11/23/21
MD

No. 21-881

==========

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

—oOo—

LINDA SHAO, AKA YI TAI SHAO

Petitioner - Appellant,

vs.

MCMANIS FAULKNER, A Professional Corporation, JAMES MCMANIS, MICHAEL REEDY, CATHERING BECHTEL

Respondents- Appellees

—oOo—

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To the California Sixth District Court of Appeal regarding its Order of May 26, 2021 Summary Denying Petitioner SHAO's second vexatious litigant application to file the appeal, in H048651which is an appeal from California Santa Clara County Court's May 28, 2020's Order denying SHAO's motion to set aside dismissal (S269711).

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

YI TAI SHAO, ESQ. *In pro per*
Mailing address: P.O. Box 280; Big Pool, MD 21711
Telephone: (408) 873-3888; FAX: (408) 418-4070
Email: attorneyshao@aol.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED:

1. Was Petitioner denied due process by the summary denial of Petitioner's application for leave to file appeal where the application had been previously approved by the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, and Appellees had not objected to the filing of the appeal, and the court altered the docket to falsify the filing date of the second vexatious litigant order to the date of summary denial?

2. Whether the California Superior Court should be "the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed" in Code of Civil Procedure Section 391.7(a) such that once filed with approval of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, the California Court of Appeal did not have jurisdiction to require a second vexatious litigant application to file the appeal?

3. Whether Petitioner was denied due process, when the State Court of Appeal concealed the Notice of Appeal transmitted from the trial court and refused to docket the appeal for 111 days when the Notice of Appeal was properly filed with the trial court with preapproval of the Presiding Judge?

4. Does due process require change of place of appeal when the State's Court of Appeal and its

Presiding Judge both are defendants in another lawsuit filed by Petitioner?

5. Whether the prefiling vexatious litigant order issued by the trial court is void where the judge failed to disclose that she was the attorney of record for Respondents for at least 2.5 years because of objective appearance of bias and prejudice?

6. Whether the Prefiling Order issued by the trial court in this proceeding should be void for not being supported by a qualified statement of decision for a prefiling order (only when an order declaring Petitioner as a vexatious litigant mentions "Section 391.7" can the order to be qualified to be an order for a Prefiling order according to *Holcomb v. U.S. Bank National, Association*, et al., 129 Cal.App.4th 1494(2005))?

7. Whether the Order declaring Petitioner as vexatious litigant should be reversed when the judge acted as Respondents' attorney, more than "gave advice" and issued opinion beyond the scope of Respondent's motion, sua sponte raised new facts at the eve of hearing and failed to give Petitioner full chance to rebut the new facts?

8. Whether the Order declaring Petitioner as a vexatious litigant should be revered when no reasonable judge would have granted the motion that has no declaration in existence and the only

purported evidence was finding of the child custody order which was pending appeal?

9. Does due process require reversal of the dismissal by the trial court when the judge failed to disclose his regular social relationship with Respondents through the American Inns of Court?

10. Does due process require reversal of all orders of the trial court and change court as Respondent is an attorney for the trial court?

11. Does due process require reversal of the orders issued by the appellate court in this case as the Justice (Allison Denny) was a colleague of Respondent and an employee to Respondent's client?

11. Should all orders signed by California Chief Justice for all Petitions filed by Petitioner in the past 10 years be reversed and cases reactivated because the Chief Justice failed to disclose her being a client of Respondent James McManis?

12. Whether due process requires the State's highest court to make available to the public on the voting result by each participating justices on granting or denying Petition for Review?

13. Whether Petitioner is clearly denied reasonable access to the court and suffered gross injustice when the records clearly show existence of extrinsic fraud that the trial court did conspire with Respondents to file their motion to dismiss

in September 18, 2019 with e-filing envelop of #3406422 and another e-filing envelop of $3408311 at even later date, with 5 steps of altering the court records and docket in faking the filing date to be 9/12/2019 when it is undisputed that Respondents did not reserve the hearing date, did not clear the hearing date of October 8, 2019 with Petitioner and would be unable to file their motion to dismiss under the then Local Civil Rule 8(c) without special help from the trial court that is a representative client of Respondents?

14. Whether Petitioner is denied due process as no reasonable judge would have granted the motion to dismiss when there is no notice to terminate stay as required by California Rules of Court Rule 3.650 (d)?

15. Whether dismissal is pre-matured where there was not a notice terminating stay and the interlocutory appeal of vexatious litigant undisputedly tolled the five years' statute to dismiss for failure to prosecute?

16. Whether due process requires all the trial court orders to be invalidated because of conflicts of interest and the trial court must be changed venue based on direct conflicts of interest that the trial court is impossible to be impartial to decide legal malpractice of its own attorney?

17. Whether the State's appellate court's dismissal of child custody appeal (H040395) should be reversed for severe violation of due process when the trial court's notices of non-compliance that were used by the appellate court to dismiss appeal are clearly false where evidence shows that Petitioner had indeed procured the designated transcripts and the child custody trial's court reporter had filed a Certificate of Waiver of Deposit on May 8, 2014 but the trial court illegally altered the docket to remove the Certificate, refused to prepare any records on appeal for four years until dismissal, and blocked the court reporter from filing the original child custody trial's transcripts?

18. Whether the State Appellate court's dismissal of vexatious litigant appeal (H042531) should be reversed and the trial court's vexatious litigant orders should also be reversed as the clerk had certified that important records on appeal were not included in the records on appeal such that there were incomplete records for review?

19. Whether the verified statement of disqualification of the State's Chief Justice should be deemed conceded by operation of law (C.C.P.§170.3(c)(4)) such that all accused facts contained in the verified statement of disqualification shall be deemed having been

admitted to be true, when Respondents had 50 days' unblocked chance to make objections but failed to make objection to any accusation contained in the verified statement?

20. The May 26, 2020 Order of the trial court denying change of venue based on all issues had been decided is clearly erroneous and unsupported by record that the order should be reversed and the case be removed to San Francisco Superior Court.

