 (Petitioning for certiorari).....	
Rule 29 (Filing and service on opposing party or counsel).....	
Rule 30 (Computation and extension of time).....	
Rules 33.2 and 34 (Preparing pleadings on 8½ x 11 inch paper).....	
Rule 39 (Proceedings in forma pauperis)	
LR 56.1.....	

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A
the petition and is reported at [http://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/
ca7/19-3395/19-3395-2020-12-08.pdf?ts=1607445016](http://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/ca7/19-3395/19-3395-2020-12-08.pdf?ts=1607445016);_or,

[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported;_or,

[] is unpublished.

☒ The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix C to the
petition and is reported at From Case-text: Smarter Legal Research, Lipinski v.

Castaneda, Case No. 16-cv-7153 (N.D. Ill. Sep.13, 2019);_or,

[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported;_or,

[] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was

December 8, 2020.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: December 22, 2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

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

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1st Amendment: Freedom of religion, speech, petition and assembly

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...E.g..Thomas v. Review Board, 450 U.S. 707 (1981)

5th Amendment: Protection against self-incrimination, double jeopardy, Protection of due process and right to a grand jury. Chicago, B. & Q. R. Co. v. Chicago, 166 U. S. 226 (1897).

6th Amendment: Right to Speedy and public trial, impractical jury, and right to counsel..

The Sixth Amendment guarantees the rights to a public trial without unnecessary delay, the right to a lawyer, the right to an impartial jury, and the right to know who your accusers are and the nature of the charges and evidence..

8th Amendment: Protection against cruel and unusual punishment. The Eighth Amendment to the United States of America Constitution states: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor cruel and unusual Punishments inflicted." This Amendment prohibits the federal governments from imposing unduly harsh penalties.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant Brief pg.8.

Lipinski filed several complaints, and after motion practice, there remained only 3 count against Yolanda Castaneda and Alonso Castaneda for malicious prosecution and, count 4 against officer Cap and Lt. Bonner for malicious prosecution and false arrest 42 U.S.C.1983. R.##48, 55. Basically Lipinski alleged that Yolanda Castaneda and Alonso Castaneda reported an alleged poisoning of their dog and that officer A. Cap and Lt. David Bonner were liable under 42 U.S.C. 1983 for false arrest and malicious prosecution. R.#48.

Lipinski was arrested and prosecuted for knowingly poisoning a dog or other domestic animal. R.##48, 55, R.#132 Ex 4, pp. 14; R.#132 EX 7 pp. 26, 59, p.29, p. 33, Ex 2; R.#159, pp.3-5.

Lipinski was found "not guilty", and the case was dismissed. R.#132 Ex 7 p 46; R.#159 p.3; R.#31.

Lipinski filed two motions for several motions and orally for appointment of counsel, and the district court denied them all. R.#5, R.#6, R.#12, R.#23.

In District Court, the defendants filed Motions for summary judgement. R.#130, R.#134. The defendants filed a Joint Statement of Undisputed facts under LR 56.1.R.#132. Lipinski filed a sworn response to the motion for summary judgement

disputing many of the defendant's statements of undisputed facts. R.#140. This response was verified R.#140 p.

On September 13, 2019, the district court granted the defendant's motions for summary judgement, R.#159. The district court deemed admitted certain facts set forth by the defendants because, the district court said, Lipinski failed to controvert those facts with citations to evidence. R.#159 p.1-2. The district court thereafter analyzed the case based upon the defendants's statement of undisputed facts and terminated the litigation.

Case: 1:16-cv-07153 Document #: 161 Filed: 10/11/19 Page 1 of 27 PageID #:1309 pgs.

1-27

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Reasons for granting the petition is to correct the errors in the case and to bring to justice the truth and correct decision in the case's Multiple errors.

1. Error: CM/ECF LIVE, VER 6.3.3 - U.S. DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN ILLINOIS-TECHNICAL PROBLEM ENTRY Summary Judgement, Docket #140 on 10/31/2018. RESPONSE by Plaintiff Jeanette S. R. Lipinski to Motion for Summary Judgement 130 . Motion for Summary Judgement 134 (Lipinski, Jeanette) (Entered: 10/31/2018).

Two documents were upload on CM/ECF LIVE, U. S. District Court, Northern Illinois system by Plaintiff Ms Lipinski. One was the RESPONSE TO CASTANEDA'S ET AL. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT and OTHER MEMORANDUM. NOTE: PLAINTIFF for summary judgement entered TWICE. NO OTHER NAMES Filed by. The documentation #140 for summary judgement is NOT a motion for summary judgement but for a RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S JOINT STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS ENTITLING THEM TO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT #130 by Yolanda Castaneda, and #134 Motion for Summary Judgement was by Lt. Bonner and officer Cap.

