

21-6925

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

AUG 31 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)

410 727 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Decision & Petition of State Supreme Court Denying Review; Unpublished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Order & Petition of State Supreme Court denying Rehearing; Unpublished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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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 b allot; 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;

7

### **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Yi, Chong Su

Date: 12/21/2021

8