

No.

21-6515

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Chadd Morris - Petitioner

VS.

Gregg Scott, James Clayton, Jerry Worley, Mitch Kessler, Bryant Mays, Keith Rose

Brandon Wear

Respondents

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 04 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Now Comes Petitioner, Chadd Morris, Pro-Se filing this "Petition For Rehearing" pursuant to Court Rules 23 and 44, for the following reasonings:

1.) The Petitioner received the court's order indicating his writ of certiorari was denied as of February 22, 2022.

2.) Court did not give 'reasoning' as to why such petition was denied.

3.) Petitioner's Writ of certiorari should not have been denied because it involves conflicts with controlling law, and conflicts with appellate, and this Supreme Court's decisions, rulings as stipulated within Petitioner's writ.

4.) The premise of what this court evaluates of granting a petitioner's Writ of Certiorari is based on if lower court rulings, decisions in fact conflicted with controlling law, and or conflicted with earlier rulings of courts, including, most importantly, in conflict with this Supreme Court's Earlier Rulings.

5.) Both of these circumstances exist in Petitioner's writ. This is present because there is 'multiple' conflicts to controlling law, as well as 'multiple' conflicts with appellate, and Supreme Court rulings 'on the same matter' of cases involving 'use of excessive force'.

6.) Lower courts rulings, (as petitioner stipulated in his writ, also conflicts with controlling law, by being non compliant to judges being required to be removed from the case, if there is a cause for bias, and or prejudice. Lower courts applied standards in conflict to controlling law, by claiming there must be a substantial conflict. Controlling law stipulates only requiring a conflict, not a substantial conflict. Petitioner proved of such conflict, noting and proving, by demonstrating how lower courts ruled in favor of Defendants when more precedential, and controlling law conflicted. This, ironically does indicate a substantial bias, and prejudice as indicated by favoring a adverse party in litigation as required to demonstrate by 28 U.S.C. Section 144.

7.) Petitioner also proved and demonstrated how lower courts falsified documents in the litigation. This is a very serious, felonious offense as to which Judges presiding shall be criminally charged for. At minimum, permanently recused from the bench.

8.) Lower courts denied plaintiffs appeal to be taken in good faith, applying prisoner standards and case law, as to which plaintiff is not a prisoner. Although petitioner is incarcerated, but not a prisoner, his incarceration is not for serving sentences for criminal violations of law. Thus court applying 'good faith' evaluations of whether or not a appeal should be taken in good faith is erroneous when applying prisoner laws, like 28 U.S.C. Section 1915 which is only for prisoners, and non prisoners whom are only being held for criminal violations. Since Plaintiff is not being held under criminal violations 28 U.S.C. Section 1915 does not apply to scrutinizing or reviewing petitioners litigations for merit, good faith appeals, etc. Lower courts applying this, is a substantial conflict to controlling law.

9.) Lower courts also refused to recruit counsel for plaintiff applying non controlling case law, and legal standards when doing so. Petitioner, on the other hand proved, by demonstrations of more controlling, and precedential case law that regardless of judges belief of criteria of evidence involved in the case if the mere presence of any medical issues are present, requires counsel to be present in favor of the plaintiff.

10.) Based on such substantial conflicts to controlling law, and conflicts to more precedential court rulings on such same matters as plaintiff has in his

litigation. As Well as lower court rulings, and this Supreme Courts Denial of
Petitioners Writ is in conflict to rullings/decisions made on this same issue in
this Supreme Court, as well as in conflicit to lower courts rulings on such same
issue. As well as conflicts to controlling law, such as the United States Code
as petitioner explaiend herein as he presented such issues in his Writ of
Certorari, this Petition for Rehearing should be granted to grant Petitioners
Writ of Certerori.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chadd Morris (Petitioner) (Pro-Se)

Date

3-4-22