Neither Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgement and Memorandum showed up in the docket. Yet Plaintiff's RESPONSE Motion for Summary judgement was WRITTEN by the CM/ECF LIVE at the bottom page #1 SAYING "Plaintiff Lipinski's Answers to

the interrogatories of the Castaneda's, and page #2 SAYING "Plaintiff Lipinski's Response to Castaneda's Motion for Summary Judgement." Interchanging back and forth every other page for 12 pages. Lipinski's certified date is October 30, 2018. So, was Lt. Bonner & officer Cap's document certified as Oct. 30, 2018. There was no documentation on the docket recorded for them, just plaintiff. Attached is Plaintiff's RESPONSE TO CASTANEDA'S ET AL. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.

There was no case stamp at the top of the document. This was often problem a problem noted to CM/ECF. Plaintiff received no Memorandum back at all. Ms Lipinski took it for granted that everything was OK until Judge ruled "denied" against Plaintiff. Plaintiff lives alone, no one has access to her computer. Many thoughts arose to why this happened but nothing made any sense since plaintiff knew she uploaded them as she usually did for the past five years following all instructions. It is a mystery! Until plaintiff took a closer look at the docket #140 online and the content and messages. It was not the documents she uploaded. It clearly says the Response to Castaneda's et al, motion for summary judgement but the document when opened said Response to defendant's joint statement of material facts entitling them to summary judgement. This entry was wrong by whoever labeled and entered it into the docket and totally confusing how this happened. This was not brought up by judge Alonso. By looking at the docket content you can clearly see the problem is Not what is written in the judges Memorandum and order.

The plaintiff believes that in this current day and age of advanced technology it is possible to change information online to cause harm to someone for someones else's benefit; called hacking. Plaintiff believes that this is what happened to her, for our current news head lines of multiple big tech company hackings. She believes from the number #2 error mentioned below is another proof of computer hampering. Today's United States technical problems stem from lack of good and safe protection of our computer systems. For lack of this protection it is easy for dishonest individuals to compromise documents, steal information and change the outcome of a person's life. Behind Docket #161 in the Appendices papers in this brief is a page from the federal docket giving this WARNING: The link to this page may not have originated from within CM/ECF. If you click the Continue link, you will be billed for the information provided. Dated 8/9/21, 11:23p. CM/ECF LIVE, Ver 6.3.3 - U.S. District Court, Northern Illinois- Confirm request.

This warning means it's from a separate site working in connection with the courts, NOT from a secure site, who is giving out the court's information. The courts need to be investigated document tampering and secure the courts clients personal information online. this problem arose with Ms Lipinski, the plaintiff no longer used the CM/ECF LIVE system to upload her documents. She handed them in, in person to the clerks office where the documents are personally stamped by the clerk and notes the clerks individual names in both federal and appeals Courts. Plaintiff hopes the U.S.

Supreme Courts will take this information into serious consideration in her Appeals case and for the whole United States court system.

2. Error: Officer Cap was removed from the docket by neither Plaintiff or Deft's attorneys.. Plaintiff brought this to Judge Alonso's attention who looked on his laptop. He was stunned, no mention of why, was given, and also not noted on the daily docket sheet. Three months later officer Cap was back on the docket?

3. Error: a. Judge Alonso made a wrong judgement in the case. In his opinion and order he states that plaintiff said she admitted pouring bleach on neighbors property and poisoning their dog. This was never said by Plaintiff, but a made up lie by the defendants and attorney's.

b. Judge Alonso also makes another mistake by saying in his order that the Vets letter says that the dog was poisoned, when it says no such statement. In fact the lower court found the plaintiff not guilty and this letter was not approved by the states attorney as factual evidence. See attached letter.

c. Judge Alonso ignored many factual evidences: false police report saying that the dog died and the same report later was redacted that the dog did not die. Case 1:16-cv-07153 Document # 133-2 Filed 10/01/18 page 2 of 5 Page ?ID # 1128, Found Not Guilty document from Markham courthouse, Veterinary letter, no poisoning evidence, no proof what so ever, only lies from Defendants.

Supreme Courts will take this information into serious consideration in her Appeals case and for the whole United States court system.

2. Error: Officer Cap was removed from the docket by neither Plaintiff or Deft's attorneys.. Plaintiff brought this to Judge Alonso's attention who looked on his laptop. He was stunned, no mention of why, was given, and also not noted on the daily docket sheet. Three months later officer Cap was back on the docket?

