

No. 21-7187

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

Paul E. Jozwiak — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Raytheon Missile Systems; et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

**PLAINTIFF'S PETITION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION and/or REHEARING**

Paul E. Jozwiak  
(Your Name)

404 South Cedar Ave.  
(Address)

Marshfield, WI, 54449  
(City, State, Zip Code)

(520)-818-4976  
(Phone Number)

# Table Of Contents

LIST-OF-PARTIES.....	1
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	2
CASES:.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL:.....	2
FEDERAL-RULES: .....	2
LEGAL-STATUTES:.....	2
OTHER-AUTHORITIES:.....	3
PLAINTIFF'S PETITION .....	3
PROVEN VIOLATIONS .....	3
THE ARGUMENT .....	7
CONCLUSION.....	13
CERTIFICATE-OF-COMPLIANCE.....	14
CERTIFICATE-OF-GOOD-FAITH .....	15
PROOF-OF-SERVICE.....	16
INDEX-TO-APPENDICES .....	18

---

## LIST-OF-PARTIES

All Parties DO-NOT Appear In The Caption Of The Case On The Cover Page. A List Of All Parties To The Proceeding In This Court Whose Judgement Is Subject To This Petition Is As Follows:

**Raytheon Missile Systems**  
**Dianne D. Avellar**  
**Joanne Bockmiller**  
**Dr. Karen A. Haas**  
**Guy C. Slominski**  
**Patricia A. Brutscher**  
**Veronica Thomas**

**MetLife Disability**  
**Beth A. Green**  
**Dr. Arthur J. Bacon**  
**Dr. John L. Schaller**  
**Mary W. Richardson**  
**Sean T. Kurysh**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES:</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<i>Borgnis v. The Falk Co.</i> , 133 N.W. 209 (Wis. 1911)	11
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i> , 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)	12
<i>Elliot v. Piersol</i> , 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828)	12
<i>Ex Parte Virginia</i> , 100 U.S. 339, and <i>Harper &amp; James, The Law of Torts</i> 1642-1643 (1956)	11
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803)	7
<i>Sawyer</i> , 124 U.S. 200 (1888)	12
<u>CONSTITUTIONAL:</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<b>U.S. Constitution Article VII, Amendment XIV, Section 1,.....</b> <i>No-State Shall Deprive Any Person Of Life, Liberty, Or Property, Without Due Process Of Law, NOR Deny To Any Person Within Its Jurisdiction Equal Protection Of The Laws.</i>	8
<u>FEDERAL-RULES:</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4.....</b> <i>Issuing A Summons</i>	5, 6
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4(c)(3).....</b> <i>Issuing A Summons</i>	4, 6
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12.....</b> <i>Responding To A Summons</i>	6
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 59.....</b> <i>New Trial, Altering Or Amending A Judgment</i>	7
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 60.....</b> <i>Relief From A Judgment Or Order</i>	7
<b>Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 73.....</b> <i>Jurisdiction, Powers, Temporary Assignment</i>	4, 5, 6
<b>Supreme Court Rule 44.....</b> <i>Petition For Rehearing / Review On Denial Of Writ Of Certiorari</i>	3
<u>LEGAL-STATUTES:</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<b>5 U.S. Code § 706.....</b> <i>Judicial Misconduct Scope Of Review</i>	11
<b>18 U.S. Code § 1503.....</b> <i>Obstruction Of Justice</i>	11

<b>18 U.S. Code § 1621.....</b>	<i>Elements Of Perjury</i>	5, 9
<b>28 U.S.C. § 455.....</b>	<i>Disqualification Of Justice, Judge, Or Magistrate Judge</i>	5, 6
<b>28 U.S.C. § 636(c).....</b>	<i>Jurisdiction, Powers, Temporary Assignment</i>	4, 6
<b>28 U.S.C. § 1331.....</b>	<i>Federal Question Of Law</i>	6
<b>28 U.S.C. § 1915.....</b>	<i>The Officers Of The Court Shall Issue and Serve All Process, and Perform All Duties In Such Cases</i>	4, 6
<b>42 U.S.C. § 1983.....</b>	<i>Civil Action For Deprivation Of Rights</i>	6, 8

