

No. 21-5458

In the Supreme Court of the United States

**HENRY J. DULAURENCE, III**

---

*Petitioner*

v.

**DOUGLAS P. WOODLOCK, ET AL.**

---

*Respondent*

---

---

**PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REHEARING  
PURSUANT TO RULE 44**

---

Now comes the petitioner in the above entitled action and requests a rehearing of this Court's denial of his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, entered January 10, 2022. By denying his petition, this Court is further supporting the underlying courts which have deprived DuLaurence of his Constitutional and Federal statutory rights. Of all courts, this Court should be one to care for protecting those rights. Unfortunately, this Court has even gone one step further, by improperly financially punishing DuLaurence for his efforts to obtain those rights. The

manner in which the federal courts in this case and in the underlying case, and in particular this Court, have prevented DuLaurence from obtaining his Constitutional rights would make for a good internet blog or a good book on how the federal courts have inflicted injustice. The petitioner in his renewed *in forma pauperis* motion has set out that he was being financially punished by this Court for being "malicious". However, if anyone was malicious, it was the Appeals Court panel of Judges Howard, Thompson, and Kayatta, not DuLaurence. DuLaurence was merely attempting to obtain his Constitutional rights, of which he has been deprived for 26 years. He ultimately went to the federal courts to obtain these rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and was illegally denied this. See booklet form petition at pages 12-13. DuLaurence then sued Judge Woodlock in part through the Supreme Court's derived cause of action, *Bivens v. Six Unknown Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), which no court will address, for monetary damages against any federal official personally who has violated a plaintiff's Constitutional rights where no other remedy is available. Id. at 392-397. See booklet petition at pages 19-21.

Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration of the  
Denial of The Petitioner's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In*

*Forma Pauperis* is incorporated by reference in this petition for rehearing. Only after this Court had sent the booklet form petition to be distributed on January 7, 2022, which It immediately denied so it could be placed on the Order List at 9:30 am the next business day, did it become apparent that this Court was punishing the petitioner by having him pay more than three thousand dollars for what he thought was a chance to have his petition accepted. (See attached invoice.) Why else would this Court rule that the petition should be in booklet form, and then immediately deny it? This Court should have allowed the *in forma pauperis* motion and denied the petition at the same time. This Court has a lot of duties, but DuLaurence is almost positive that one of them is not intentionally financially punishing litigants, which would undermine the integrity of the judicial system. DuLaurence is certain that one of this Court's duties is to maintain the integrity of the judicial system, and not to deliberately continue to prevent one his or her Constitutional and statutory rights. This Court is punishing DuLaurence for his setting out in detail what the judges did to deprive him of his Constitutional rights, including obstruction of justice and his Right to Redress pursuant to the Bill of Rights of the United States

Constitution. The federal courts including this Court (denial of certiorari) have denied him his rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in the underlying case, Appendix L (App. 42a.), when it was clear that Judge Woodlock had no intention of granting jurisdiction based on the fact that federal courts could not "review the state court judgments and that indeed I would have an obligation did I have jurisdiction to give full faith and credit to them". Appendix N (App. 63a.) See DuLaurence's paid for booklet petition at page 12, pages 7-8, and Appendix N (App. 65a-66a.). This improper deprivation of DuLaurence's Constitutional rights by Judge Woodlock was then upheld by the Appeals Court. Appendix H (App. 33a.) As set out above, this Court subsequently denied DuLaurence's Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Based on this deprivation of rights, DuLaurence filed a Civil Rights complaint against Judge Woodlock. Appendix M (App. 56a.) This detailed account of what Judge Woodlock and Judges Howard, Thompson, and Kayatta perpetrated was a necessity to demonstrate to this Court that his petition was warranted. For some reason, this Court could not see that. Maybe this Court did not bother to read his petition. A judgment is void *ab initio* if it is entered in a manner inconsistent with due process.

