

21-6399

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

David Wayne Anderson

Appellant

v

Roger Lee Stacey

Appellee

Act No. 210159

"Petition for Re-Hearing"

Comes now the Appellant namely David Wayne Anderson proceeding pro se before the Honorable Court according to Rule 44 of Rules of this Court, submitting the following "Petition for Re-Hearing" in above styled case and after careful review and consideration pray Court would GRANT AS REQUESTED BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING:

1. That Appellant is presenting the PETITION FOR RE HEARING AND IN good faith NOT for delay.

2. That the grounds IN PETITION FOR RE HEARING ARE LIMITED TO INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANCIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT OR TO OTHER SUBSTANCIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED.

P-10F.5

RECEIVED

FEB-24-2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

That Appellant has clearly established thru court documents that The Appellee Roger Lee Stacy did obtain double judgement in General District Court of Washington County, Virginia against multiple parties during same time frame from period of August 2018 to February 2019 for house payments (or rental), damages, alleged car put which was not his, and other expenses. The court records will determine that Mr. Stacy misled courts into believing he had residence sold and rented during same time frame to two different parties, which was virtually impossible. The Appellant has proven to courts thru various documents he prosecuted that he was purchasing residence, owned all contents thereof and was legally his property.

However Stacy took it upon himself as evidence presented to (rent) same residence out to Millers on August 23, 2018, with all Andersons personal possessions intact. Be it noted for court records Mr. Stacy as evidence clearly shows filed "unlawful detainer" on Millers and evicted them before he pursued same on Anderson. Additionally Mr. Stacy gave Anderson possession of residence back on March 9th, and gave

permission to not dwelling. So in essence Mr. Story lied to courts to obtain judgment against Anderson for same time frame as Millers.

Under the Landlord Tenant act in Commonwealth of Virginia the landlord is obligated to follow necessary steps to obtain legal possession of residence or property in which he sells, rents etc. He cannot just assume ownership & take over.

He must first serve the tenant with notice of eviction which he clearly did not. Notice was not issued until Nov 2018 three months after he illegally assumed possession and rented to Millers. (Court documents confirm). If say in fact he could assume possession the law states he must protect the contents of owner, renter by taking accurate inventory and storing for period of 30 days with notification as such. This was never done!! Mr. Story not no longer than even 1-day had property rented wrongfully containing all of Anderson's assets which he was not entitled to, nor anyone else for that matter.

Mr. Story violated the Laws of Commonwealth of Virginia + Constitutional rights of Anderson, by assuming something he had no legal right or authority to assume until all procedures followed as Law allows.

Of say Mr. Story did follow procedure in "unlawful detain" and Anderson appealed and continued to pay payments accordingly the residence and contents were still his until final order of appeal which once again was never done. Anderson on record show continued to make payments however Story assumed possession once again before being granted ownership by Circuit Court in Dec 2019. He further testified during hearing that "He did in fact not dealing to Miller on August 25th 2018 with all Anderson's belongings. Anderson never deserted his residence, he was arrested on August 25, 2018 and had assigned Power of Attorney in which Story consented to and knew about.

The facts are clear and concise Story clearly violated Rules of Court, + Rules established by Supreme Court of VA and US. Under Landlord tenant agreements and Rights Theory, he used Mr. Anderson's knowledge of

becoming entangled to his own personal benefit
for profit and gain by manipulating the courts,
Mr. Anderson and Hillier.

Therefore the Appellate request after careful
review and consideration of Anderson's rights being
violated the court should reverse judgment
awarded to Stacy in unlawful detainer and
second judgment to Anderson in eminent
domain appropriate by court in question.

Signed on this 14 day of February
In the year of 2022.

B. David Wayne Anderson

CERTIFICATE - Scribe

I David Wayne Anderson certify true and
accurate copy was mailed to courts and Appellee
on this 14 day of February In year of 2022

B. David Wayne Anderson

CERTIFICATE SERVICE

I, David W Anderson hereby certify
true and accurate copy was mailed to court and
Respondent Roger Lee Stacy @ 19601 P.R. COS
DRIVE LAGO VISTA, TEXAS 78645-6067 via 1st
class mail on this 14 day of February
in year of 2022

By: David W Anderson

cc:

Supreme Court U.S.

Roger Lee Stacy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

David Wayne Anderson

Petitioner

No: 21-6349

v

Roger Lee Stacy

Respondent

"Notice of Failure of Respondent
to comply with order of Court
and request Sanction"

Cones now The Petitioner proceeding pro se
in above-styled case before Honorable Court in question
submitting the following notice of failure of Respondent
to comply with standing order of Court which was issued
by Court on November 23, 2021 to be served upon
Respondent which consisted of notice of brief deadline
due no later than Thursday December 23, 2021
Pursuant to Rule 15.3 and waiver to file brief
in question.

The Petitioner has complied with Rules of
Court in question and accordingly served the
Respondent by first class mail on December 1, 2021
as required by Court.

Be it advised and noted for court record no motion for continuance, waiver or brief in opposition as of date of this motion has been received by Petitioner in question as order of court and Supreme Court Rules allow and afford right to do so. As best of Plaintiff's knowledge and belief court has not received documents above.

Wherefore Petitioner ask Court sanction the Respondent in question for failure to comply with Rule 15.3 in not filing timely opposition to court and Petitioner and not filing nor sending copy of opposition, nor waiver in question as Rules of court allow.

The Petitioner request court would GRANT said request and after careful review as shown by negligence of Respondent would reverse judgement and find Respondent at fault on civil judgement and request court