

NO. 21-5473


IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMESON ROSADO,
Petitioner
, v.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL & STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR REHEARING FROM THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

Jameson Rosado, Pro Se
58 Heald Street
Carteret, NJ 07008
(732) 366-4534
Email: Jamesonrosado@gmail.com



QUESTION PRESENTED

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether Jamie (PETITIONER) was ordered for the FFD to ultimately have him removed from federal service in retaliation for pursuing prior EEO activity;
2. Whether Mike Ward referred Jamie to the Inspection Division in retaliation for disclosing his EEO activity during a meeting in April 2010
3. Whether the allegations of insubordination and misconduct were clustered together to exaggerate the severity as a pretext for discrimination and retaliation to remove Jamie for engaging in EEO activity;
4. Whether the Agency's removal of Jamie was based on discriminatory and retaliatory motives despite receiving successful performance reviews and having been found fit for duty;
5. Whether Jamie was removed in retaliation for his EEO activity related to the current case as well as previous EEO activity;
6. Whether Mike Ward's referral of Jamie to the Inspection Division for insubordination was in retaliation for an EEO investigation which Mr. Ward was present;
7. Whether Mike Ward's referral to the Inspection Division was based on retaliation for failing to follow the chain of command when Jamie was

"put off" by his first and second line supervisors;

8. Whether the Agency's alleged reasons for ordering the FFD in abundance of caution based on statements Jamie made on August 30, 2011 are a pretext for retaliation.

9. Whether the District Court prejudiced BOTH the initial processing of the complaint AND appeal or BOTH.

10. Whether Martin F. Zielinski's purported eleven (11) stressors relied upon in recommending the FFD were a pretext for retaliation as many factors enumerated are common stress factors to any ordinary person and do not pose a high security risk. Additionally, Jamie's wife was not, in fact, leaving him;

11. Whether Mike Ward's referral to the Inspection Division for misconduct, insubordination, and miscellaneous violations were a pretext for retaliation and actually motivated by discrimination to get Jamie removed because of mental illness;

12. Whether the allegation of misconduct that Jamie was not performing his duties despite receiving successful performance evaluations signed by his first and second line supervisor was a pretext for retaliation for engaging in prior EEO activity;

13. Whether the Agency's allegation of insubordination for going outside

his chain of command regarding his prior EEO matter was a pretext for retaliation when Jamie had previously received an email from Mike Ward stating "the FBI operates via an open door policy" and the chain of command "does not preclude anyone from reaching out to higher levels of management if he/she feels the need".

14. Why did the District Court engage in exparte communications with other State of NJ Judges while prejudicing my complaint?

15. Why did for former Magistrate Judge Joseph Dickson burden me with additional losses AFTER my matter was erroneously dismissed?

16. What Court will remedy the reprisal established by the EEOC, in addition to FBI Newark witnesses?

17. When can appellant expect relief, including reinstatement, which he has waited a decade for?

18. When can petitioner expect relief, including reinstatement, after being made to wait more than a decade in litigation?

19. When can he expect NJ State fabricated charges to be properly addressed, dismissed, and firearms, other property, including restitution be returned?

20. Why did the District Court have a separate agenda other than remedying the petitioner's civil AFFIRMED reprisal discrimination/

hostile work environment, whistleblower matter, which was supplemented with an EEOC decision also in petitioner's favor?

21. Why did the District Court, after more than 5 years, and before Judge Esther Salas issued a scheduling order, fail to schedule a settlement conference?

