

No. 21-7843

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 18 2022
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Tina M Bradford — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Los Angeles County Office
of Education (LACOE), et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Tina M Bradford
(Your Name)

2838 South Sycamore Ave, Apt. 1
(Address)

Los Angeles, California 90016
(City, State, Zip Code)

(323) 239-0830
(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Plaintiff-Appellant questions whether Due Process Clause of the Constitution (Substantive Due Process) entitlement to trial by jury, the right to oral argument and hearing were denied systematically and unjustly by overuse Of (Procedure Due Process) using Motion Practice to Dismiss. Whether intermediate scrutiny is needed for Due Process of law.
2. Is the Due Process of law still accomplishing what it was intended to accomplish.

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 the court whose judgement is the subject of this petition is as follows.

1. Worker's Compensation Appeals Board (Division of Labor)

455 Golden Gate Ave, Ste. 9328

San Francisco, CA 94102 Phone Number (415) 703-5020

2. Los Angeles Department of Health and Human Services (Health Department)

3. Center for Disease Control (CDC)

4. Occupational Health and Safety (OSHA)

5. Department of Public Health

RELATED CASES

Case Number: 20-56148

D.C. Number: 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS

United States Supreme Court Docket NO. 18-9078

Los Angeles Superior Court, Case NO. 19STCV37015

Supreme Court of the State of California, Case NO. S250516

California Court of Appeals 2nd District, Case NO. B290453

Worker's Compensation Appeals Board, Case No. ADJ10064793

Worker's Compensation, Case No. ADJ8736268

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To: United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Petitioner: TM Bradford

2838 South Sycamore Ave, Apt 1

Los Angeles, Ca 90016

TM Bradford, In Forma Pauperis, MBHM; MAED

VS.

Los Angeles County Office of Education; et al

Sedgewick: York Risk Services, Inc.

Defendants-Appellees (s):

1. Los Angeles County Office of Education; et al

Vibiana M. Andrade, Esquire, Dep County Counsel

9300 Imperial Highway EC-299

Downey, CA 90242

Phone Number: (562) 922-6123

2. Sedgewick: York Risk Services, Inc.

Margret Goedecke Parke, Attorney; Retained

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP

633 W. Fifth Street, 52nd Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Phone Number: (951) 892- 7200

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented	i
List of Parties.....	ii
Related Cases.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Index of Appendices.....	1V
Table of Authorities.....	V
Opinions Below.....	1
Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved.....	1
Statement of Case...	2
Reason for Granting Petition.....	2
Procedure Law Practicing; Motions To Dismiss and Due Process.....	3
Conclusion.....	3
Appendices	

INDEX TO APPENDIX

Appendix A: Order, Before Tallman, Rawlinson, and Bumatay, Circuit Judges, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 20-56148, Plaintiff-Appellant Petition for Panel Rehearing and Hearing En Banc (Docket No. 21) were Denied, Filed January 24, 2022.

Appendix B: Memorandum, Before Tallman, Rawlinson, and Bumatay, Circuit Judges, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 20-56148, Decision Without Oral Argument Plaintiff-Appellant Tina Marie Bradford, Appeal from District Court, Central Division, Dismissing Claims for STAPH Infection and effects of Syndrome related illness (COVID 19 and all Variants that will arise) submitted October 12, 2021.

Appendix C: Order Before Judge S. Gutierrez, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS, Minutes (In Chambers), the Court Denies Plaintiff's, Motion to Reopen Case (See minutes for further details (y1))

Appendix D: Minutes (In Chambers) Order Before Judge Phillip S. Gutierrez, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case no. 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS, The Court grants the motions to Dismiss and Denies the motion to deem Plaintiff a vexatious litigant (C.D. Docket 13); Motion to Dismiss (MD JS-6. Case terminated) Denying (C.D. Docket 16) Motion to Dismiss Case as Frivolous Denying (17) Motion for Sanctions: For the foregoing reasons, Court Denies LACOE's motion to deem Plaintiff vexatious litigant. The Court Grants Defendant's

motions to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint. This order closes the case.

