

21-6925

No. _____

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

AUG 3 1 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Chong Su Yi — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Larry Hogan et al — RESPONDENT(S)

State of Maryland

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Court of Appeals of Maryland

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chong Su Yi
(Your Name)

3 Pooks Hill Rd #103
(Address)

Bethesda MD 20814

(City, State, Zip Code)

410 924 9254

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED
SEP - 7 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Could the court apply rules that do not fit the person?

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4,5,6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
CONCLUSION.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

Decision& Petition of State Supreme Court Denying Review; Unpublished

APPENDIX D

Order & Petition of State Supreme Court denying Rehearing;Unpublished

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Chisholm v Georgia (1791)	7

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the Court of Special Appeals court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. *is with Court of Appeals*

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Aug 2, 2021.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

14th section 1

... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Montgomery county of maryland; herein County; used digital canvass ballots; since NY Times v Tasini (2001);

In 2016, County sent out notice; of changes in types of digital canvassing machine;

Due to County's action ; petitioner was legally qualified to raise issues from incident; to county board of elections; fro to; opposing digital canvassing to paper canvassing ballots; to no avail;

On 2018 november election; petitioner was directed to church; from high school; due to changes in home address; as polling place; which used digital canvass ballots; this gave petitioner legal right to start action against State; raised issue from incident;

Use of church as polling place to evade paper canvass ballot; under religion; than public building;

Use of taxpayers money; canvass ballot; to finance; existence and furtherance of political party's primary; and its winning candidate's participation in general election; to evade paper canvass ballot; which John B Anderson lost candidacy (1980) to government funded primary candidates; on general election; due to lack therein;

Primary election candidates present constituents; does not represent public; when digital canvass ballot is used; as such digital canvass ballot should not be used but paper canvass ballot; and,

These raised issues were quashed by circuit court and court of appeals; in reason of unpaid fee; exhibit C;

But court of appeals of maryland; i.e. supreme court of state of maryland; allowed writ of certiorari to be filed; then made ruling; exhibit D;

Ruling in Exhibit D is without admission of existence in elements of controversy;

4, 5, 6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

When in chisholm v georgia (1791); herein chisholm; court ruling is final; over a State;
Court never ruled digital canvass ballot was proper; under constitution;
Despite rulings from state courts; court does need to rule; as in chisholm;
For foregoing reasons; granting petition is proper;

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Yi, Chong Su

Date: 12/21/2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Yi, Chong Su".