PARTIES INVOLVED

Unites States Supreme Court
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543
Attn: Mr. Michael Duggan

Office of the Solicitor General, Mr. Brian Fletcher
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Third Circuit Court of Appeals
601 Market St Ste 18614,
Philadelphia, PA 19106
Case 20-2801

District Court, Newark
50 Walnut St Rm 4015,
Newark, NJ 07102
2:15 CV 03999; Rosado v. AG

US Attorney's Office Camden
401 Market Street
Camden, NJ 08102

US Attorney's Office
970 Broad Street
Newark, NJ 07102

NJ Appellate Division Clerk's Office, Mr. Joseph Orlando, Mrs. Marijean
Stevens, Ms. Sara Felecia
P.O. Box 006
Trenton, New Jersey, 08625
2:15 cv 03999 , 1201W2020 000354 & appeal A002741-20T4
1201XTR2020-2 & appeal A000819-20

Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office
25 Kirkpatrick St #3
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
2:15 cv 03999 , 1201W2020 000354 & appeal A002741-20T4
1201XTR2020-2 & appeal A000819-20

Petitioner seeks a Petition for Rehearing in the captioned matter, on appeal from the recent writ of certiorari denial from the US Supreme Court. Petitioner is a pro se litigant.

There was conflicting correspondence that was received from NJ State authorities that coincided with this petition for rehearing. Per our phone call recently in which I inquired as the format of this request, and because I am a pro se litigant, please accept this letter petition addressing BOTH State & Federal (Civil matters).

Per Supreme Court

instruction, I have drafted “newer” questions since the Supreme Court DENIED my writ for certiorari. However, although everyone, included myself expected that, I found it interesting that while the State charges, coincide with a recent Supreme Court decision, 20-157, Caniglia v. Strom et al, in which the Court ruled in favor of the petitioner on May 17, 2021. My case also has several pieces of recorded evidence in which the State and federal government withheld.

Numerous attempts by the State of NJ, (re : the attached July 23, 2021 letter, September 1, 2021 letter, June 30, 2021 letter , which is a

response to my correspondence dated June 11, 2021) all suggest of have the misleading appearance suggesting the State charges are not involved in my civil matter. **This is false and completely untrue as the affiant in the State charges is a former Magistrate Judge, Joseph Dickson, assigned to my civil matter.** civil matter. That is the first of many issues regarding your letter.

I have decided to detail how BOTH State & Federal entities prejudiced my matters, unfairly took advantage of and exploited me as a pro se litigant.

A second issue also suggests that I “lost” my State appeal matters. You will recall, since I was forced to withdraw those appeals, NJ agencies had nothing to show for as progress or good faith in the year the matter concerning State charges was unaddressed. I also can say, much like the attached letter dated September 1, 2021, this letter was postmarked 10/14/21, and received 10/20/21, showing substantial delays and this is a third or fourth time NJ responding parties have done this.

A third issue also is where there are some “**significant troubling parallels**” regarding both State & Federal entities exploiting me as a pro se litigant. One of those “parallels” concerns 1) discovery in BOTH processes, and a “not so innocuous remark” made to me on August 13,

2020, by a Carteret police officer, the officer whose name the complaint is in on behalf of the former judge.

In an effort to keep the timeline chronological, note the following:

- 1) On August 7, 2020, Mr. Dickson dispatched 2 US Marshals;
- 2) To the Carteret Police Department;
- 3) Who then entered my home unlawfully,
- 4) To discuss my recently dismissed civil matter, 2 days PRIOR on August 5, 2020.

For ALL INTENTS & PURPOSES, this was an unlawful entry, it was NOT an interview, as suggested in the fabricated Carteret police reports, which can be found in the Appendix (**page44A**) provided to the Supreme Court. In addition to the above remark, ALL parties were told when they entered my home: the visit was highly inappropriate.

I know that during this first of two unlawful visits, the second occurring days later on August 13, 2020, coincidentally 1) the same day the former Magistrate held a “bizarre status conference call” on my recently dismissed matter. The State of NJ, despite 2 hearings, one on September 9, 2020 before NJ Superior Court Judge Colleen Flynn, who held a “rushed TERPO hearing” which was decided by her not only before

September 9, 2020, but also before my initial appearance before her on August 24, 2020, and the additional “fabricated harassment charge” was held before Judge Allen Comba of Carteret NJ. That initial appearance before him was April 19, 2021 and final on May 3, 2020. However, I am seeing a name of Judge William Feingold who ultimately signed off on these fabricated State charges. **I have repeatedly requested what was presented to these Judges to secure those fake warrants/ complaints, and have not yet received an answer.** I can tell you, if the sole piece of evidence, which DID NOT sustain State charges, the charges were upheld because 1) I was taken advantage of as a pro se litigant, 2) had to be finalized as soon as possible (it is NOT a coincidence the TERPO matter was finalized in days and the harassment charge pending for almost a full year, nor is it coincidence I was not afforded an attorney for the TERPO matter, something which all judges knew in advance. It is also not a coincidence I was NOT provided an attorney for the TERPO matter, something Mr. Dickson not only took full advantage of.