See *Glebe v. Frost*, 574 U.S. 21, 135 S. Ct. 429, 430-431 (2014) (per curiam); *Wendt v. Leonard*, 431 F.3d 410, 413 (4th Cir. 2005). The Bill of Rights with the "Incorporation Doctrine" of the Fourteenth Amendment provides that any state or court that denies one his rights is violating it's duty to provide "equal protection of the laws". The doctrine is the recognition that no procedure can be just if it deprives a person of his or her human liberties. One of these guaranteed rights is the redress of grievances. Although this Court apparently does not believe in the above, Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 states: "The Judicial Power shall extend to all cases in Law and Equity, arising under the Constitution (and) Laws of the United States..." DuLaurence has claimed he was deprived of rights secured by the United States Constitution and Federal statutes, Due Process, and the Right to Redress. See booklet petition pages 27-30. DuLaurence clearly had no adequate remedy by appeal, see *Bivens, supra*, at page 2 above, when it was the same Appeals Court panel which had upheld Judge Woodlock's improper ruling (see page 4 above) that the federal courts had no jurisdiction to hear 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims. See booklet petition at 8-9. Appendix H (App. 34-35a.) Further, the Appeals Court panel would not

address DuLaurence's recusal/disqualification motion as to Judge Woodlock, 28 U.S.C. § 455, other than that it was "moot". Appendix H (App. 35a.) See booklet petition at 8-9.

DuLaurence further requests payment from this Court for the money he has expended for the improper punishment It imposed. Please see the attached invoice for what he expended.

Please also see attached Rule 44 Certification.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry J. DuLaurence  
Henry J. DuLaurence, III  
1 South Union Street, #114  
Lawrence, MA 01843  
(978) 208-1399

Dated: January 23, 2022

**Supreme Court Press**  
 1089 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 283  
 Boston, Massachusetts 02215  
 Phone: (888) 958-5705 | Fax: (888) 958-5798  
 Email: editor@supremecourtpress.com

**Invoice Pro Forma**

<b>Client:</b> Henry J. DuLaurence III	<b>Date:</b> Oct 22, 2021
<b>Firm:</b> Petitioner Pro Se	<b>Case:</b> <i>DuLaurence III v. Woodlock</i>
<b>Phone:</b> (978) 208-1399	<b>Type:</b> Petition for Writ of Certiorari
<b>Address:</b> 1 South Union Street, #114 Lawrence, MA 01843	<b>Email:</b> caskart5@icloud.com <b>Invoice #:</b> 456621

Qty	Item Description	Amount
1	Petition for Writ of Certiorari <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 for the Court, 3 for client, and 3 for respondent.</li> <li>• Typesetting. You send us unformatted documents which we place into Supreme Court format.</li> <li>• Preparation of Cover</li> <li>• Generation of table of contents/authorities</li> <li>• E File Preparation</li> </ul> Set Up Fee = \$750 discounted 25 % to \$ 562.5. *** You are receiving a 25% discount off the service fees which is reserved for near-IFP filers ***	\$ 563
	89 Additional appendix pages @ \$20/typeset page = \$1780 discounted to \$1335. Appendix pages that are typeset, but later removed by the client are refunded at \$10/typeset page	\$ 1,335
	47 Brief/Cover pages @ \$20/typeset page = \$940 discounted to \$705	\$ 705
	<b>Service Fees to Supreme Court Press</b>	\$ 2,603
<b>Pass Thru and Other Costs</b>		
+	Service upon court and parties, certificate of service/compliance	\$ 150
	SCP Issuance of Filing Fee Check	\$ 300
	<b>Total (with filing fee check)</b>	\$ 3,053
	<b>Initial Payment (Due Upfront)</b>	\$ 1,526.25
	<b>Final Payment (Due Prior to Print Date)</b>	\$ 1,526.25

**Additional Comments:**

- We accept checks, money orders, and credit/debit cards. If you mail a check, you must provide a tracking number for the shipment. There is a 2% fee on credit/debit cards to partially offset the high transaction fees. We can also hold a credit card and give you 7 days for a check to arrive. There are no refunds.
- The Supreme Court Press does not provide legal advice. The strategic decisions and wording choices are the sole province of the attorney or pro se client, if applicable. The Supreme Court Press does not calculate filing deadlines. It is the client's responsibility to manage to and meet their deadlines.
- Late submission, late edits, or slow turnaround time on proof review may result in additional night/weekend/early AM charges at \$150-175/hr.
- Limitation on liability: Supreme Court Press shall not be liable for any amount in excess of that paid by the client.

**CERTIFICATION - RULE 44**

The petitioner certifies that this petition for rehearing is limited both to intervening circumstances of a substantial and controlling effect, and to other substantial grounds, not previously presented. This Court by denying DuLaurence's petition in the manner that it did was not only unlawful, but unconstitutional. This Court yet again prevented DuLaurence from obtaining his rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. This Court also intentionally essentially stole money from DuLaurence by financially punishing him for his attempts to obtain these rights.

This is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 29th day of January, 2022.

  
Henry J. DuLaurence  
Henry J. DuLaurence, III