21. Does due process requires invalidation of the new Civil Local Rule 8(c) of the Santa Clara County Court as the Rule unreasonably blocks the fundamental right of a litigant to have reasonable access to the court as the new rule gave the Clerk's Office right to reject filing of a motion and giving the Clerk's office the ability to delay giving out a hearing date, and conflicts with the notice provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure §1005 when the clerk's office of the trial court had not given a day of hearing for Petitioner's motion to set aside dismissal and all orders issued by Judge Folan since November 4, 2021?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner: Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Shao, in pro permailing address: p.o. box 280; big pool, MD 21711

4 respondents: Mcmanis Faulkner, pc, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel who are represented by counsel
Janet Everson, Esq. at Murphy, Pearson, Bradley & Feeney 580 California Street, Suite 1100; San Francisco, CA 94104

Table of Contents

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Statutes

TABLE OF APPENDIX

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the California Sixth District Court of Appeal ["Sixth Appellate District"]'s order of May 26, 2021 which, in disregard of direct conflicts of interest, denied summarily the *second* application for leave to file appeal made in this proceeding, to foreclose the appeal which had been approved for filing and filed by the Presiding Judge of the trial court in the identical vexatious litigant application about 10 months prior on 7/27/2021 with apparent disallowing Petitioner a day in the court on the merits. This case has exceptional situations of conflicts of interest and abnormally enormous court crimes that warrant certiorari as it is the source of all court crimes that caused all appeals filed by Petitioner in the past 10 years, including Petitions 11-11119 (June 2012), 14-7244 (2014), 14A677, 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-639, 20-524. This appeal involves the issues of direct conflicts of interest at all levels of the Court which caused all orders of the trial court illegal throughout the entire proceeding. In the August 25, 2021 Order of California Supreme Court, which is the basis of this Petition, California Supreme Court Chief Justice conceded her being Respondent McManis's client. On October 18, 2021, in a related appeal pending

with the D.C. Circuit with case number of 21-5210, Respondents' counsel exposed an ex parte "approval" of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal of their "undocumented" motion for summary affirmance of the District Court's sua sponte dismissal order.

JURISDICTION

California Supreme Court's order was entered July 25, 2018. Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 USC §1257 as the decisions of the California courts rejected Petitioner's claims under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The Petition is timely under 28 U.S.C. §2101(c) and US Sup. Ct. Rule 13.1 and 13.3.

OPINION BELOW

On August 25, 2021, California Supreme Court en banc denied review without stating a reason in S269711 (App.30). For the first time, however, California Chief Justice did not participate in the purported voting. The Supervising Clerk explained that California Chief Justice's not participating in the voting was because of Petitioner's verified Statement of Disqualification of California Chief Justice.

Upon inquiry, California Supreme Court does not have any voting record that may be available to the public.

Petitioner's verified Statement of Disqualification of Chief Justice includes evidence and severe accusation of her conflicts of interest with Respondent James McManis, including her being McManis's client, colluded with McManis to deny all reviews that were signed off by her since 2012, colluded with McManis to use State Bar of California to retaliate against Petitioner including a Supreme Court case specifically opened against Petitioner only on the date the Appeal was filed (App.143), and two days later, Chief Justice issued an unconstitutional premature order to suspend Petitioner's bar license pretending that order was for a list of licensees when there was only one attorney listed who is Petitioner. By operation of law, Chief Justice also conceded having used the State Bar to cause California Franchise Board to impute income against Petitioner from 2016 and garnish money based on the imputed income.

Chief Justice conceded having conspired with Respondent Mcmanis to purge the recent complaint numbered 21-O-07258, to remove all records to complain against McManis and promptly close the complaint against McManis's attorneys to conceal the felonies involved in 5 steps of criminal acts in altering the e-filing stamps on Respondents' motion to dismiss to change filing record from 9/18/2019 to 9/12/2019

in dismissing the case. Chief Justice misappropriated her administrative power at State Bar of California and California Supreme Court. Respondents had 50 days to object but never objected to any of the accused conspiracies, which Chief Justice has effectively conceded.

The August 25, 2021 Order was in response to Petitioner's Petition for Review the Sixth Appellate Court's unusual order of May 26, 2021 that was accompanied by a felonious alteration of docket entry on the day of issuance of the order in H048651 (App.33). After objecting to the Supervising Clerk about this crime, the docket was then corrected.

The Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood has direct conflicts of interest as she is the wife of Judge Edward Davila, who started the entire corruption in unlawfully ordering parental deprival on a Case Management Conference on August 4, 2010 to place the 5-year-old minor at the sole custody of her accused abuser (father) without any notice, motion, nor evidentiary hearing.

She concealed the Notice of Appeal transmitted to her on 8/10/2020 (App.118) and refused to enter a docket for 111 days after many inquiries by Petitioner. Then the Sixth Appellate District silently opened a case docket of H048651 without notice on 12/7/2020, and with

clear attempt trying to quietly dismiss the appeal, the Court issued a default letter *without notice* to Petitioner on 12/7/2020 where all prior excuses to dismiss appeals behind the back of Petitioner were required in the 12/7/2020 letter. The letter explicitly did not mail to Petitioner but only by email and purposely sent to the email Google had blocked Petitioner from entry (App.106).
After the attempt of quiet dismissal of appeal failed, then the Sixth Appellate District required a second vexatious litigant application to file this appeal on 12/22/2020 (Ap.31). Petitioner immediately re-filed the same application that was already approved on 7/27/2020 by the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court.

Greenwood withheld the application by 5 months, then caused Respondent McManis's prior colleague, Justice Allison Danner, to act on her behalf to summarily denied the application on May 26, 2021. Moreover, Justice Danner and Presiding Justice Greenwood caused the deputy clerk to alter the docket entry to falsify the filing date of Petitioner's second application to be post dated 5 months to change from 12/22/2020's filing date to be on the same day of her denial, 5/26/2021---it appeared that Greenwood tried to justify her denial of the second application by alleging late filing. (App.33)

Petitioner filed a motion to vacate the May 26, 2021 Order as the Court had no jurisdiction to require a second vexatious litigant order and to issue a summary denial of the same application in conflict with the Presiding Judge of the trial court's approval order of 7/27/2021 and based on stare decisis, Respondents' non-objection constitutes waiver, such that the Sixth Appellate District had no ground to require a second application. The Sixth Appellate District delayed adjudication passing the due date for Petition for Review; therefore, there was a case of S269711 when the motion was also pending in H048651. Two days after the summary denial of review in S269711, Justice Denny, again, disregard of conflicts of interest, issued an order summarily denying again with a ground of "moot" because of the 8/25/2021 decision in S269711.