While drafting this document, I was forced to condense at least 20 “prejudicial acts” over the course of 5 plus & continuing years in which

this matter pended. Upon consideration & granting this request, they will be presented at my “rehearing” if Granted, or unless this matter is otherwise settled. Considering numerous “bad faith acts” by both District Court Judges and the Defendant in my civil matter and State matters as well, which I am the Defendant, I do not foresee these matters being settled amicably, or WITHOUT SUPREME COURT involvement.

Judges are reminded : failing to provide items in discovery AND failing to compel the Defendant can be considered a violation of Rule 37 in the Rules of Civil Procedure. However, the District Court’s real problems began in June 2017, when they refused to provide me with the active shooter bulletin posted in the Courthouse and failed to compel the Defendant in my civil matter, to provide the information. It is also a violation of my due process and Constitutional rights. . My case concerning fabricated State charges is just as strong, *if not more so because of multiple occurrences of illegal activity, such as collusion between the federal government & State of NJ government.*

HOW John M. Vazquez got the decision incorrect, and to be truthful, Judge Esther Salas, whom had my civil matter BEFORE it was reassigned to Judge Vazquez, could not have made his job ANY EASIER

as to ruling in my favor.

She accepted the following 3 items:

- 1) Nonpayment of student loans after being discriminated against in the FBI's student loan repayment program;
- 2) Non-selection to the Evidence Response Team;
- 3) And SAC Mike Ward's referral of me to the INSD, and adverse action AFTER he witnessed specific EEO activity, which had nothing to do with Ward, until he CHOSE to involve himself.

The Court is reminded: there is an FBI affidavit from Supervisor Mike Pohl, dated June 9, 2010, implicating **BOTH** he and ASAC Mike (DOC 21 EX 1, District Court Docket) Schulstad **were aware I was being retaliated against for information I provided to the INSD in 2007 and about budgetary abuses, specifically overtime.** In that same affidavit, Pohl stated BOTH were also aware 'I had a pending EEO complaint against the entire floor of management, and the retaliating parties included **ADMIN ASAC Dave Velazquez.** Once this statement is made, with an EEOC decision also **AFFIRMING** reprisal, my allegations should have been immediately remedied.

Now, Velazquez was involved in the following half dozen retaliations:

- 1) The non payment for being considered for student loans, in 2009 &

2010. Discovery yielded CONSECUTIVE years I was discriminated against and the Student loan program falls under Velazquez's responsibility in the Newark Office.

2) The non selection for ERT, and discovery also yielded an additional secondary argument. Making matters worse is Judge Vazquez's remarks about these specific incidents are unacceptable as they are irrelevant.

3) In addition to those now 3 retaliations, Dave Velazquez also oversaw the New agent testing program, for which I took the test in 2006 or 2007, and failed, and when I went to retest, because of scrutiny concerning my college degree status, was not permitted a retest. Instead I was terminated for cause with this charge being not only misrepresented, but given the FBI interfered in my 2 attempts to become a police officer, this issue was a non issue. Also, the Defendant fails to mention, and this is lying by omission, that had it promoted me to a GS 10 in 2006 when due, I would have been able to pay a school debt from one school to another so transfer credits previously agreed upon were not approved after the school changed its policy, making me have to make up years worth of credits.