<b><u>OTHER-AUTHORITIES:</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
<b>Arizona Code Of Judicial Conduct, (“ACJC”) Cannons, Rules and Statutes</b>	4, 6, 9, 11
<b>Arizona Local Rules Of Civil Procedure 3.7(b)</b>	4, 5
<b>COVID Administrative-Order No. 2020 – 41</b>	5, 6
<b>COVID Administrative-Order No. 2020 – 160</b>	4, 5, 6, 9

## PLAINTIFF’S PETITION

Pursuant To The Supreme Court’s **Rule 44**, This Petitioner, Plaintiff Who Had Their Civil and Constitutional Rights Denied and Violated Due To The Courts Issuing Known Adverse Orders, Rulings and/or Wrongful Dismissal Of His Case, Respectfully Petitions This Court For Reconsideration and/or Rehearing Of Its **April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022** Order Dismissing His Writ Of Certiorari.

## PROVEN VIOLATIONS

As This Supreme Court Should Be Aware Of By Now, This Case Involves Well Documented and Proven Violations Of Employment Law, ERISA Benefits, Disability Rights, Insurance

and/or Written-Law Compounded By The Lower Court's Violations Of COVID Orders, Rules Of Judicial Conduct, Civil and Constitutional Rights With That Of Written-Law! These Court-Violations Being Well Documented AND Undeniable, Are Found In The AZ District Court's Records Where On;

- 1) **January 24, 2020**, (Doc. 1) Magistrate-Judge David C. Bury Illegally-Presided Over The Case, (Doc. 5) Without Consent Of Any Litigant Violating AZ Loc. R. Civ. P Rule 3.7(b), Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 73, 28 U.S. Code § 636(c) and Others!
- 2) **March 19, 2020**, (Doc. 09) Judge Bury DENIED The Plaintiff's 28 U.S. Code § 1915 Petition For In Forma Pauperis Status, Rejecting The Financial Documents From H & R Block! He Also DENIED The Legally-Entitled Request For The Summons Or Documents To Be Served By Federal Marshals Or Others Under Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4(c)(3) Ordering The Plaintiff To Pay All Filing Fees Or have His Case Dismissed!
- 3) **April 20, 2020**, (Doc. 11) Judge Bury Stated Within The Court Record On Page-1, Line-18 and Line-19 "The Court Mistakenly Denied Waiver Of The Filing Fee", Which Included "In Forma Pauperis Status"! He Then Refused To REFUND The Filing Fees and Correct This Mistake While Continuing To Block The Summons Or Documents From Being Served By Federal Marshals Or Others!
- 4) **June 29, 2020**, (Doc. Court-Rejected) The Plaintiff Submitted His "COVID Legal Guidelines For 2020 Court Cases" Advising Them Of Problems With Serving The Court Summons, Documents Due To Mail and/or Package Services SUSPENDING Signature-Services On **March 2020**, and Process-Servers Being Unable To Perform Service Due To COVID Orders. The Court FAILED and/or REFUSED To Enter This Into The Record!
- 5) **October 07, 2020**, The AZ Supreme Court Issued Their Updated COVID Order No. 2020-160 SUSPENDING A Court's **Service-By-Mail** Signature Requirements For Summons and/or Documents! Judge Bury Defied and Violated This Order Involving The Plaintiff's Case!
- 6) **October 14, 2020**, (Doc. Number-Missing!) The Court ORDERED The Summons and/or Documents To Be Re-Served ILLEGALLY Using A Certified Registered-Mail Carrier With A Signature-Service Falsely Claiming It Was An Alternative-Means Which Violated

Written-Law, COVID Order No. 2020-41, No. 2020-160, 28 U.S. Code § 455 With Other's and Was A Known Impossible Task! READ Judge Bury's ORDER, (Page 03, Line 21 through 24)!

