

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Petition for Rehearing

Docket Number: 21-7843

Petitioner: Tina Bradford

2838 South Sycamore Ave, Apt 1

Los Angeles, Ca 90016

Tina Bradford, In Forma Pauperis, MBH; MA. SPC.ED Vs

Los Angeles County Office of Education;

York Risk Services, Inc.

Questions Presented


#1 Was Due Process denied systematically and unjustly an over abuse of power dismissing cases of tort injury by Motion to Dismiss.

#2 Is the Due Process of law still accomplishing what it was intended to Accomplish.

Although Plaintiff's questions presented does not explicitly state the word Res Judicata, time barred, and stature of limitation these words are where the Plaintiff's questions present themselves. Not only do these words present themselves here these words are what the Defendant initially used in motion to dismiss and demurer to strike and dismiss. All this is within the briefing.

I ask the Panel to Consider this petition for Certiorari it is an important matter(s) entrenched within. I have tried to be concise and to the point as much As I possibly can. Through all of the tribulations I have had to endure to get Disability benefits, I have yet to receive.

P. 1/4



This unravels truths about where the democratic government and rule of law was going. Although unintended it is with great honor for me to be instrumental part of sustaining this great Nation by combating the spread of disease. Arellano v. McDonough on Statutes of Limitation and Res Judicata. Based on the Audio of the argument that took place 10/04/2022, matter concerned code 5110, equitable tolling and Veterans disability claims. Plaintiff prevailed in the argument. Supposedly it is an agency decision to establish guidelines when the clock starts to run for statute of limitations. As Justice Kavanaugh stated there was no statute of limitations in that case due to tolling. There is no statute of limitations in the (Bradford v. LA County) case neither. There is statute of limitation exceptions depending on the benefit (Andrews Decision L) dependent benefits (Code 5101 (a) 1 (a) 21-432). It just so happens (Plaintiff Bradford is a dependent of a veteran). The (Arellano v. McDonough) although a different case, is similar enough to (Bradford v. LA County) to submit both cases.

According to the Supreme Court Of The United States new submitted (Arellano v. McDonough) case. This means the case of (Bradford v. LA County Office of Education al., etc.) can be remanded for monetary relief. Defendant(s) argued to dismiss all Plaintiff's filings due to statute of limitation and Res Judicata.

In fact, Plaintiff (Bradford v. LA County) has reviewed several recent cases argued and submitted by the United States Supreme Court that are closely related to (Bradford v. LA County). Docket 21-442 (Reed v. Goertz) argued 10/11/22 and Docket 21-869; (Andy Warhol Found., Inc. V. Goldsmith) argued 10/12/22. According to (Reed v. Goertz) this argument has to do with due process, and when rehearing and appeal can be filed. Acure when statute of

limitation begin to run. Relating to when cause of action is filed and when harm is complete (Corona Virus and all its variants, syndrome and Staphylococcus (MRSA) does not technically never heal). The (Reed v. Goertz) case is almost exactly arguing the Questions that Plaintiff Bradford asks the court in Writ Of Certiorari to interpret. Reed v. Goertz was argued and submitted, yet (Bradfordv.LA County was denied). The decisions of the cases mentioned above will be the same for the (Bradford v. LA County), the questions and interpretation of the law will be the same if (Bradford v. LA County) is submitted without oral argument). According to (Reed v. Goertz) relief is paid on a month-by-month basis for as long as it took to finalize the case. Not just with one retroactive year from the time the cause of action is filled. For The reason of the above mentioned and the similarity with the questions Plaintiff Bradford asked the court to interpret with the case the court did choose to be heard Plaintiff respectfully ask the court to reconsider Writ Of Certiorari Of (Tina Marie Bradford v. Los Angeles, County Office Of Education, al., etc.) and York

Docket 21-869 (Andy Warhol Found., Inc. V. Goldsmith) This case also relates to the Questions that the Tina Marie Bradford v LA County Office Of Education al., etc. ask the court to consider, when it comes to copyright and what the Person who uses someone else art intends to do with it as far as changing its content for a different use than what the original artist intended.

Certification of Counsel

This Petition for Rehearing is restricted to the grounds of Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States (Rule 44, paragraph 2) and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Tina Marie Bradford, MHCM, MA.SPC.ED

Tina Marie Bradford
10/21/2022

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Tina Marie Bradford — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.
LA County Office
of Education, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Tina Marie Bradford, do swear or declare that on this date, October 21, 2022, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Clerk: Supreme Court of the United States, Washington DC 20543
York Risk Services, INC; Margret G Parke, Attorney, 633 W. 5th St, 52nd fl LA 90071
LA County Office of Education; Vibiana Andrade, General Counsel, 933 Imperial Highway #
299, Downey, CA 90242-2890

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 21, 2022

Tina Marie Bradford
(Signature)