4) In addition to the above, it was learned that Velazquez, whom also oversees the Newark Division's financial disclosure program, directed

parties to fish for information concerning this school bill, in the hopes I had not disclosed it so it could be used against me. Now, this item also needs its own 15 pages and I am not concerned with the rhetoric or legalese from Judge Salas regarding how she addressed this matter. For ANY Judge, at ANY level, be it EEOC, District Courts or Supreme Court, when it is uncovered that the FBI is not only abusing policies but its most sensitive policy, I expect Judges to not only take issue with that but also potentially sanction the party. I was even more taken aback because given Judge Salas' remarks concerning this issue, one would think ANY Judge would take issue with that, especially when the Judges themselves annually file financial disclosures.

CONCLUSION – WHY THIS REQUEST SHOULD BE GRANTED

As stated previously, the petitioner has BEEN MADE TO WAIT over a decade for his day in Court. In 2014, the District Court was forwarded a 2013 “blacklist letter” written by the Defendant, which has led to a decade of continued full time unemployment, FOR OVER THAT Now more than a decade.

In addition to that, once I provided that letter, I thought the Court would expedite matters, and instead, they not only did the opposite by unnecessarily delaying matters for over 5 plus years, they assisted the

Defendant in carrying out that blacklist's damage, which continues to this day.

The District Court permitted the Defendant to consistently act in bad faith, and to a great extent, encouraged that bad faith conduct. When discovery concluded with information supporting that not only was the hostile environment worse than at first thought, but also "pinpointed" to a specific incident in 1997, the Judges assigned to this case ignored that and I unfortunately cannot let that continue to go unaddressed. Also, FOR THE RECORD, when the entire floor of Executive Management, 1) admits to gossiping about the petitioner, 2) for over a decade, from 1997–2012, 3) and you have several hostile environment complaints : it's time for Judges to acknowledge the hostile environment. Very early on in the District Court complaint process, Judges made mistake after mistake, which initially were discovered through a pattern of observation by me. However, there is more than ample evidence to also support, NOT JUST ANY 1 Judge assigned to this matter either 1) lacked any experience adjudicating hostile environment complaints, 2) more specifically, hostile environment complaints specific to the FBI.

Also, for the record, concerning Judge Vazquez's opinion, which is not only incorrect but much like the EEO complaints, " all over the place",

some of his remarks would need 15 pages to address. When you are a litigant, 1) employed in one unit, 2) of one FBI office for 16 years, 3) with 4 of the 16 years as the supervisor of the ONE SINGLE UNIT, and on either the first or second page of Judge Vazquez's opinion states the plaintiff worked in "various roles"; the last time I checked, one does not equate to various. It might be time to update the "boiler template decisions" in the Courts.

Also, concerning remarks by Judge Esther Salas, she stated I felt I should have been demoted to the hostile environment AFTER the return from my wedding & subsequent honeymoon (I was demoted to the hostile environment the day before my wedding). No, I did not ever state or feel that. The obvious point missed was : 1) given my 16 YEARS in one unit, 2) with 4 of the 16 as the supervisor, 3) I should NOT have been demoted, AT ALL, 4) much less the day before my wedding. I honestly have to say, some remarks from ALL of the Judges on paper are troubling and confounding.

I also have not been reimbursed for the over \$3,000 in State charges and those receipts will be forwarded in the very near future because somebody needs to pay those damages. If the matter cannot be settled by the end of the year, those damages should be reimbursed.

Now, it is important to note, since Mr. Dickson was “to be in the process of scheduling 1 of 2 settlement conferences before this matter was dismissed”, my hope is that if the Supreme Court were to GRANT this request, I am amenable to moving to settlement, which is now YEARS overdue.

On all 5 dates Mr. Dickson held a status conference, beginning with the first in July 2017, he AFFIRMED discrimination damages WITH REINSTATEMENT are \$2,000,000 million dollars.

