

(Page 1) 24th Day of March 2022

Docket No. 21-6881

Attn: Office of the Clerk

Supreme Court of the
United States

Aaron J. Bressi - Petitioner

Vs.

Tracy McCloud, et al. - Respondents

Docket No. 21-6881

Petition: For a rehearing,
of a denied Petition for a
Writ of Certiorari, denied
on March 21, 2022. (Pursuant
to Rule 44).

RECEIVED

APR 13 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED

MAR 31 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

(Page 2) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

1. I Aaron J. Bressi ask this Honorable Supreme Court of the United States to grant this Petition for a rehearing, due to the Honorable District Court does have discretion to represent any person unable to afford Counsel pursuant to (28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e)(1)); (See) Montgomery V. Pinchak, 294 F.3d 492, 499 (3d Cir. 2002); (See also) Tabron V. Grace, 6 F.3d 147, 153 (3d Cir. 1993).

The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit also has the discretion to grant/appoint Counsel for an indigent litigant. It States appointment of Counsel should be made when Circumstances indicate the likelihood of Substantial prejudice to him resulting,

(Page 3) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

for example, from his probable inability without such assistance to present the facts and legal issues to the Court in a complex but arguably meritorious case. (See) Smith - Bey V. Petsock, 741 F.2d 22, 26 (3d Cir. 1984). (Please also see) (Appendix A, and G), filed with Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

2. The Honorable District Court and Appeals Court without a doubt should also have granted this amended Complaint pursuant to (Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)), which states to amend all government Officials / defendants Claims brought against them in their Individual Capacity also. (See) (Appendix E), filed

(Page 4) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

With Petition for a Writ of
Certiorari.

It States Civil damages
are liable to Plaintiff,
when the Government
Officials / Police Officers
involved Violated a Statutory
or Constitutional Right that
was clearly established at
the time of challenged
Conduct. (See) Taylor V.
Barkes, 135 S. Ct 2042,
2044, 192 L. Ed. 2d 78
(2015).

Also, the Third Circuit
has remarked that qualified
immunity provides ample
protection to all but the
plainly incompetent or
those who knowingly violate
the law. These government
Officials / defendants / Criminals
without a doubt knowingly
violated the law against
me and may as well be

(Page 5) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

known as being plainly incompetent, due to how serious and dangerous these crimes were that were committed against me by these defendants. (See) Blackhawk V. Pa., 381 F.3d 202, 215 (3d Cir. 2004). (See also) (Appendix A, E, and G), filed with Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

It also states in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in both the Honorable District Court and Honorable Appeals Court that a Judge will be deprived of his immunity (this includes District Attorneys and Assistant District Attorneys), will be subject to liability when he has acted in the clear absence of all jurisdiction. (See) Stump V. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978).

(Page 6) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

(See also) (Appendix E, F, and G), filed with Petition for a writ of Certiorari.

3. The Honorable District Court and Appeals Court without a doubt erred in not serving the defendants. It states, a document filed (Pro Se) is to be liberally construed, and a pro se Complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. (see) Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 167 L. Ed. 2d 1081 (2007); (See also) Boykin v. Keycorp, 521 F.3d 202, 214 (2d Cir. 2008).

(Page 7) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

4. The Honorable District Court and Appeals Court without a doubt erred in not serving two subpoenas to both Northumberland County Office's, who were served subpoenas correctly pursuant to (Fed. R. Civ. P. 45), by the Plaintiff. And also erred by not holding both Northumberland County Office's in Contempt pursuant to (Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(9)), due to the Plaintiff filing a Motion: to hold in Contempt, due to both office's failed without adequate excuse to obey their subpoenas. (See) Malibu Media, LLC. V. John Does 1-11, U.S. Dist. Lexis 26217 (2013). (See also) (Appendix B, F, and G), filed with Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

(Page 8) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

5. The Honorable District and Appeals Court without a doubt erred by dismissing Plaintiff's Amended Complaint/Claims, for failure to State a Claim. It States, every person who, Under Color of Statute, ordinance, regulation, Custom, or Usage, of any State or Territory or the District Columbia, Subjected, any Citizen of the United States or Other person within the Jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities Secured by the Constitution and laws, Shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law.... To State a Claim Under Section 1983, a Plaintiff is required to show that

(Page 9) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

an individual acting Under Color of State law violated the Plaintiff's Constitutional rights or Statutory rights. (See) West V. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48, 108 S.Ct. 2250, 101 L. Ed. 2d 40 (1988).

