

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

JASON T. SHORTES,

*Petitioner,*

vs.

GOOGLE, LLC,

*Respondent.*

---

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari  
From District Court Of Appeal Fifth District Of Florida

---

Jason T. Shortes, Pro Se  
673 Dwight Ave SE  
Palm Bay FL. 32909  
Telephone: 321-432-4057  
Email: j.shortes@yahoo.com

### **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE**

The Corporate Disclosure Statement in the petition remains unchanged there is no parent or publicly held company owning 10% or more of the corporation's stock.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE.....	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	3,4
PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	5,6
PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION .....	6
PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRITTEN OPINION.....	7
CONCLUSION.....	8
CERTIFICATE OF PRO SE COUNSEL .....	8
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	9
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	9

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Cases**

<i>Google LLC v. Equustek Solutions Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 5000834 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2017).....	5
<i>Surf Club v. Tatem Surf Club, Inc.</i> , 10 So. 2d 554, 557-61 (Fla. 1942).....	5

### **Supreme Court Of The United States**

Rule 44.2 Rehearing.....	5,8
--------------------------	-----

### **Federal Statutes**

47 U.S.C. § 230, Section 230 Of The Communications Decency Act.....	5
---	---

### **Laws of Florida**

Florida § 542.18 .....	5,6,7
Florida § 542.19 .....	5,6,8

**Constitution law**

First Amendment to the United States Constitution, Freedom of the Press.....  
.....5,7

First Amendment to the United States Constitution, Freedom of Expression.....  
.....5,7

**Foreign law**

Canadian order.....5

Federal Republic of Germany, The Network Enforcement Law, NetzDG.....5,6

## **PETITION FOR REHEARING**

Petitioner Jason T Shortes petition for rehearing of this Court's January 18, 2022

Order denying their petition for a writ of certiorari.

### **REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING**

This Court's Rule 44.2 authorizes a petition for rehearing based on "intervening circumstances of a substantial . . . effect."

The critical fact Court has overlooked or misapprehended that Court's, Order "The petition for writ of certiorari is denied." inadvertently sanctions, gives official permission, or approval, to GOOGLE, LLC enforcing Federal Republic of Germany, The Network Enforcement Law, NetzDG in United States, State of Florida, thereby nullifying First Amendment To The United States Constitution, Freedom of the Press and Freedom of Expression and nullifying "Florida Statute 542.18 Restraint Of Trade" and "Florida Statute 542.19 Restraint Of Commerce." The Commerce Clause refers to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That Petitioner respectfully asks, and is legally entitled that the Court to apply a focused interpretation with application of law, at the Court opinion in "*Google LLC v. Equustek Solutions Inc.*, 2017 WL 5000834 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2017). The Court Held: "The Canadian order would eliminate Section 230 immunity for service providers that link to third-party websites. By forcing intermediaries to remove links to third-party material, the Canadian order undermines the policy goals of Section 230 and threatens free speech on the global internet;" That in conjunction with Petitioner's Brief appeal request for interpretation, and application of law therein Petitioner's Brief. That rehearing is warranted as demonstrated above and *en banc* consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity within the Court's decisions.

*Surf Club v. Tatem Surf Club, Inc.*, 10 So. 2d 554, 557-61 (Fla. 1942), prevailed in obtaining rehearing because it was able to direct the Court's attention both to a controlling statute that changed the result and to the portions of the record and briefs where the statute was argued.

The other critical facts Court has overlooked or misapprehended relevant statutory laws and case laws demonstrated in petition for writ of certiorari in support of pro se Petitioner.

### **PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION**

Petitioner Jason T. Shortes moves for certification of a question of great public importance pursuant to Supreme Court Rules Rule 19. Procedure on a Certified Question.

Consumers are unable to defend themselves adequately against these unlawful practices, that GOOGLE, LLC enforcing Federal Republic of Germany, The Network Enforcement Law, NetzDG in State of Florida, as United States Legislature and this Supreme Court of the United States absolutely recognizes First Amendment to the United States Constitution, trade activities between the states "Florida Statute 542.18 Restraint Of Trade" and U.S. Constitution, through the Commerce Clause in conjunction with "Florida Statute 542.19 Restraint Of Commerce." Indeed, this Court should realize that the enforcement of such invalid Federal Republic of Germany, The Network Enforcement Law, NetzDG Law that GOOGLE, LLC's enforcement use are widespread and harmful. Thus, while this Court did not grant the Petitioner in their requested relief, it understood the magnitude of the issue by certifying a questions presented in Petition For Writ Of Certiorari.

## **PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRITTEN OPINION**

Petitioner, Jason T. Shortes by and through himself undersigned counsel and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §411, moves this Court for issuance of a written opinion and, separately, for rehearing and rehearing *en banc*.

28 U.S. Code § 411 provides: “The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States shall be printed, bound, and distributed in the preliminary prints and bound volumes of the United States Reports as soon as practicable after rendition, to be charged to the proper appropriation for the judiciary. The number and distribution of the copies shall be under the control of the Joint Committee on Printing.” Such is the case here.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Jason T. Shortes prays that this Court would withdraw the denial and issue an opinion that addresses the conflicts raised above so as to allow the Petitioner to pursue certiorari review in the Supreme Court of the United States or, alternatively, rehear the case as a panel or *en banc* in order to address the intra-district splits Petitioner has identified that the per curiam affirmance implicitly creates but avoids identifying by way of the lack of a written opinion.

Without a decision explaining the Court’s reasoning, there is no way to argue that the decision “expressly and directly” conflicts with existing Court precedent.

I express a belief, based upon a reasoned and studied professional judgment, that a written opinion will provide a legitimate basis for Supreme Court review because a written opinion in this case will reveal express and direct conflict with case law demonstrated in Petitioner's Brief, First Amendment to The United States Constitution Freedom of the Press and Freedom of Expression, and “Florida Statute 542.18 Restraint Of

Trade” and “Florida Statute 542.19 Restraint Of Commerce.” on the same question of law, or would allow the Court to certify the question described above as one of great public importance, either of which alternatives would provide the Supreme Court with jurisdiction to review this case pursuant to Constitution of United States of America.

### **CONCLUSION**


For the reasons set forth in this Petition, Jason T. Shortes respectfully requests this Honorable Court grant rehearing and his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

### **CERTIFICATE OF PRO SE COUNSEL**

Compliance with 28 U. S. C. § 1746 “I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.”

As Counsel on behalf of himself I certify that this petition for rehearing is in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Jason T. Shortes, Pro se

DATED: January 28, 2022  
673 Dwight Ave. SE  
Palm Bay FL, 32909  
Cell phone: 321-432-4057  
Home phone: 321-831-3572  
Email: j.shortes@yahoo.com