Each of four complaints carry a maximum damages of \$300,000 (three hundred thousand dollars), for a total of \$1,200,000 (one million two hundred thousand dollars). The remaining \$800,000 (eight hundred thousand dollars) is back pay, for a total of \$2 million dollars. In 2010, SAC Mike Ward, during one of several inappropriate meetings discussing my EEO matters stated even if the FBI were to give me a million dollars to settle my complaint I would still be expected to do my job. While that was not an inappropriate comment for him to make, I told him, in 2010, that was nowhere near enough for the years this matter deprived / lost of me waiting in litigation & other regrets. That being said, I have seen the Supreme Court can “triple” damages and will be seeking those damages of \$2 million dollars be tripled, for a total of \$6 million dollars, more than a

decade waiting justifies that.

The sum total of ALL student loan debt is expected. I was denied this in 2009 & 2010 and that debt continues to rise and is one of several reasons this matter needs to be expedited. In addition to the Student Loan debt, the FBI will pay for a Master's Degree of my choosing.

Once you get past the back pay, educational remedies AND annual leave, sick leave, credit of time lost (a decade) which brings 20, 25 year service awards, and a retirement contribution, the only remedies left are : office of assignment, position, and salary.

Because of the educational remedies, I would accept reinstatement to the Newark Office, but at a "satellite office" or Resident Agency of my choosing, which would more than likely be the Franklin Township Office, given its proximity to Rutgers University or possibly Princeton, which are 2 schools of consideration for pursuing my Master's.

I repeatedly stated that during the years, specifically in 2005 and again in 2007, FBI Newark parties hindered my attempts to become a police officer. The first in 2005 involved the Jersey City Police Department, and the second in 2007, was the Port Authority Police Department.

During that first "incident", a Newark FBI supervisor, Ms. Tricia

Revis, was one of several parties that hindered that JCPD attempt to become a police officer.

Ironically, Ms. Revis, with the petitioner and 2 other FBI Newark support employees, were candidates at the PAPD in 2007. The other 2 employees would go on to negotiate better paying FBI jobs so as to stay with the FBI and not leave for the PAPD, and Ms. Revis also would be rewarded with the Special Agent position. I, after being laughed out of the office, (there is video, in which the Defendant provided), I get to beg for my job back after NUMEROUS humiliations.

That being said, and because of discovery yielding damning evidence of Executive Management gossiping about me for years, I will accept a position equivalent to that of Deputy Assistant Director, at a salary of no less than \$172,000, which is the reported salary Deputy Director Andrew McCabe was making before his wrongful termination. This was the best possible way for me to “quantify” lifelong regrets.

While space constraints permit me, I also would like to address something in which Judge Esther Salas addressed rather either mistakenly or inappropriately.

There was an incident years back in which parties placed a box of womens disposable douche on my desk, and I threw it away after a few

days. I then discovered that, in an opened case of this product, which I provided photos of, in which shows the missing / discarded box.

Parties from the Cargo theft squad then came looking for it. A remark was made to me that the party looking for it “hoped it was not counted”, meaning inventoried.


Later in the day, a verbal shouting match ensued between myself and an agent on my squad, whereas he told me not to make this an issue or “it could get everyone on the floor, including himself, in trouble. My supervisor not only threatened me for making it an issue, he carried out the threat by removing & suspending me from the squad, which involves another omitted pretext in addition to my removal from the Newark Office.

While one expects federal judges to comport themselves properly, when a male litigant 1) is harassed with a box of a womens sanitary product, 2) threatened and 3) the threat carried out, 4) while the Judge failed to correlate : this may have been evidence from a cargo theft seizure, her “tone deaf response was” “no doubt Mr. Rosado found it hurtful”, that is unacceptable. It was very clear Judge Salas either had minimal, if ANY qualifications to adjudicate 1) hostile environment complaints and / or 2) such complaints specific to the FBI.

In closing, as previously stated, and since settlement terms are in this request, and because the District Court should have scheduled "at least one of 2 settlement conferences" prior to this dismissal, per Mr. Dickson on April 2, 2019, I would consider settlement, but unfortunately, the State matters, which involve over \$3,000 (three thousand dollars in damages alone), and the safe return of my firearms and other property, I do not foresee the Supreme Court not being involved in those matters. In fact, in the 14 months in addressing NJ appeals, up until right now as I submit this writ, the NJ Appellate Division, just on all of the evidence alone, should have settled & returned my firearms by now. All they have shown is bad faith and have been very transparent & obvious about it. My reason for submitting the NJ letters enclosed is because you yourself can deduce they are not taking the matter seriously.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for rehearing should be granted.