- 7) **November 05, 2020**, (Doc. 48) Judge Bury ORDERED The Case To Be DISMISSED When Evidence Of The Court's Own Violations Of COVID Order No. 2020-160, With Rules and/or Regulations Concerning The SUSPENSION Of Mail Signature-Services, Service By Process-Servers and Written-Law Was Presented To The Court!
- 8) **November 05, 2020**, (Doc. 48) Judge Bury Published Fraudulent-Statements To The Record and Internet, (Starting October, 2020) Claiming, "The Defendants Were NOT Required To Respond To The Service Of Their Summons", and DISMISSED The Case For Lack Of Service Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4! He Claimed, "The Plaintiff Has Chosen To NOT Comply With This Order and Instead Responded That The Court Failed To Properly Consider The Rules Of Service and Drew Erroneous Conclusions", When Court Records Showed The Plaintiff Was Carrying Out These Orders! These Criminal Acts By The Court Violated 28 U.S. Code § 455 and 18 U.S. Code § 1621!
- 9) **April 08, 2022**, (Doc. 62) The Plaintiff Filed A Legal-Request With The District Court Clerk, (By USPS Mail) For A Copy Of The 9th Circuit Appeals Court ORDER For The AZ District Court-Record To Be Sent With A Numbered-List, Its-Certification and Transmission-Report Showing Dates and Times When This Was Completed!
- 10) **April 20, 2022**, (Doc. 63) Judge Bury REJECTED This **April 08, 2022** Request For This Court Case Information and WARNED The Plaintiff To STOP All Requests For His Court Case Information! He Claimed The Record Was Sent, But He Sees NO-MANDATE From The Appeals Court When The Appeals Court Clerk Claimed This Record Was NEVER-REQUESTED and NEVER-SENT Meaning The Appeals Court NEVER-REVIEWED The Record!

AND The CA 9th Circuit Appeals Court Records Where On;

- 1) **December 03, 2020**, [Doc. 01] Judge Barry G. Silverman, Morgan B. Christen and Kenneth K. Lee Presided Over and Ruled Upon This Case Having Full-Knowledge Magistrate-Judge David C. Bury Had Illegally Presided Over and Ruled Upon This Plaintiff's Case Without Consent Of Any Litigant Violating AZ Loc. R. Civ. P Rule 3.7(b), Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 73,

28 U.S. Code § 636(c) and Many Others! This Includes Their Knowledge That Judge Bury Had;

- a) ORDERED The Plaintiff To Re-Serve Court Summons and Documents Illegally Using A Certified Registered-Mail Carrier With Signature-Service Violating Written-Laws, COVID Order No. 2020-41, COVID Order No. 2020-160, 28 U.S. Code § 455 With Other's! and
- b) Violated Multiple Civil and Constitutional Rights, Codes Of Judicial Conduct, Due-Process and Written Laws Documented and Proven By The District Court Docket, Record and Appeals Brief!

2) **March 10, 2021**, [Doc. 10] The Court Illegally DENIED The Plaintiff's 28 U.S. Code § 1915 Petition For "In Forma Pauperis Status", and Legally-Entitled Request For The Summons Or Documents To Be Served By Federal Marshals Or Others Under Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4(c)(3)! They Also DENIED His Motion To Transfer This Case To The Federal D.C. Court Of Appeals For A Proper-Review While ORDERING The Plaintiff To Pay All Filing Fees Or have His Case Dismissed!

3) **August 26, 2021**, [Doc. 17] This Court's Memorandum (MEMO) Dated **August 17, 2021**, Marked "NOT-FOR-PUBLICATION" and First Discovered On The Internet Site "Justia Legal Resources", Endorsed The AZ District Court's FRAUDULENT-RULING! The Memorandum Was Proven-Fraudulent Due To;

- a) The Appeals Brief, Under Subject Matter and Jurisdiction On Page-5 Stated, "This Case Raises Federal Questions Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, Due To The COVID Pandemic and Civil Rights Questions Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983" Due To It Involving Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4, (Issuing A Summons) and Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12, (Responding To A Summons) With The Interpretation and/or Application Of Laws By The Court and/or Others During The COVID Crisis!
- b) Their Failure and/or Refusal To Address ANY-QUESTIONS Involving Interpretation and/or Application Of The Laws For Service-Of-Process and/or A Plaintiff's Rights Due To The COVID Crisis Found Throughout The AZ Court-Record, AND Within The Appeals-Brief!