Petitioner filed another motion to vacate 8/27/2021's Order of Acting P.J. because the summary denial decision does not have precedential effect. Thus far, for already 2 months, that motion is still pending in H048651.

The appeal as approved by Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court was based on the undisputable conspiracy of Respondents and their client, Santa Clara County Superior Court to allow filing of their motion to dismiss in violation of the then Civil Local Rule 8(c) on 9/18/2019.

Moreover, the efiling stamps were altered and antedated from 9/18/2019 to 9/12/2019. No reason judge would have grant dismissal as the stay was not terminated yet; according California Rules of Court Rule 3.650(d) (App.19), the stay requested by Respondents can only be terminated by a notice. Therefore, the dismissal is premature. Presiding Judge Deborah Ryan approved Petitioner's vexatious litigant application and filed the Notice of Appeal on 7/27/2020, which was docketed as H048651 4 months later.

To cover up the trial court's conspiracy, after Judge Theodore Zayner, a buddy to Respondents through the American Inns of Court(App.66; opinion of Meera Fox, Esq.), became the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court, the reservation requirement for Local Rule 8(c) was removed, including the need to clear the hearing date with opposing party before reservation. (App.28-29). The new civil local rule 8(c) caused chaos in the court's administration, and violates due process in empowering the clerk's office to reject filing, to endlessly withhold a motion, and conflicts with the notice requirement of Code of Civil Procedure.

Based on new discovery that Judge Maureen Folan, the judge who issued vexatious litigant orders in this proceeding and was the case

management judge for the great majority time of this case, who Petitioner criticized her having acted as Respondents' attorney and acted more than "giving advice" in C.C.P.§170.1(a), indeed was retained by Respondents in their legal malpractice cases and failed to disclose her being an attorney for defendants as required by the Congressional intent for C.C.P. §170.1 as stated in Assembly Bill 2504 (App.60).

The judge who dismissed this case behind Petitioner's back on 10/8/2019, Judge Christopher Rudy, was discovered to have close and regular social relationship with Respondents through the American Inns of Court such that his order and judgment of dismissal should be vacated.

Further, Petitioner found the hard copy of the court reporter's certificate of waiver of deposit for court reporter's fees and the copy of the check for payment, which directly proved that the courts have unlawfully dismissed the child custody appeal with false excuse of not purchasing court reporter's transcript such that the dismissal of child custody appeal (Petition 18-569; H040395) and vexatious litigant appeal (Petition 18-800; H042531) should be reversed.

Under the management of Respondent's buddy, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, Petitioner's second motion to set aside dismissal and further all orders of Judge Maureen Folan

has been withhold from filing by the Clerk's Office under the new Civil Local Rule 8(c) since November 4, 2021 (App.61), already 20 days and the Clerk's Office refused to give out a hearing date.

STATUTES INVOLVED(APP.1-29)

1. Constitution, Article IV, §2
2. Constitution,first Amendment
3. Constitution, fourteenth Amendment
4. 28 USC§ 455
5. Judicial Conference of the United States, Committee on Code ofConduct for United States Judges, Compendium of Selected Opinions § 3.6-6[1] (Apr. 2013)
6. Calif. Gov. Code §6200
7. Calif. Gov. Code §6201.
8. Calif. Gov. Code §6203.
9. Calif. Government Code §68150
10. Calif. Gov. Code §68151(a)(3)
11. Calif. Gov. Code§68152
12. Calif. Penal Code §96.5
14. Calif. Code of Civil Pro §170.1.
15. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §170.3
16. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §1005
17. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §583.310
18. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §583.340
19. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §583.130
20. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §583.140.
21. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §391

22. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §391.2
23. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §391.3
24. Calif. Code of Civil Procedure §391.7
25. California Rules of Court Rule 3.650. Duty to notify court and others of stay
26. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 3.515. Motions and orders for a stay
27. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 3.1300. Time for filing and service of motion papers
28. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 8.54. Motions
29. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 8.57. Motions before the record is filed
30. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 8.100. Filing the appeal
31. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 8.714. Superior court clerk duties
32. California Rules of Court Rule 3.1304. Time of hearing
33. Rule 3.1342. Motion to dismiss for delay in prosecution
34. Calif. Rules of Court Rule 8.100. Filing the appeal
35. California Rules of Professional Conduct 5-300
36. California Santa Clara County Superior Court's CIVIL RULE 8: PRETRIAL MOTIONS AND EX-PARTE PROCEEDINGS (effective until 4/24/2021)

37. Santa Clara County Superior Court Civil Local Rule 8 (c) revised on April 22, 2021

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF THE CASE

From the beginning until present, this is a case that have cases within cases with abundant undisputable evidence of severe obstruction of justice that requires correction.

On October 18, 2021, Respondents' counsel at the related appeal case pending with the D.C. Circuit with case No. 21-5210, disclosed the truth that the dismissal of the appeal case of 19-5014 was because on July 31, 2019, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal "granted" Respondents' undocumented "motion for summary affirmance". From there, shocking conflicts of interest of the DC Circuit in handling the appeal case of 19-5014 was discovered. Through the American Inns of Court, Respondents were related to the DC Circuit judges as well as judges of this Court. The undisputable court crimes directed by Respondents in this proceeding were also done through the function of the American Inns of Court. It is time for the Supreme Court to look back from 1985 until present as to how the private social function of American Inns of Court has facilitated illegal ex parte communications between attorneys and judges and corrupted the judiciary. This case is a typical judiciary

corruptions from the beginning until present and how to remedy the judicial crisis.

Through being a major donor of the American Inns of Court, Respondent James McManis became the leading attorney of the American Inns of Court and became an attorney of Santa Clara County Superior Court and had supported many judicial seats by way of the American Inns of Court.