Respectfully submitted.


Jameson Rosado, Pro Se,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION**

RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P.O. Box 006, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0006
(609) 815-2950

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO
CLERK

JOHN K. GRANT
DEPUTY CLERK - CASE PROCESSING

KAREN M. CARROLL
DEPUTY CLERK - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES



CHRISTINA O. HALL
DIRECTOR, CENTRAL RESEARCH

MARIE C. HANLEY
CHIEF COUNSEL

September 1, 2021

rec'd 10/20/21; PMKD 10/14/21

Jameson Rosado
58 Herald Street
Carteret, NJ 07008

Re: In the Matter of J.R.
Docket No. A-000819-20T4

/AND NJ A2741-20 SMF (2APPEALS/NJ)

Dear JAMESON ROSADO,

The enclosed material (CD & Letter with attachments) is being returned to you, unfiled for the following reason:

The above Appellate Docket Number is closed, and we do not accept copies of pleadings submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Thanks,
Sara Felicia
X-52661

Enclosures
cc: Joie D. Piderit

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION**

RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P.O. Box 006, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0006
(609) 815-2950

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO
CLERK

JOHN K. GRANT
DEPUTY CLERK - CASE PROCESSING

KAREN M. CARROLL
DEPUTY CLERK - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES



CHRISTINA O. HALL
DIRECTOR, CENTRAL RESEARCH

MARIE C. HANLEY
CHIEF COUNSEL

July 23, 2021

JAMESON ROSADO
58 HERALD STREET
CARTERET, NJ 07008

Re: IN THE MATTER OF J.R.
Docket No. A-002741-20T4

Dear JAMESON ROSADO:

The Clerk's office received your letter dated June 11, 2021 in which you state that your appeal cannot be pursued at this time because you have pending matters in the United States Supreme Court. The Clerk's office cannot accept this letter as a letter withdrawing the appeal. Moreover, you did not respond to the clerk's office letter inquiry, dated June 22, 2021, regarding finality of the municipal court judgment on appeal and whether the Appellate Division has jurisdiction.. Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed. A copy of the order of dismissal is enclosed.

Your letter also requests that the filing fee be refunded to you. Please be advised that the clerk's office has no authority to refund the filing fee after a notice of appeal is docketed.

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO, CLERK

Marijean R. Stevens

BY: MARIJEAN R. STEVENS
STAFF ATTORNEY

C: Middlesex County Prosecutor, Attention: Joie D. Piderit

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO. A-002741-20T4

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
V.
JAMESON ROSADO

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL
WITHOUT PREJUDICE

This matter being opened to the court on its own motion, and the Clerk of the court having previously advised appellant by written or electronic notice that the appeal appeared to be interlocutory, and appellant not having responded to the notice;

It is HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal is dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to prosecute.

WITNESS, the Honorable Carmen Messano, Presiding Judge for Administration, at Trenton, this 23rd day of July, 2021.

S/JOSEPH H. ORLANDO

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO
CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

1201W2020000354
MIDDLESEX

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION**

RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P.O. Box 006, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0006
(609) 815-2950

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO
CLERK

JOHN K. GRANT
DEPUTY CLERK - CASE PROCESSING

KAREN M. CARROLL
DEPUTY CLERK - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES



CHRISTINA O. HALL
DIRECTOR, CENTRAL RESEARCH

MARIE C. HANLEY
CHIEF COUNSEL

June 30, 2021

JAMESON ROSADO
58 HERALD STREET
CARTERET, NJ 07008

Re: IN THE MATTER OF J.R.
Docket No. A-000819-20

Dear JAMESON ROSADO,

Your email dated June 29, 2021 was referred to me by Case Manager, Sara Felicia, for a response. As you were advised by letter dated April 14, 2021, I remind you that any communication with the Clerk's Office should be by written correspondence, not emails. In this way, respondent State of New Jersey is apprised of all your communication with the Clerk's office.