4) **December 03, 2021** [Doc. 26] Judge Barry G. Silverman, Morgan B. Christen and Kenneth K. Lee DISMISSED The Case To Prevent Review and/or Reconsideration Due To Their Violations Of COVID Orders, Plaintiff's Rights and Written-Laws Violating Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 73 and 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)!

- a) These Judges Claimed, "Jozwiak's Petition For Rehearing En Banc (Docket Entry No. [25]) Is Rejected As UNTIMELY." AND

- b) These Judges Claimed They Inadvertently DENIED *In Forma Pauperis*, That Resulted In A Denial Of The Legally-Entitled-Right For The Summons and/or Documents To Be Served By Federal Marshals and/or Others, While Refusing To REFUND The Filing Fees!
- 5) December 06, 2021 [Doc. Court-Refused-To-Accept] The Plaintiff's "Motion For The Court To Re-Evaluate Their Claim The Petition For A "Rehearing En Banc" Was Untimely" Was Submitted To The Court Of Appeals! This Was Due To This Court;
  - a) Dismissing and Closing The Case **November 22, 2021**, [Doc. 24], and Allowing For 14-Days To File This Motion, Its Due Date Was **December 06, 2021** Which Violated Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 59 and 60!
  - b) Becoming Hostile Due To Evidence Being Presented Showing This Court Had BLOCKED and/or REFUSED To;
    - 1) Abide By COVID Orders and/or Written-Law, Where The AZ Court's Order For Service-Of-Process Was A Known and Documented Illegal-Violation Of These Orders and Written-Laws!
    - 2) Address Any Questions-Of-Federal-Law Regarding COVID Orders and Their Conflicts With Written-Law, Where This Court's Act Is Proven Under State, Federal and/or Constitutional Written-Law To Be A Violation Of A Plaintiff's Rights and Due-Process While NOT-BEING-A-VALID-CASE-REVIEW!
- 6) April 08, 2022, [Doc. NOT-FILED] The Plaintiff Filed A Legal-Request With The 9th Circuit Appeals Court Clerk (By E-Mail and USPS Mail) For A Copy Of Their ORDER For The AZ District Court-Record To Be Sent With Its Numbered-List, Its-Certification and Transmission-Report Showing Dates and Times When This Was Completed! The Court Clerk Claimed This Record Was NEVER-REQUESTED and NEVER-SENT Meaning The Appeals Court NEVER-REVIEWED The Record and This Case Was Only "RUBBER-STAMPED" To Endorse The Known Fraudulent AZ District Court Ruling!

---

## THE ARGUMENT

The Best-Known, and Most Often-Cited, Power Of The U.S. Supreme Court Is The Power Of Judicial Review. This Power, Being Established In The Case Of Marbury v. Madison, **5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803)** By A Supreme Court Ruling, Allows A Court To Rule On The Constitutionality Of An Executive Order Or Congressional Legislation.

**Article VII, Amendment XIV, Section 1; The U.S. Constitution Clearly States That NO-STATE Shall Deprive Any Person Of Life, Liberty, Or Property, Without Due-Process Of Law, Nor Deny To Any Person Within Its Jurisdiction Equal-Protection Of The Laws.**

**42 U.S. Code § 1983, Civil Rights; Clearly States That Any Person Under Color Of Statute, Ordinance Or Regulation In Any State Or Territory Including The District Of Columbia, Causes Any Citizen Or Other Of The United States To Be Deprived Of Any Rights, Privileges, Or Immunities Secured By The Constitution and Laws, Shall Be Liable To The Party Injured In An Action At Law.**

---

With This Supreme Court's Duty and/or Obligation To The Country and Constitution Being Firmly Established, This Court Should Remember This Document's List Of Proven Violations By The Courts, Judges and Others Is NOT A Comprehensive-List! This Is Due To These Violations Occurring Throughout Our Country Because Of;

- a) Multiple, Independent COVID Orders and/or Regulations NOT Complying With Most Other State's Orders and/or Regulations! AND
- b) A Failure Of Our Courts and/or Leaders To Correct These Problems By Issuing Uniform Orders Which Complied With All States and Supreme Court! AND
- c) A Failure and/or Refusal To Comply With These COVID Orders and/or Regulations Handed Down By The CDC, Supreme Court and Others With Our Written-Laws!