On August 4, 2010, Petitioner suffered gross injustice where, at the Case Management Conference, without any notice, motion, nor evidentiary hearing, based on ex parte communications Judge Edward Davila had with David Sussman, the attorney of Petitioner's ex-husband Tsan-Kuen Wang, the little 5-year-old was forcibly taken away from her mother and placed in the sole custody of her complained abuser, Wang. Based on undisputed ex parte communication, without any hearing, nor presence of an attorney, Davila signed a supervised visitation order against Petitioner at the night of August 4, 2010 and a sibling separation order on August 5, 2010.
Petitioner retained Respondents to get her child custody back. Yet, Respondents chose to sponsor Davila and sold Petitioner's interest as well as the little child's interest.

On March 11, 2012, Petitioner brought a formal lawsuit against Respondents for breach of fiduciary duty, legal malpractice and discrimination, after settlement discussion since October 2011 failed. In order to claim lack of causation, Respondents caused Santa Clara County Court to maintain parental deprival of Petitioner, as the only defense to this lawsuit. See, Decl. Meera Fox,¶4 (App.65)

Defendants had their buddy, Judge Carol Overton dismissed this case in February 2014 taking advantage of Petitioner's overseas. Petitioner then discovered that Santa Clara County Superior Court is a representative client of Respondent McManis Faulkner, and thus, after Overton's dismissal, Petitioner filed a new lawsuit with the U.S.D.C. in San Jose. Judge Lucy Koh, who concealed her close social relationship with Respondents through the American Inns of Court from disclosure and dismissed that case. Thus, Petitioner sought to vacate Overton's dismissal.

After the case was reactivated, Judge Maureen Folan became the Case Management Judge for this case. Respondents immediately filed a motion to declare SHAO as a vexatious litigant, security order and prefiling order.

On the very same day when the Notice of Appeal for this proceeding was filed (App.120),

7/27/2020, California Chief Justice conspired with Respondent to create a case No. S263527(App.143) at the California Supreme Court to retaliate against Petitioner trying to take away Petitioner's bar license, the third time. Respondents previously had conspired with Department of Child Support Services to try to suspend Petitioner's bar license two times and driver's license multiple times when Petitioner should not have owed any child support to her ex-husband but for the conspiracy to purposely create some debits in order to harass Petitioner. That is the appeal case where Attorney Meera Fox's first declaration was filed—H039823 where the court blindly imputed income against Petitioner in order to enable Respondent to use government resources to harass Petitioner, after Respondent McManis admitted in his deposition of his being an attorney for Santa Clara County Court where he has been appearing in front of for numerous cases, of the fact that he had provided free legal services, or bribed the judiciary, at Santa Clara County Court, the Sixth Appellate District as well as California Supreme Court. On August 25, 2021, California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye eventually conceded to her being Respondent McManis's client, and had conspired with McManis in dismissing cases, dismissing US Supreme Court's case filed by Petitioner through

her being able to influence the US Supreme Court by way of having served as President of Anthony M. Kennedy American Inn of Court of American Inns of Court, had conspired in suppressing McManis's violation of Rule 5-300 by staying the enforcement case of 15-O-15200 by 3 years and then dismissed it, and had conspired with Respondent McManis in covering up the crimes involved in the conspiracy of dismissal of this case which was reported by petitioner to the State Bar in 2020, had conspired with McManis in retaliating against Petitioner.

Respondents misappropriate their influence through the attorney-client relationship, colleague relationship (McManis is a Master for the trial court for many years) and regular social relationship through the Americans Inns of Court to

(1) cause permanent parental deprival of Petitioner,

(2) cause Petitioner unable to seek relief from the court by the fraudulent Prefiling Order,

(3) cause dismissal of all appeals,

(4) caused dismissal of this underlying case by commission of about 20 felonies of violation of California Government Code Sections 6200-01 in conspiracy with the trial court,

(5) removed all records of State Bar against Respondents and closed all cases against

Respondents' comrades including their attorneys such that not even an inquiry could be made on all these court crimes,
(6) caused all dockets of the courts involved to be altered. (regarding the child custody appeal, Respondent McManis, as the leading attorney of American Inns of Court, even influenced the U.S. Supreme Court to alter the docket of 18-569 to remove the filing record of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children)

A series of undisputable or conceded judicial conspiracies are discussed in REASONS WHY WRIT SHAOULD BE ISSUED, below.

REASONS TO ISSUE WRITS

There is severe judicial crisis in this case that has extraordinary incidents of court crimes involved including clear and convincing evidence of judicial conspiracies, each court concealed their conflicts of interest which now are exposed, on the top of many infringements on integrity of the court's records and extrinsic fraud at all levels of California courts and even State Bar of California and California Franchise Tax Board that has constituted severe obstruction of justice beyond severe violation of due process that the supreme court cannot overlook. There is no current legal measures to cope with this after math discovery

of evidence of court crimes and conspiracy and Petitioner defers to this Court on how to handle the loopholes resulted because of discovery of truth.

In Doc.#37 of the Appendix, Petitioner attached her Petition for Rehearing that was blocked from filing by this Court and respectfully requests this Court to follow the law and public policy stated therein to transfer this case to qualified justices in Court of Appeal of New York to substitute this Court in handling the issues presented in this Petition.

I. SHOULD ALL ACCUSED FACTS CONTAINED IN PETITIONER'S VERIFIED STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION AGAING CALIFORNIA CHIEF JUSTICE TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE'S IN S26971 SHALL BE DEEMED CONCEDED BY OPERATOIN OF LAW ACCORDING TO C.C.P.§170.3(C)(4) WHERE RESPONDENTS NEVER DISPUTED IN THE 50 DAYS WHEN IT WAS PENDING AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ADOPTIVELY ADMITTED TO THE ACCUSED CONSPIRACY.

California Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(4) (App.10) states that:

(4)A judge who fails to file a consent or answer within the time allowed shall be deemed to have consented to his or her

disqualification and the clerk shall notify the presiding judge or person authorized to appoint a replacement of the recusal as provided in subdivision (a).

See also, *Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.* (1991) 234, Cal.App.3d 415.