In your email, you advised Ms. Felicia that you will not be pursuing your appeal docketed above. Pursuant to Rule 2:8-2, an appellant may dismiss an appeal at any time before the first brief is filed. The rule requires that you notify the State of your dismissal. The Clerk's office will accept a letter indicating that you are withdrawing your appeal along with a certification of service of that letter on the Middlesex County Prosecutor's office. Please submit your letter withdrawing the appeal and proof of service by July 12, 2021, or the appeal will be reviewed for administrative dismissal without further notice. If you have any questions, please contact Sara Felicia, Case Manager, at (609-815-2950 x 52661).

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO CLERK
Marijean R. Stevens

BY: MARIJEAN R. STEVENS
STAFF ATTORNEY

cc: Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office, Attn: Assistant Prosecutor Joie D. Piderit

Superior Court of NJ

Appellate Division

Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex

PO BOX 006

Trenton, NJ 08625-0006

Appeal A-000819-20; in the matter of J.R. ; &

A-002741-20 = STATE OF NEW JERSEY V. JAMESON ROSADO

June 11, 2021

Jameson Rosado

58 Heald Street

Carteret, NJ 07008

Dear Mr. Orlando,

Reference your June 30, 2021 letter regarding withdrawing appeal(s), it appears your letter suggests some confusion regarding returning an appeal fee, which is the 2nd matter, a false harassment charge, in which the State of NJ, in bad faith, prematurely accepted that order knowing certain filings were not only NOT submitted timely, but at all. As a result of the State of NJ's continuous ignorant and irresponsible matter these appeals proceedings have been addressed to date, and because these fabricated State charges identify the AFFIANT in the State complaints is a former federal Magistrate Judge assigned to civil matter 2:15 CV 03999, Rosado v. US Atty General, I have to additionally involve the U.S. Attorney's Office in Newark, NJ, the District Court Chief Judge is getting a courtesy copy, in addition to the U.S. Supreme Court & Attorney General. These State matters are attached to civil matter 2:15 CV 03999; Rosado v. US Attorney General.

Concerning State appeal # A002741-20, I see a money order purchased on May 24, 2021 was accepted by the State, when I was not advised 1) the initial appeal has to go through N.J. Superior Court first, and given the charge was pled on May 3, 2021, gives me until May 23, 2021 to file that appeal, 2) which then goes to the Appellate Division. Given Judge Colleen Flynn addressed a PRIOR rushed TERPO hearing on September 9, 2021, that information should have been made known to me, if anything as a courtesy. But, as a Judge, when you deliberately omit information, especially while taking advantage of & exploiting an unsuspecting pro se litigant, that does not look favorable on any judge. The

Magistrate's taking advantage in that process only further proves that point, and when you get to the ex parte conversations, and denying due process regarding discovery, the State only made my cases for me. Also, the State of NJ informed me, on June 22, 2021 that the appeal was not filed in Superior Court first; something it was aware of over a month ago. Please refund that \$250.00 fee upon receipt of this request.

The U.S. Supreme Court is being advised that I am going to be requesting these matters be pursued separately and NOT attached to my civil matter BECAUSE of the excessively & aggressively well documented prejudices.

I am also requesting the New Jersey Attorney General's Office look into this matter as the lack of response from that agency, to date, is both troubling & unacceptable.