Knowing These Facts, The Supreme Court Needs To Consider This! How Would Court's Judges and Others Successfully Serve Court Documents and A Summons When Litigants Were Using COVID Orders and/or Regulations With The Aid Of Attorneys, Judges Or Others To Evade-Service, (Proven By District Court Records, USPS Signature-Service Cards and Process Server Affidavits In Appendix-D Through I)? Investigation Showed The Only Option For A Litigant To Prove Service-Of-Process Was Successfully-Completed, and What The Others

Response Was Upon Receiving Their Documents Was To Use The FEDEX, UPS and/or USPS Mail's Own Tracking and Delivery Reports!

This Was Due To Attorneys, Courts and Others Refusing To Comply With COVID Orders, (AZ Order No. 2020-160, Etc.) Requiring Them To Accept Unsigned Signature-Service Cards As Proof Service Was Completed Because Package and Postal Delivery Agents Were Returning These Cards **BLANK, UNSIGNED**, With **C19** Or Something Else In The Signature Block! What Made This Worse Was Courts Issuing Known Illegal Orders Blocking Service-By-Publication and In Some Instances Service By E-Mail! This Court Must Also Remember That Some Judges Used The COVID Orders To Intentionally and Illegally Order Litigants To Perform Service In Violation Of These Orders and Laws In Their Attempt To Dismiss and/or Overthrow Court Cases, (Which One Example Is Judge Bury Doing This In His October 14, 2020 Court ORDER To The Plaintiff)!

When AZ District Court Judge David C. Bury Illegally DISMISSED The Plaintiff's Case On **November 05, 2020** While Filing Multiple and Proven-Fraudulent Statements, (Committed Perjury In Violation Of 18 U.S. Code § 1621 and Violated The Judicial Codes Of Conduct) In The Court Record and On The Internet, This Plaintiff Filed His Appeal With The CA 9th Circuit Court Of Appeals! When That Court Discovered AZ Judge Bury Had Presided Over and Ruled Upon This Case Without Authority and/or Jurisdiction, They Refused To Transfer The Case Back To The AZ District Court For A Rehearing and Refused To Transfer It, (As Requested Multiple Times By The Plaintiff) To A Federal District Court For A Proper Review and Ruling! This Included Their Failure and/or Refusal To Read The Plaintiff's Detailed and Thorough Appeals-Brief Which Referenced Relevant Court Evidence and Records With Quotes, Laws and/or Rulings Necessary To Make An Informed and Legally-Correct-Decision!

The Final Result Was The 9th Circuit Court's Refusal To Address Any Questions Of Law Regarding Interpretation and/or Application Of COVID Orders Impacting The Service-Of-Process and/or Court's Functions, Violations Of Due-Process and Plaintiff's Rights, Written-Law, Etc., Stated Throughout The Appeals-Brief and AZ Court Record! Their Fraudulent-Ruling, Which Endorsed The Illegal-Ruling By Judge Bury, Stated They Refused To Address Questions NOT Outlined Within The Appeals-Brief Or AZ Court Record! This Court Needs To Carefully Consider The Lower Court's Actions and Realize While Court Documents and/or Evidence, With State and Federal Orders Were Being Timely Provided To Them By Attorneys, Litigants, News-Media, Process-Servers and Others, The Court's Claimed To Have NO Knowledge Of The COVID Orders, The Pandemic's Impact Upon Court Operations and The Violations Of This Plaintiff's Rights Which Was Proven To Be Completely-Fraudulent!