Moreover, all severe crimes of conspiracies mentioned there was **not** denied by Respondents when they had full chance to oppose or make objection during the 50 days from 7/7/2021, the time of the filing of the Verified Statement of Disqualification until the decision of 8/25/2021. According to the explanation of the Supervising Clerk of California Supreme Court, the reason why Chief Justice did not participate in the voting was because of her concession of recusal. Therefor all facts and evidence provided in Petitioner's Request for Recusal shall be deemed admitted and true, which include:

(1) California Chief Justice is Appellee McManis' client;

(2) California Chief Justice was a President of Anthony M. Kennedy American Inn of Court, and have unduly influenced Justice Kennedy about Petitioner's cases of 11119, 14-1712,

(3) California Chief Justice knowingly refused to investigate the severe conflicts of interest suffered by Petitioner after she was made known to such conflicts of interest since 7/19/2017.

(4) California Chief Justice assisted Appellees (McManis) in blindly denying reviews of all Petitions filed by Petitioner in order to secure permanent parental deprival which is the sole defense of Respondents to this case.
(5) California Chief Justice conspired with Appellee James McManis to stay a State Bar enforcement case of 15-O-15200 for three years and close the case on 9/25/2019 (a complaint by SHAO about McManis's admission that he gave fee legal services to judges and justices about their personal affairs in violation of Rule 5-300(a) of California Rules of Professional Conduct);
(6) Regarding Petitioner's complaint against James McManis, Janet Everson and Suzie Tagliere regarding their conspiracy with Santa Clara County Court to file their motion to dismiss without compliance with Civil Local Rule 8(c) which required reservation for all motions and the moving party to clear hearing date before reservation,and further conspired with Santa Clara County Court to alter the efiling stamps of their motion to dismiss with at least 5 steps with two e-filing California Chief Justice conspired with Appellee James McManis to purge State Bar complaint case of 20-O-07258 against McManis such that the case number could not be found at California State Bar against

McManis, and to promptly close State Bar complaints against McManis's attorneys, Suzie Tagliere and Janet Everson without even making an inquiry on the crimes of Government Code Sections 6200-6201

(7) On the day when this appeal was approved for filing, i.e., 7/27/2020, California Chief Justice conspired with Appellee James McManis to harass Petitioner with creation of a new case docket of S263527 planning to take away Petitioner's bar license and issued an illegal premature order to suspend Petitioner's bar license on 7/29/2020 without any preceding notice or hearing when the hacker hired by Respondents saw Petitioner had not paid bar dues and were having discussions with the state bar. It was premature as the due date of payment was 9/30/2020.

(8) California Chief Justice conspired with Appellee James McManis to cause State Bar of California to send letters to California Franchise Tax Board to impute income against Appellant SHAO, and to cause CFT to garnish imputed tax from SHAO's law firm account, having harassed SHAO for the tax years of 2016 until present. Respondents' non-objection in face of severe criminal accusation should be deemed admission by adoption as well. Now with Chief Justice's conceded facts, Petitioner respectfully rquests the

court to order that Chief Justice has effectively conceded to the judiciary conspiracy and **whether all orders denying review signed by California Chief Justice should be reversed and reactivated? And whether California Supreme Court should make available their voting records on the purported En Banc order?**

II. 5/26/2021 ORDER IN H048651 SHOULD BE REVERSED AS IT IS AN ACT WITHOUT JURISDICTION AND THE APPEAL SHOULD BE REMANDED TO THE FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL BASED ON THE SEVERE DETERRENCE OF APPEAL AND CRIME OF CONCEALING THE NOTICE OF APPEAL AND ALTERATION OF DOCKET.

After Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court approved the application to file a new appeal, there was a conspiracy to disallow appeal by the following facts:

1. In violation of CRC Rule 8.100(App.22), Alex Rodrigues who is suspected to be McManis's client, caused return of the appeal fees on 7/29/2020, which appeared to be paving the way of the later default notice.
2. Santa Clara County Court violated Rule 8.714 in delaying transferring the filed Notice of Appeal with 8 days' delay.

3. Presiding Justice Greenwood concealed the Notice of Appeal and refused to create an appeal case by 111 days.
4. Created a default notice for lack of payment, civil appeal cover sheet, and further sent to Petitioner's extinct email that they knew Petitioner has had no access to since March of 2018 and the default notice was sent by email only.
5. On 12/21/2020, Petitioner discovered the case and saw such notice on the docket and handled all requests by the due date of 12/22/2020.
6. Seeing Petitioner satisfied all requests in the secret letter dated 12/7/2020, a new order was issued on 12/22/2020 requiring Petitioner to file a second application for leave to file appeal (App.31)
7. Petitioner promptly filed the same application on 12/22/2020.
8. 5 months later, Associate Justice Allison Denny, a colleague to James McManis, summarily denied the application and the docket showed alteration of date of Petitioner's filing of the application from 12/22/2020 to be 5/26/2021. Such alteration of docket constitutes alteration of the court records under Government Code §68151(a)(3) and is a felony under Government Code§6200. (App.33)

   This is a new issue and there is no case law on this. According to C.C.P.§391.7(1), the vexatious

litigant application should be made to "the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed" which is Santa Clara County Court as a Notice of Appeal can only be filed with the trial court. Once approved, the Sixth Appellate District does not have a jurisdiction to require a second application. Therefore, May 26, 2021 Order should be reversed as the Sixth District Appellate Court was acting beyond it jurisdiction. Further, based on the actual prejudice of this court in deterring appeal as mentioned above, Petitioner respectfully requests change of court of appeal to the First District Court of Appeal in San Francisco. and remanded to another court of appeal due to severe conflicts of interest where Petitioner is the victim of these court crimes, and they are defendants/appellees in another related case in the D.C. that no reasonable person will believe Petitioner may have a fair appeal in California Sixth Appellate District Court.