3. Error: a. Judge Alonso made a wrong judgement in the case. In his opinion and order he states that plaintiff said she admitted pouring bleach on neighbors property and poisoning their dog. This was never said by Plaintiff, but a made up lie by the defendants and attorney's.

b. Judge Alonso also makes another mistake by saying in his order that the Vets letter says that the dog was poisoned, when it says no such statement. In fact the lower court found the plaintiff not guilty and this letter was not approved by the states attorney as factual evidence. See attached letter.

c. Judge Alonso ignored many factual evidences: false police report saying that the dog died and the same report later was redacted that the dog did not die. Case 1:16-cv-07153 Document # 133-2 Filed 10/01/18 page 2 of 5 Page ?iD # 1128, Found Not Guilty document from Markham courthouse, Veterinary letter, no poisoning evidence, no proof what so ever, only lies from Defendants.

d. Judge Alonso denied several requests for plaintiff attorney representation.

e. Judge Alonso denied transcript fee waiver for transcripts that would have facts with case evidence. Legally entitled for low income people.

f. Judge Alonso denied motion to reconsider request to expose the factual truth evidence.

g. The court of Appeals dittoed judge Alonso's wrong Memorandum opinion and order and did not look into the facts and slam dunked Plaintiff's rights to Rehearing En Banc knowing full well the availability of pro se attorney's are not available during Christmas holidays.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; PERCUSSION OF JUDEO-CHRISTIANS

It is Written: Our Forefathers to present, Adam & Eve, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Judges, Esther, Ruth, King David, Y'shua (Jesus), Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, John Cabot, Christopher Columbus, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan & many others.

Hebrews 11:6, 32-40 KJV

6 And without trusting, it is impossible to be well pleasing to God, because whoever approaches him must trust that he does exist and that he becomes a Rewarder to those who seek him out.

32 What more should I say? There isn't time to tell about Gideon, Barak, Shimshon, Yiftach, David, Shmucl and the prophets; 33 who, through trusting, conquered kingdoms, worked righteousness, received what was promised, shut the mouths of lions, 34 quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, had their weakness turned to strength, grew mighty in battle and routed foreign armies. 35 Women received back their dead resurrected; other people were stretched on the rack and beaten to death, refusing to be ransomed, so that they would gain a better resurrection. 36 Others underwent the trails of being mocked and whipped, then chained and imprisoned. 37 They were stoned, sawed in two, murdered by the sword; they went about clothed in sheepskins and goatskins, destitute, persecuted, mistreated, 38 wandering about in

deserts and mountains, living in caves and holes in the ground! The world was not worthy of them! 39 All of these had their merit attested because of their trusting. Nevertheless, they did not receive what had been promised, 40 because God had planned something better that would involve us, so that only with us would they be brought to the goal. (Today!)

IN GOD WE TRUST

CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, the decision of the District Court should not be affirmed and a writ of certiorari should be granted. Plaintiff did not fail to comply with LR 56.1. The Court pre-judged a problem and deemed it as correct without knowing the truth. The Court has multiple errors and misjudged and ignored the Plaintiff's factual evidence and beliefs. The court failed to look into the truth of these errors, The Courts errors are not harmless but proved a lack of legal discretion of the law. The plaintiff believes true justice can only be justified when applied correctly.

Pledge of Allegiance

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, Indivisible, with liberty and Justice for all.

The American's Creed Believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are from the consent of the governed; a Democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to LOVE it; to Support its Constitution, to Obey its laws; to Respect its Flag; and to Defend it against all enemies.

A Tribute to Old Glory

"I am what you make me---nothing more. I am your belief in yourself; the dream of what a people may become. I am all you hope to be and have courage to die for.

"I swing before your eyes, a bright gleam of color, the pictured suggestion of that big thing which makes this nation great.

"my stars and my strips are your dreams and your labors. They are bright with cheer, brilliant with courage, firm with faith, because it is well that you glory in the making."

—Franklin K. Lane.

Illinois Blue Book-1959-1960 pg, 15

Ask not what your Country can do for you, ask what you can do or your country.

—John F. Kennedy. 1961-1963.

I pray this petition for a writ of certiorari shall be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 12, in the year of our Lord 2021.



Jeanette S.R. Lipinski

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH

FRAP RULE 32(a)(7), Frap 32?(g), & CR32

This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App.P 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App.P. 32(a) (6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally-spaced typeface 12-point Linotype style font.

This document complies with the type-volume limitations of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a) (7)(B) and Circuit Rule 32, this document contains 6,424 words, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f).



Jeanette S. R. Lipinski

14121 S. Green Bay Ave.

Burnham, IL. 60633

myhealingjesus@outlook.com

773.240-7701