How Are These Actions, Orders and Rulings Legal Or Possible When, Law Abiding Citizens Of Integrity, Reasonable Intelligence and Sanity Would Agree, Judges Or Others Were Issuing Orders, Responses and Rulings That Intentionally Violated COVID Orders and/or Written-Laws While Denying A Plaintiff's COVID Related Requests Stating, "The Plaintiff Made No Showing As To Why He Was Unable To Complete A Task" (Documented In The Court Records As Happening To This Plaintiff)! These Are Proven Facts Obtained From The Lower Court's Signed Documents Where This Court Must Now Very-Carefully Consider This! How Is It Possible For Judges Or Others Who Handled, Presided Over, Decided and/or Ruled Upon As Many Cases For As Many Years They Have To Commit This Many Severe-Violations Of;

- a) Our Constitution, (Which Is Mandatory Knowledge For Them To Hold Their Position and Properly Apply The Law)? AND
- b) State and Federal Orders and/or Regulations, (Provided To Them In A Timely Fashion As Mandatory Reading For Them To Properly Apply The Law)? AND

- c) The Codes Of Judicial Conduct, (Which Is Mandatory Knowledge For Officers Of The Court, Judges and/or Others To Prevent Their Violation Of The Law)? AND
- d) The Written-Law, (Which Is Mandatory Knowledge and Readily Available Where One Of Reasonable Intelligence, Integrity and Sanity Could Read and Understand)?

The Only Possible and Sane Answer Is This Was Done To Defy Our Constitution, COVID Orders and/or Written-Laws In Order To Deny The Litigant's Due-Process, Legally-Entitled Disability Benefits and Rights! NO-OTHER Answer Will Suffice Since It Can Readily Be Proven As Another Attempt To Obstruct-Justice, 18 U.S. Code § 1503 Due To The Extreme-Amount Of Documented Judicial Misconduct, 5 U.S. Code § 706 By These Judges and Others Found Within The AZ District Court and CA 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Appeals Court Records! How Is It NOT Possible For This Court To See and Understand The Seriousness Of This Nation-Wide Crisis and What Is The Reason For Refusing To Do Their Sworn Duty To Correct These Issues By Enforcing Their Own Decisions and/or Rulings So The Rights Of The Plaintiff and Others Who Were Wronged Can Be Restored and Our Constitution With Its Laws Can Be Properly Enforced and Protected? Does This Supreme Court NOT Remember Previous Case Rulings Under;

- a) (**Borgnis v. The Falk Co., 133 N.W. 209 (Wis. 1911)**), "For The Purposes Of Review, It Has Been Said That Clear Violations Of Laws On Reaching The Result, Such As Acting Without Evidence When Evidence Is Required, Or Making A Decision Contrary To All The Evidence, Are Just As Much JURISDICTIONAL ERROR As Is The Failure To Take Proper Steps To Acquire Jurisdiction At The Beginning Of The Proceeding." AND
- b) (**Ex Parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339**), and (**Harper & James, The Law of Torts 1642-1643 (1956)**) "A Judge Is Liable For Injury Caused By A Ministerial Act; To Have Immunity The Judge Must Be Performing A Judicial Function. The Presence Of Malice and The Intention To Deprive A Person Of His Civil Rights Is Wholly Incompatible With The Judicial Function." AND
- c) (**Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974)**), "When A State Officer Acts Under A State Law In A Manner Violative Of The Federal Constitution, He "Comes Into Conflict With The Superior Authority Of That Constitution, and He Is In That Case Stripped Of His Official Or Representative Character and Is Subjected In His Person To

The Consequences Of His Individual Conduct. The State Has **NO-POWER** To Impart To Him **Any Immunity From Responsibility** To The Supreme Authority Of The United States.”!