III.MAY 28, 2020 ORDER OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY COURT DENYING VACATING DISMISSAL SHOULD BE REVERSED BASED ON CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE WHICH SHOWS JUDICIAL CONSPIRACY AND EXTRINSIC FRAUDS WITH ABOUT 20 FELONIES OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 6200-01 INVOLVED IN DISMISSING THE CASE ON OCTOBER 8, 2019 THAT THE DISMISSAL BY SANTA CLARA COUNTY COURT SHOULD BE REVERSED AND VENUE BE CHANGED TO SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT DUE TO DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

Since November 2014, Santa Clara County Court has strictly enforced its Civil Local Rule 8(c) (App.28) which requires a reservation with its Law and Motion Department and in turn, it requires the moving party to clear the hearing date with the opposing party. Without a reservation, no motion can be filed. Evidence supporting reversal of dismissal by the trial court and remand to another court for this case includes:

(1) Civil Local Rule 8(c) is the **undisputed evidence of judicial conspiracy of dismissal** as without the Court's assistance, Appellees' motion to dismiss would be impossible to be filed.

(2) In denying Petitioner's application to reopen discovery to investigate how the motion was filed, both Judge Kulkarni and Respondents' counsel conceded that it is undisputed that respondents did not make a reservation for their motion to dismiss.

(3) Judge Christopher Rudy was not a case management judge and would only substitute in Judge Kulkarni on October 8, 2019.

(4) Judge Rudy knew or had reason to know that he should not handle this case as the last order in the court file was Judge Peter Kirwan's 12/15/2017 (App.50) recusal order where he recused because of his membership with American Inns of Court with a defendant. Rudy failed to disclose that he had the same membership with respondents through the American Inns of Court such that based on the doctrine of stare decisis, Judge Rudy must be recused.

(5) No reasonable judge would have granted dismissal because the Respondents have failed to give notice of termination of stay as required by CRC Rule 3.650(d)(App.19). Without lifting the stay, a motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute cannot be granted at all pursuant to Rule 3.515(j).

(6) Unaltered efilng stamp for their Certificate of Service of the motion to dismiss was surfaced as Page 103 of Declaration of Suzie Tagliere in

support of Respondents' Opposition to Petitioner's motion to vacate dismissal, filed with the trial court on 3/11/2020. It shows an efiling envelop number of #3406422 and efiling date of 9/18/2019. All other papers for the motions shows erasing the 9/18/2019 with a new typeset of 9/12/2019. (App.42-47) But the docket shows another efiling envelop of #340831(App.48) which indicates that there were 5 steps to alter a paper and the one who did the efiling for #340831 was Janet Everson, Respondents' attorney as being noted by the clerk for "motion". The documents of Respondents' motion to dismiss must be taken off from the docket, typed over 9/12/19, re-file with #340831 envelop, and removed envelop from each record as shown on the court's website—4 or 5 steps for each document.

(7) This P.103's unaltered efiling stamps prove that Suzie Tagliere must know how and why the efiling stams on Respondents' motion to dismiss were altered but she refused to respond. (App.43)

(8) The Clerk Supervisor also did not have an answer regarding the alterations as shown in App.42. Therefore, Judge Kulkarni's 5/28/2020 Order stating the efiling stamps were "corrected" by the Clerk is not supported by any evidence.

(9) Even with 9/12/2019's filing date, the notice was still insufficient as there was no personal service, no written agreement to electronic service and

Petitioner did not receive any notice as Respondents sent to the extinct email of attorneylindashao@gmail.com that they had their friend Google suspend that account such that Petitioner was unable to know existence of such motion to dismiss. If by mail, the 16 working days' notice needs to add additional 5 days and there were no 5 days for mail.

(10) After Judge Theodore Zayner became the Presiding Judge of the trial court, he changed the Civil Local Rule 8(c) to conceal the evidence of judiciary corruption. Based on spoliation of evidence doctrine, there is an adverse inference that Santa Clara County Court was purging the incriminating evidence of conspiracy in dismissing this case by altering Civil Local Rule 8(c). Zayner has a past history of surreptitiously grabbed all court files from the jury trial courtroom (Judge Derek Woodhouse) and caused Volume 5 of court records to be disappeared and grabbed away the original deposition transcripts of Respondent James McManis and Respondent Michael Reedy. (App. has helped Respondents to block child custody return by refusing to hold any evidentiary hearing for 2 more years and assigned the case to Judge Patricia Lucas without disclosing that they are both closely socialized with respondents through the American inns of Court.

Therefore, fraud is clearly involved and with the severity of court crimes and conflicts of interest, Petitioner respectfully request the Court to reverse the May 28, 2020's Order denying setting aside dismissal and change court based on severe conflicts of interest.

IV.CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE OF COURT'S CRIMES IN REPEATEDLY GENERATING FALSE NOTICES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE §6203 AND REPEATED VIOLATION OF CRC RULE 8.57 IN DISMISSING THE CHILD CUSTODY APPEAL (H040395) WHICH JUSTIFY EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF TO REVERSE DISMISSAL AND REVERSE THE CHILD CUSTODY ORDER OF JUDGE PATRICIA LUCAS WHEN IT APPEARED TO BE DRAFTED BY RESPONDENTS.

1. Ms. Meera Fox testified about judicial conspiracy existed and continued the shenanigans of dismissal of the child custody appeal.(App.78-79).
2. The Sixth Appellate District dismissed twice. The first time was by way of a Saturday notice dated on 3/12/2016 and Presiding Judge Conrad Rushing issued a dismissal order without a noticed motion, which was required by Rule 8.54. The second time was a false docket entry framing

a non-existent notice of default for the same reason that Petitioner did not procure the records.