Appendix E: Order, Before Wardlaw and Miller, Circuit Judges, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth circuit, Case No. 20-56148, Plaintiff- Appellant Motion for Monetary Judgement (Docket Entry No. 3) and Motion for Production of Transcripts at Government Expense (Docket Entry No. 2) is Denied, Filed January 15, 2021.

Appendix F: Order by Magistrate Judge Alka Saggar, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No: 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS, Request to Proceed in Forma Pauperis With Declaration in Support (CV-60). (hc)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Abbott v. Latshaw, 164 F.3d 141, 146 (3d Cir. 1998). The focus is on the remedial process, not the government's actions that allegedly deprived the Plaintiff of his liberty or property interest. Defendant(s) should have focused on the remedial process instead of focusing on dismissing case. Lite Depalma Greenberg Law Blog (June 6, 2019).

Bd. Of Regents of State Colls. V. Roth, 408 U.S. 564,577 (1972). Lite Depalma Law Blog (June 6, 2019). To have a property interest in a claim of entitlement to alleged interest must have legitimate claim of entitlement.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit, opinion for Rehearing and Hearing En Banc appears at Appendix A to the petition and is Unpublished.

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit, Memorandum appears at Appendix B to the petition and is Unpublished.

The opinion of the United States District Court for the Central Division appears at Appendix C to the petition and is Unpublished. *Court Denies Plaintiff's Motion Reopen.*

The opinion of the United States District Court for the Central Division appears at Appendix D to the petition and is Unpublished. *The Court Grants Motions to Dismiss*

JURISDICTION

A timely petition for panel rehearing and hearing en banc was denied by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on January 24, 2022.

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The United Constitution Fifth Amendment, says to the Federal Government that no one shall be “deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.”

The United States Constitution Fourteenth Amendment says to State governments that no one shall be “deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.” The Due Process Clause.

Wikipedia Article, Substantive Due process, principle in constitutional law, allows courts to protect fundamental rights, from government interference, even if procedural protections are present or rights are not specifically mentioned elsewhere in the constitution.

STATEMENT OF CASE

The 14 years of litigation on this matter has not ended up the way it started. This matter started out as a Worker's Compensation Claim for irreparable Cumulative injury to Plaintiff-Appellant from a STAPH infection, contacted while working for Los Angeles County Office of Education. Although Cumulative injury to Plaintiff TM Bradford was evident claim for Cumulative injuries were constantly denied (All related cases) except Case No. ADJ8736268 that was initially, denied then accepted. Plaintiff could not understand why claim would be denied when Plaintiff was ill and dying and not able to work.

After Plaintiff-Appellant TM Bradford discovered evidence that Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) and The Department of Health knew what I was suffering from all the time when I could not find a cure and continued to deteriorate in health Plaintiff filed a civil lawsuit in Los Angeles Superior Court for monetary judgement (Abbott v. Latshaw; Case NO. 19STCV37015) The conduct of the Defendant(s), Defendant's attorney's, State Doctor's was cold and malice without regard for Human life, that Plaintiff claimed punitive damages (Abbott V Latshaw). The only issue addressed in pre-trial conferences were procedural motions to dismiss without oral argument (denial of my 5th and 14th amendment Due Process Clause). Referencing the 5th amendment here is not grounds for case dismissal, A U.S. Supreme Court denied Docket exist from Worker's Compensation Claim Court Docket NO. (18-9078). In my condition Plaintiff was being left to die. After Plaintiff's case was dismissed in Los Angeles Superior Court, one week later, a press release hit the media about the Corona Virus. Plaintiff TM Bradford recognized everything that was being said about the Corona Virus was (stated verbatim with a different name) out of Plaintiff's case filing.

The complaint reached a point where Plaintiff found it hard to keep up memory continued to fail, stomach problem occurred, Thyroid failed (blood was not getting enough oxygen), Plaintiff developed fatigue, shortness of breath, pain in legs, bones and joints developed. It was clear that Plaintiff could not work anymore. Then Plaintiff applied for Social Security disability and was Denied. Plaintiff petitioned court to take up social security matter D.C. Number: (2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS) Plaintiff had no income.