It also States in order for a Plaintiff to adequately State a Claim Under Section 1983, he must establish that the defendant(s) deprived him of a right(s) Secured by the United States Constitution acting Under Color of State law. (See) Mark V. Borough of Hatboro, 51 F.3d 1137, 1141 (3d Cir. 1995). (See also) District Court Case No. 4:18-CV-1345, (Doc. 15 and Doc. 31), along with all (Exhibits) filed towards

(Page 10) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

Amended Complaint / Claims
as evidence against these
very Serious and dangerous
government Officials /
defendants / Criminals.

6. The Honorable District
Court and Appeals Court
without a doubt also did in
fact erred in dismissing
Plaintiff's Amended Complaint /
Claims without affording him
the opportunity to amend
his Claims regardless of the
fact they allowed Plaintiff
to amend retaliation Claim.

It States, a Plaintiff
alleging a Constitutional
Violation must portray Specific
Conduct by Officials which
Violates Some Constitutional
right. (see) Chavarriaga V.
New Jersey Dep't of Corr.,
806 F.3d 210, 222
(3d Cir. 2015). By doing So,

(Page 11) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

a Plaintiff must demonstrate a defendant's (Personal Involvement) in the alleged Constitutional Violation by adequately alleging either (1) the defendant's personal involvement in the alleged violation; or (2) his actual knowledge and acquiescence in the wrongful Conduct. (See) Rode V. Dellarciprete, 845 F.2d 1195, 1207 (3d Cir. 1988). (See also) District Court Case No. 4:18-cv-1345, (Doc. 15 and Doc. 31), along with all (Exhibits) filed towards Amended Complaint/Claims as evidence.

Also, the Consideration of the Serious importance to the public of the issue. It is a Very Serious and dangerous issue to have these Very Serious and dangerous Criminals opperate/run the Criminal Justice System in Pennsylvania by protecting these Criminals with Immunity from Suit/Lawsuit, So they Can use the Criminal Justice System as a Weapon towards innocent people. (See) (Appendix E, F, and G), filed with Petition for a writ of Certiorari.

Thank You,
Aaron Bressi
(3-24-22)

Docket No. 21-6881

(Page 13) 24th Day of March 2022
Docket No. 21-6881

(Proof of Service)

I Aaron J. Bressi also Served a Copy of this Petition for a rehearing, of a denied Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, to the Office of the Attorney General of Pennsylvania. I have not Served any of the defendants in this Case/docket No., due to the Honorable District Court and Honorable Appeals Court both erred to Serve any defendants a Copy of their Summons and Complaint. Served as follows pursuant to (Rule 29):

Office of the Attorney General
Josh Shapiro
Strawberry Sq., 16th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Thank You, Aaron Bressi
(3-24-22) Docket No. 21-6881

(Page 1) 6th Day of April 2022

Docket No. 21-6881

Attn: Office of the Clerk

Supreme Court of the
United States

Aaron J. Bressi - Petitioner

Docket No. 21-6881

(Verification)

The facts set forth in the foregoing are true and correct to the best of the undersigned's knowledge, information, and belief and are verified subject to the penalties for unsworn falsification to authorities under Pennsylvania Crimes Code 4904 (28 U.S.C. § 1746).

Thank You, Aaron Bressi

Docket No. 21-6881 (4-6-22)

(Page 1) 6th Day of April 2022

Docket No. 21-6881

Attn: Office of the Clerk

Supreme Court of the
United States

Aaron J. Bressi - Petitioner

Docket No. 21-6881

(Certificate of Faith)

I Aaron J. Bressi Certify
that this (Pro Se) filed
Petition: for a rehearing,
mailed from here at SCT -
Rockview through regular First
Class mail, is being
presented to this Honorable
Court in good faith and
not for delay.

Thank You, Aaron Bressi

Docket No. 21-6881 (4-6-22)