3. At the time when that fake entry was put in the child custody appeal docket, Petitioner discovered that the court removed her divorce case from the court's website completely and complained to Presiding Judge on 3/6/2017. Lucas refused to correct the false docket notice, and refused to put back the family case docket of 2015-1-F:126882 until about 8 months later. (App.101) This irregular docket hiding even is more likely because the Court in faking the notice of not procuring records, had altered the docket of the divorce case and purged the filing of Certificate of Court Reporter's Waiver by Court Reporter Julie Serna, who transcribed the child custody trial, on May 8, 2014 to waive deposit as she was paid $3,072.60 for the trial transcripts for the child custody trial. Such purging docket violates Government Code §6200 and the false notices violate§6203.
4. McManis hired a hacker to purge all data base of Petitioner such that Petitioner had no records of fully paid the reporter's transcript.
5. Respondents' counsel Lambie also perceived that it was Santa Clara County court's issue in refusing to prepare the records on appeal. (App.96)

6. The hard copy of the Certification showed up as shown in App.98 and the check payment record also was found as in App.97.
Therefore, the dismissal of child custody appeal in H040395 which was later appealed to this court with petition No. 18-569 (App.93) based on failure to procure the records should be reversed and also Judge Patrical Lucas's child custody order of 11/4/2013 should be reversed. Petitioner has submitted to this Court many times about evidence of dangerous mental illness of her divorce case Respondent Tsan-Kuen Wan such that child custody should be immediately returned to Petitioner.
Based on the gross injustice and solid evidence of court crimes, the United States Supreme Court is asked a renovated measure to **vacate all involved orders regarding child custody and immediately release the minor**, now 16, who has not had her mother around for 11 years, **to Petitioner**. Writ should be issued for this extraordinary situations.

is not bound by the two years restriction in C.C.P. §170.1(a)(2)(B). Here, Folan must be recused as she did acted beyond "gave advice" in this proceeding. Such behaviors include:

i. In her 6/16/2015 Order declaring Plaintiff Shao as a vexatious litigant Folan's acts mandated disqualification under C.C.P. §170.1(a)(2)(A) or §170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) include:

(a) Folan knowingly and willfully granted Defendants' fatally-flawed motion to declare vexatious litigant when no reasonable judge would have granted the motion for lacking a declaration that may prove Plaintiff had repeated actions "that are so devoid of merit and so frivolous without reasonable probability of success that may qualify for consideration as a proceeding for vexatious litigant", according to the holding of Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 963.

(b) Moreover, Folan's malice in granting the motion despite of this this fatal flaw is shown in the very same order where Folan stated on its last Page. Folan found defendants' "failure to satisfy their burden of persuasion" and wrote: "But since the Court already found Defendants presentation of the argument and evidence in this regard to be incomplete, there is no need to address the above issues" Disregard of failure to

satisfy defendants' burden of persuasion, Folan unreasonably granted the motion.

(c) Folan *sua sponte* raised new facts for defendants in her order of 6/16/2015 that **were beyond Defendants' motion** and **further disallowed Plaintiff to rebut such new facts,** which is an act violating structural error due process. Defendants' motion mentioned 5 proceedings that Plaintiff lost lawsuit in the preceding 7 years. When Folan found that defendants' motion failed to establish 5 proceedings lost in 7 years as required to declare a vexatious litigant, instead of denying the motion, Folan acted more than "giving advice" by sua sponte raised new issues of facts first time on the eve of the hearing, in her tentative decision issued in the afternoon of June 15, 2015, to add 7 proceedings of summary denial in appellate courts arising from the divorce case that is beyond Defendants' motion, to create 10 lost proceedings in 7 years; and further disallowed Plaintiff to present evidence to rebut the new facts sua sponte added by her and disallowed Plaintiff to make arguments more than 10 minutes. When Plaintiff contested the time was insufficient, Folan disallowed another time to allow Plaintiff to complete her argument to contest the tentative decision. Folan's actual serving as their attorney beyond the statutory

requirement of "gave advice" was very obvious to any reasonable person. Defendants did not include the 7 summary denial orders by appellate courts as these proceedings cannot be legally counted a lost proceeding as they have no precedential effect as being summarily denied. See, Kowis v. Howard, 3 Cal.4th 888 (1992).

(d) When defendants' motion failed to be supported by a declaration and failed their burden of persuasion as commented by Folan herself, Folan willfully quoted finding of Judge Patricia Lucas' child custody order of November 4, 2013 as the only evidence to support repetitiveness or frivolousness, when no reasonable judge would have done so as that order was pending appeal. Folan's malice knowing that she could not quote Lucas's finding as evidence is proven by Page 9, Lines 15-16 of her 6/16/2015 Order where Folan wrote the following: "A judgment is final for all purposes when all avenues for direct review have been exhausted (Holcomb, supra, at p. 1502; Childs v. Paine Webber, Inc. (1994) 29 CA 4th 982, 993) Thus the pending appeals prevent this Court from properly adjudicating Plaintiff a vexatious litigant on the basis of the underlying Court of Appeal cases. (See Childs, supra, at p. 993)." [emphasis added]

(e) Folan forged the date for the Prefiling Order.

1. the envelop mailing that Prefiling order was postmarked by a machine to be "6/18/2015"
2. it was not entered into the docket until 8/15/2017, two years later. Such belated docket entry took place when Judge Zayner, Defendants' buddy, was in charge as a civil supervising judge
3. Tsan-Kuen Wang's declaration dated June 23, 2015 (App.109) did not present the Prefiling Order. If the Prefiling order was available, Wang would hve attached the Prefiling order instead of the 14 pages's order.
4. No deputy clerk would be willing to enter into the docket this Prefiling Order. It was only entered into the docket two years later, on 8/15/2017, by a "contractor" of this Court; with a backdated entry of 6/16/2015. This appears that all deputy clerks knew this Prefiling Order was fraudulently made.

Any reasonable person knowing the fact would believe Judge Folan cannot have created the Prefiling Order without committing ex parte communications with Defendants, Folan's clients, to help ensure Plaintiff's parental deprival to be permanent which is the Prefiling Order's only utility before this case's appeal--- to unreasonably stall Plaintiff from filing a motion to change custody. In Buhl Independent School Dist.v.

Neighbors of Woodcraft, 289 F.196 (9th Cir. 1923) and in Anthony v. County of jasper, 101 U.S. 693, the US Supreme Court as well as the 9th Circuit both held that false date is equivalent to false signature. The offense of forgery even though was used in the court proceeding is considered to beadministrative in nature with applicability of 18 U.S.C. §1001 (conspiracy felonies), and may be considered as a crime of conspiracy. In California, forged court's records by employees of the court is a felony under Government Code §6200-01.