Plaintiff petitioned the courts for oral argument and ponderance of the evidence. Plaintiff had to meet filing deadlines, type, research, print forms, and respond to Defendant(s) motion(s) to dismiss. The burden was causing Plaintiff not to focus on healing but to focus on being able to get relief by court order. Plaintiff appealed for the ponderance of evidence, to help clarify points in discovery that could not be expressed in writing. There was no mention of Plaintiff's health in ongoing claims and STAPH infection was never mentioned.

REASON FOR GRANTING PETITION

Granting this case will unravel the biggest coop de gras and conspiracy ever taken in the history of America, concerning healthcare and democracy.

The way Plaintiff case-claim was handled by the state was unethical and Plaintiff dose not want others to experience this kind of misconduct when at the lowest in health. Heath is something that effects all people. This Petition should be granted, this Petition is within the cofounds of the law and beholds strictest scrutiny.

The way in which the issue-claim was handled turned into mis-conduct on a state and federal level to where the respect for law, ethics and humanity were not present. The only thing the State of California was concerned about was getting case dismissed without regard to how to get case-claim dismissed as long as it was

dismissed.

The irreparable damage to Plaintiff and disregard for the Fourteenth Amendment right of Plaintiff was disregarded especially in regard to health.

PROCEDURE LAW PRACTICING; MOTIONS TO DISSMISS AND DUE PROCESS

Plaintiff-Appellant Questions the procedure used by the Federal and State Courts through the use of motion practicing to undeniably dismiss cases without due process. I never wanted to take it to a punitive damage level but when I found evidence from the Department Of Health Services on MRSA in (2015) (C.D. Docket No, 2:20-cv-03691-PSG-AS, Exhibit K Update on MRSA Study) It was clear Los Office Of Education (LACOE) knew what disease I had all the time and settled out on it for \$40.000. As the Plaintiff, I would have never settled my life for this amount, if I would have known I was never going to heal from it and most likely to die from it, that there was no cure and a syndrome of effects that would occur the longer the disease persisted. This is when all the Botched proceedings started to take place to keep Plaintiff out of court that Denied right to Due Process.

Plaintiff's-Appellant is not rearguing the case just questioning and exposing the legal tactics against her to Deny Plaintiff Bradford Due Process. Legal warning was ignored through arguing facts that were not true or did not happen. Defendant's argued the wrong subject matter. In Los Angeles Superior Court Defendant's argued prior Worker's Compensation case when the case was a new, civil law suit. Case was transferred to a Worker's Compensation Hub for pretrial conference. Notice of Default was never filed, Plaintiff was told it was at the bottom of the drawer, Default was never entered. Plaintiff was told Default could not be entered due to case being dismissed, default was filed before case was dismissed. District Court

Magistrate Judge rejected filing all my motions for Discovery, stating my filings were either deficient or premature (9th Circuit corrected this, filings were not deficient or premature). District Court Judge PSG in his decision said my case was dismissed for failure to file Opposition. Plaintiff had filed an Affidavit as Opposition that had been received by the court but not yet filed. Plaintiff filed Motion to reopen Case, Motion was denied (Appendix D). Case Closed

CONCLUSION

It was not intended for Plaintiff Bradford to reargue related cases on this Writ For Certiorari although it probably should be reargued since nothing was never argued about sustaining Plaintiff's healthcare need and financial entitlement. Plaintiff Petition for Writ of Certiorari to Question the Procedure and level of Review used by the States to Deny Access to Healthcare and to hold those accountable who are supposed to protect the people, rather it is the Government, Insurance Company, Worker's Compensation, Occupational Health and Safety, Department of Public Health al, etc. This Petition should be granted so it can rest peacefully and Plaintiff can rest Gracefully knowing that generations to come healthcare will be treated with Quality, dignity and respect for the elderly, sick and dying people who access care. Healthcare will be affordable and available to anyone who is sick and need care. A single payor health care system is not needed to accomplish this.

Plaintiff-Appellant has suffered irreparable damage to health, access to quality health care, loss of 14 years of life that can never be regained due to ongoing litigation. During ongoing litigation new protocols for infectious disease, vaccines were developed response readiness for pandemics and biological warfare Procedures are in place which is definitely a good thing.