This Court CANNOT-FAIL To See This Case Is NOT One Of Simple Judicial Or Another’s Error, But Is One Where Judges and Others Acted With Clear, Intentional, Malicious Intent As They Intentionally and Openly Violated Our Constitution, State and Federal COVID Orders, Regulations and Written-Law! Since The Violations Of COVID Orders Adversely Impacted The Very Laws Our Nation’s Courts Relied Upon To Carry Out Their Sworn Duties, This Court’s Failure and/or Refusal To Properly Review and Decide This Plaintiff’s Case By Denying Writ Of Certiorari Endorses These Violations While Seriously Violating Their Sworn Duties Where This Decision Was Found To Be In Conflict With Their Own Previous Orders and/or Rulings As Found In;

- a) (Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828)), “*Without Authority, Its Judgments and Orders Are Regarded As Nullities. They Are Not Voidable, But Simply VOID; and Form **NO-BAR** To A Recovery Sought, Even Prior To A Reversal In Opposition To Them. They Constitute No Justification; and **ALL PERSONS CONCERNED** In Executing Such Judgments Or Sentences, Are Considered, In Law, As Trespassers.*” AND
- b) (Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (1888)), “*If A Judge Does NOT Fully Comply With The Constitution, Then His Orders Are VOID Where He / She Is Without Jurisdiction, and He / She Has Engaged In An **ACT OR ACTS OF TREASON.***” AND
- c) (Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)), “*NO State Legislator, Executive Or Judicial Officer Can War Against The Constitution Without Violating His Undertaking To Support It. Any Judge Who Does **NOT-COMPLY** With His Oath To The Constitution Of The United States Wars Against That Constitution and Engages In Acts In Violation Of The Supreme Law Of The Land. The Judge Is Engaged In **ACTS OF TREASON.***”

If This Supreme Court WILL-NOT Do Their Duty By Endorsing and/or Enforcing Our Constitution, Regulations and Laws, Then They Are Promoting Criminal Misconduct Within

Our Courts and Who Can A Citizen and/or Litigant Turn To When Their Rights Were Clearly and Intentionally Violated By The Very Courts Which Were Required To Honor and Uphold The Laws? This Dereliction Of Duty Cannot Be Allowed To Happen As This Imposes A Double Standard Upon The U.S. Citizens Sending A Clear Message That Laws and Rights Are NOT Allowed By and For The People, But Are Only Allowed For A Preferred, Select Few At The Discretion Of Those Presiding Over A Case!


## **CONCLUSION**

This Petition For Reconsideration and/or Rehearing To Grant Writ Of Certiorari Is Due To The Lower Courts Multiple and Serious Violations Of COVID Orders, Civil, Constitutional, Federal and State Laws! The Plaintiff's Appeal-Brief, Court Records and Writ Of Certiorari Expose The Court's Wrongful and/or Criminal Acts Which Adversely Affected The Rights and/or The Due-Process Of This Plaintiff and Thousands Of Other U.S. Citizens!

This Plaintiff Prays This Court Will (1) Vacate Their Previous Order Denying Certiorari, (2) Grant A Rehearing and (3) Properly Redispose Of This Case By Granting His Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To Vacate The Lower Court's Judgments and Issue Orders and/or Rulings Upon All States To Correct The Injustices Against Other U.S. Citizens Who Had Their Cases Wrongfully Decided, Or Remand This Case To The Federal District Court For A Retrial To Keep Uniformity With The Older Supreme Court Established Case Law Authorities.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 12, 2022



*Sherry L. Prochnow*  
Sherry L. Prochnow  
Marshfield, WI 54449  
Exp 4-23-2024

## **CERTIFICATE-OF-GOOD-FAITH**

**Case No. 21-7187**


**Paul E. Jozwiak**  
*Applicant,*

v.


**Raytheon Missile Systems; et al.,**  
*Respondent.*

As Required By The Supreme Court **Rule 44**, I Certify That This Plaintiff's Petition For Reconsideration and/or Rehearing Is Presented In Their Justifiable Attempt To Obtain Their Legally-Entitled Benefits and Rights Where This Document Is Presented In Good Faith and NOT For Any Delay Of This Court.

I Declare Under Penalty Of Perjury That The Foregoing It True and Correct.



Executed On May 12, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink that appears to read "Paul Jozwiak".

Paul E. Jozwiak, Pro Se

404 South Cedar Ave.,

Marshfield, WI 54449

Phone: (520)-818-4976

Email: Orion5x5x9@yahoo.com