V. The Prefiling order should be vacated as it is not supported by a statement of decision

Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 963 held that a prefiling order not supported by a statement of decision is void for violation of due process. In *Holcomb v. U.S. Bank National, Association*, et al., 129 Cal.App.4th 1494 (2005), the Court held that "the order did not cite section 391.7 and does not purport to restrict Holcomb's ability to file future lawsuits."

No where in Folan's 6/16/2015 14-page Order mentioned "Prefiling Order" and the order did not mean to issue a Prefiling Order as a matter of law under Holcomb because Folan's 14 page order of 6/16/2015 did not mention the required language of "section 391.7" to qualify her 14 pages order to be an order for Prefiling Order.

Petitioner respectfully request the Court to vacate the prefiling order. The Prefiling Order was illegally used to stall child custody return. This Court cancelled an ex parte application of Plaintiff in July 2015 based on the Prefiling Order. Moreover, on 4/29/2016, Judge Joshua Weinstein "cancelled" all motions filed by Plaintiff, when that Order appeared to be drafted from someone outside of the court as it was blurry, not done in the court, and had no proof of service. Then, thenPresiding Judge Rise Pichon, without any notice, motion, or hearing, created a sua sponte Order of May 27, 2016 to require Plaintiff to make vexatious litigant application to the Presiding Judge for any motions Plaintiff would make in the family court setting.

VI. THE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT ORDERS SHOULD BE REVERSED AS THE RECORDS ON APPEAL WERE INCOMPLETE

Santa Clara County court directed its clerk R. Delgado to forge a Notice of Completion of Records on appeal on 12/12/2017. Sixth Appellate District used that to deny Petitioner's motion to enlarge records on appeal in H042531 or reversed the orders as lack of important records to enable review. Later, Ms. Delgado created a certification herself to verify that indeed important papers for records on appeal to enable Petitioner's appeal were missing. (App.52 &53)

VII. SANTA CLARA COUNTY FAKED A MINUTES ORDER TO FAKE A FACT THAT ALL ISSUES RAISED BY PETITIONER TO CHANGE VENUE WERE ALREADY DECIDED, WHICH IS SHOWN IN JUDGE KULKARNI'S ORDER OF 5/28/2020; THUS VENUE MUST BE CHANGED AS SANTA CLARA COUNTY COURT CONSPIRED WITH RESPONDENTS IN AVOIDING MENTIONING THE RELATIONSHIPS RESPONDENTS HAD WITH SANTA CLARA COUNTY COURT

On April 28, 2017 was the last hearing in front of Judge Woodhouse, after a lengthy stay of the jury trial. Petitioner moved to change venue, as the 12th times of her motion in front of Judge Woodhouse. New evidence was proffered to Judge Woodhosue that both sides' expert witnesses concurred that respondent McManis does have attorney client relationship with Santa Clara County Court. Woodhouse, after denied 11 times, expressed that he had no authority to grant change venue and such motion must be made in front of the Presiding Judge, i.e., Judge Patricia Lucas.

Petitioner then filed the motion, as directed by the court, to be in front of Judge Maureen Folan. A fraudulent tentative decision was issued on October 30, 2017 which were

inconsistent with the facts. Therefore, Judge Folan issued the order of 11/21/2017 to procedurally denied the motion, without adjudicating on the merits. Petitioner then followed instruction to make an application in front of Judge Woodhouse to partially lift the stay in order to have the court consider the motion to change venue. Y et Judge Peter Kirwan appeared to block the application to lift stay to be heard in front of Judge Woodhouse. Judge Kirwan denied the application despite Petitioner cautioned his conflicts of interest about his close social relationship with Respondents through the American Inns of Court. That was how Kirwan issued the 12/15/2017 Order to recuse himself based on relationship with Respondents through the American Inns of Court.

The Tentative Ruling apparently was drafted by Respondent. For the first time in the court's history, the Tentative Ruling became "Minute Order" and the date of the Tentative Ruling was altered from 10/30 to 1o/31/2017 to fool the public. On the docket, this Tentative Ruling was being fraudulently docketed as 11/1/2017's minute order.

And the real order of 11/21/2017 (App.56-57) was "concealed" from the docket. See the fraudulent "Minute order" in App.54-55. See the docket of this Court which showed that the Minute Order

has an attachment but not for 11/21/2017 Order. In concealing the ruling of Folan that she did not deny on the merits, the court caused an entry that "This lawsuit is Stayed in all regards until disposition ofthe subject appeal. *See order for more details."

As shown in Meera Fox's Declaration (App.65-93), there are three relationship between McManis respondent and Santa Clara County Court and the Court never ruled on, which is because of the conflicts of interest that McManis influenced Santa Clara County Court not to rule on the merits of Petitioner's Motion to Change Venue:

(1) McManis represented Santa Clara County Court in at least one unidentified matter. McManis is attorney for many judges/justices and provided free legal services as gifts to them.

(2) McManis has colleague relationship with all judges who have worked at Santa Clara County Court as he has been appointed as Special Master—quasi-employee of the court- for many years..

(3) McManis is a leading attorney of American Inns of Court and respondents closely socialized with about 30 judges/justices for one location alone--- William A. Ingram American Inn of Court. There is no information on how many judges that mcManis socialized through San Francisco Bay

Area Intellectual Property Rights American Inn of Court, nor how many he socialized at Edward Coke American inn of Court (based on recent discovery of judicial conspiracy between McManis and DC Circuit Court of Appeal to summary affirm the dismissal order of the trial court on July 31, 2019.)

As a result of this extreme and egregious injustice to block decision on the merits of a motion to change venue based on public view of impossible to have impartial tribunal, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to order change venue to San Francisco Superior Court for both the family case and this civil case..

VIII. NEW CIVIL LOCAL RULE 8(C) SHOULD BE INVALIDATED AS IT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS AND CONFLICTS WITH C.C.P. SECTION 1005

As mentioned above, Petitioner's new motion to vacate dismissal and all orders of Folan was withheld by the Clerk's Office in not giving out a hearing date and has been 18 days since November 4, 2021. Such practice violates a litigant's fundamental right to have reasonable access to the court. A clerk has ministerial duty to file paper but this new local rule empowers the clerk's office to betray the basic function of a clerk's office for the court.

Dated: November 22, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yi Tai Shao

Yi Tai Shao