


Chasmind Miller
5156 west Olive Ave
Glendale Az 85302
480-593-5299
chasmiller6@gmail.com

ORIGINAL

21-5557

Rick

SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES



Chasmind Miller

Petition for panel rehearing


Vs

Government employees insurance

Company

LHM CORP.AJC

The plaintiff moves the court for a panel rehearing due to the fact the district court judge lied in his memorandum as he stated that the plaintiff was warned several times that his case could be dismissed which is untrue nowhere on the record can the district court show that Chasmind Miller was warned that his case could be dismissed as he was never warned that his case could be dismissed not even once let alone several times the judge stayed this untrue accusation because he issued the harshest sanction that he could possibly issue to a pro se litigant when the the action he was being sanctioned from did not prejudice opposing counsel in any way when there was other sanctions that were appropriate in this case .



The plaintiff was also sanctioned by the court when he became ill and missed a deposition however the deposition was not court ordered and was not required as i was not on trial opposing counsel was. I was sanctioned for missing the deposition when i shouldn't have been and the judge knew i shouldn't have been sanctioned and even when he ordered the sanction he never warned the plaintiff that his case could be dismissed The plaintiff also showed that he missed the teleconference do to extraordinary circumstances that were beyond his control and that combined with the fact that missing the teleconference did not prejudice the defendants in any way there were much less severe sanctions that could have been issued or none at all Judons ge Tuschi was much more eager to impose sanctions and dismiss the case when it came to a pro se litigants shortcomings then he was when it came to educated seasoned attorneys as there were many times that sanctions should have been imposed against opposing counsel but those times were ignored and justice was denied when the plaintiff had overwhelming evidence proving that LHM CORP.ACJ and GEICO both committed the actions in the complaint so much so neither defendant could properly oppose the prose plaintiffs motion for summary judgement .

Chasmond Miller

01-07-2022