The Supreme Court should also be advised : a document portraying me as some sort of active shooter was posted in the District Courthouse as of June 2017, two years AFTER the initial filing of my civil matter. The document has 1) the June 2017 date, 2) my FBI employee photo, 3) has Judges Esther Salas (the initial judge assigned to my complaint) name on it, along with Magistrate Judge Joseph Dickson, and then Chief Judge Jose Linares's names on it, 4) and referenced the very pending FBI litigation before the District Court Judges, **WHICH PREJUDICED THE MATTER, AS OF THAT DATE.** The former Magistrate then admits to using documents in abeyance before him, **IN THE FALSE STATE** charges, and admittedly additionally prejudiced the initial civil matter, but also the **appellate matter.** The Third Circuit Court of Appeals, for that reason alone, 1) should not have DENIED me a re-hearing, or 2) taken as long (7 months) to dismiss the appeal, particularly FOR the reason it was dismissed.

Lastly, in closing, State charges have resulted in over \$3,000 in losses, not to mention firearms and other property which must be returned. Then there is vacating those charges, which include the TERPO ban, and then there is my civil matter, in which given Judge Salas opinion regarding discovery, yielding further evidence in support of my reprisal claims, already AFFIRMED by the EEOC, when discovery yields a 1) dated document of September 2011, 2) written by the ENTIRE FLOOR of Executive Management in the FBI Newark Office, 3) admittedly gossiping about me from 1997 -2011; that is about as "hostile" as "hostile work environments" get. Given this matter was initially assigned to former corrupt Magistrate Judge Joe Dickson, who himself admitted, after denying 3 requests for pro bono counsel, not being able to get past the volume of paper, and then later exhibited even further confusion in a recorded conversation the State never provided which took place on August 13, 2020, ultimately showed he was

unqualified to address either 1) hostile work environment complaints or 2) such complaints specific to the FBI.

As I previously informed the US Supreme Court, writs are being written as I tend to withdrawing these appeals, which once the US Supreme Court overturns these State decisions and vacates the charges and returns my firearms, the appeals would be unnecessary in the State processes. As for the Supreme Court, this matter CANNOT be dismissed FOR ANY REASON. Limited conversation with Supreme Court Clerks, about the process and timeliness of, have led me to believe that that is NOT being taken seriously on my end. I do not know if, in anticipation of that course, the matters can be remanded back to the District Court for "proper & fair" adjudication, but under the United States Constitution, the Court has BOTH a legal & moral obligation, specifically under TITLE VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to remedy reprisal. At present, we are WAY past reprisal. Ultimately, there is also a matter involving student loan debt, expected to be repaid by the Defendant, and the District Court wasting 5 plus years adding to that debt.

The District Court, for a fourth & final time is being requested, as is MY RIGHT, to provide the unredacted bulletin housed within the Courthouse confines dated June 2017. Failing to do so is NOT an option and failing to do so violates BOTH my Constitutional & due process rights.

In closing, I welcome any opportunity to discuss this matter and can be reached at 732-366-4534. All parties should also be advised, once the initial writs are submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court, all further correspondence, including changes or amendments to those writs, should be done electronically and emails should be provided. The NJ appellate matters cannot be pursued at this time because of the States continuous notifications changing deadlines which conflict with an appeal that is the priority before the US Supreme Court. The State was advised of this, as well as numerous health issues requiring surgery which would limit ability to respond to documents is why these withdrawals are necessary. However, it is worth mentioning entering a year into this appeals process, the State has not acted in good faith and appears to be taking advantage of the fact that I am a pro se litigant to justify keeping my firearms, which is NOT acceptable. Ultimately, I know that it will undoubtedly involve the US Supreme Court to facilitate returning those firearms and other property.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jameson Rosado

Certificate of Service

The following document was forwarded to the following parties on June 12, 2021 at the following locations, via US postal service:

Superior Court of NJ

Appellate Division

Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex

PO BOX 006

Trenton, NJ 08625-0006

Joseph Orlando

U.S. Supreme Court

One First Street NE,

Washington D.C. 20543

Newark District Court

Chief Judge Freda Wolfson

50 Walnut Street

Newark, NJ 07102

U.S. Attorney's Office

Daniel Meyler

970 Broad Street

Newark, NJ 07102

New Jersey Attorney General

25 Market Street, BOX 080

Trenton, NJ 08625-0080

Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office

25 Kirkpatrick Street, #3

New Brunswick, NJ 08901