
Yi Tai Shao, Petitioner-Appellant-Applicant

v.

TaniCantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice at California Supreme Court, Clerk Jorge Navarrete, Mary J. Greenwood, Presiding Justice of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner at Santa Clara County Superior Court of California, Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Maureen A. Folan, Judge Rise Pichon, James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm, and Tsan-Kuen Wang

**REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.,
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE
SAMUEL ALITO, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN, ASSOCIATE
JUSTICE SONIA SOTOMEYER, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE NEIL GORSUCH,
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRETT KAVANAUGH AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICE
KANJI JACKSON; MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**

Yi Tai Shao, Esq.

Shao Law Firm, PC

Mailing address:

P.O. Box 280

Big Pool, MD 21711

Tel.: (408) 873-3888

Fax: (408) 418-4070

attorneyshao@outlook.com

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
POLICE OFFICE

2022 JUL 24 PM 10:18

0792M

Table of Contents

I. IN THIS PETITION 22-28, ACTUAL PREJUDICE OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS HAS ALREADY BEEN SHOWN BY THE UNUSUAL DELAY IN DOCKETING AND POSTING THIS PETITION NO. 22-28 ON THE COURT'S WEBSITE.....	8
#2 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and II: There Were 4 Orders Since December 2015 Regarding Recusal based on Judges' Membership At American Inns Of Court Foundation Under 28 U.S.C.455(a): (1) Judge Peter Kirwan's Order Of 12/15/2017 At Santa Clara County Superior Court In Shao v. Mcmanis, et al. (2012-1-Cv-220571), (2) Judge Socrates Manoukian's Order Of 12/2/2015 (2012-1-Cv-220571), (3) California Supreme Court's Order Of 8/25/2021 In S269711 Showing Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye's Not Participating In Voting; And (4) Supreme Court Order Of 12/14/2020 In Petition No. 20-524 Showing Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Stephen Breyer, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice SoniaSotomeyer DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN VOTING; therefore all justices, except Justice Amy Coney Barrett, must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a).....	10
#3 FACTS REQUEST JUDICIAL NOTICE: JUDICIAL CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE PETITIONER OF CHILD CUSTODY BY CALIFORNIA COURTS AS DIRECTED BY MCMANIS FAULKNER LAW FIRM, JAMES MCMANIS AND MICHAEL REEDY	11
#4 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and III: #4 Facts For Judicial Notice: All Seven Justice Failed To Perform Their Paramount Constitutional Duty To Decide On Requests For Recusal Because Of Undisputable Illegal Gifts Of Temple Bar Scholarship And Their Participation Of The Illegal Function Of Mentorship Of American Inns Of Court Foundation That Caused Them To Violate The Ethical Rules Of Avoiding Ex Parte Communication; As their failure to decide the Requests for Recusal took place in each Peitions that are related to this Petition, They Must Be Recused From Handling This Petition 22-28.	20
A. FIVE PRESENT JUSTICES, CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES THOMAS, ALITO, KAGAN, SOTOMEYER WHO ARE DEFENDANTS AND RESPONDANTS IN THE RELATED CASE/APPEAL OF SHAO V. ROBERTS, ET AL MUST BE RECUSED BASED ON DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) (U.S.D.C. for the D.C. with case number of 1:18-cv-01233 RC and U.S.D.C. for the E.Calif. with case number of 22-cv-00325-JAM-AC) AS THE LAWSUITS ARE RELATED TO PETITIONS 11-11119, 14-7244, 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-639, 20-524, 21-881 AND 22-28.	20

#5 REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE (whole section): Petition 21-881 is Related To This Petition 22-28 As The Fraudulent Prefiling Order That Came From 21-881 Was Used To Block Petitioner's Right To Access The Court to get her child custody back, that the conflicts of interest involved in 21-881 require 7 present Justices (other than Associate Justice Barrett and Associate Justice Jackson) to be recused.	20
B. All SEVEN JUSTICES PARTICIPATED IN AIDING AND ABETTING THE 111 FELONIES WHILE CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERETS WAS INVOLVED WITH 84 FELONES AT THIS COURT	25
#6 Facts for judicial notice: All defendants in the two civil lawsuits of Shao v. Roberts have tacitly admitted to 111 felonies committed by the federal courts (including 84 felonies committed by this Court and countless court crimes committed by California courts orchestrated by James McManis, when the courts and all involved judges and justices have been related to McManis by way of American Inns of Court Foundations.	25
HOW THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURTCORRUPTED THE U.S. JUDICIARY WITH THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT WHERE PETITIONER IS A VICTIM.	25
C. ALL SEVEN JUSTICES CONSPIRED TOGETHER NOT TO DECIDE ON REQUESTS FOR RECUSAL BECAUSE THEY WERE UNABLE TO DENY THEIR FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT BY THE ILLEGAL GIFT OF TEMPLE BAR SCHOLARSHIP	26
#7 Fact for Judicial Notice Temple Bar Scholarship is an illegal gift which had been distributed frequently to the US Supreme Court Justices as shown in the table	26
TABLE OF GIFTS ALLOCATED TO JUSTICES OF THE U.S.	27
#8 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: All seven justices other than Justice Barrett and Jackson had conspired together that not one of them would decide on any of petitioner's Request for Recusal when Chief Justice Roberts conspired with Clerk Scott Harris and Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins not to file/post any of the appendix which contain evidence for these Requests for Recusal; in Petition 20-524, Petitioner's Request for Recusal was altered to appear there were no appendix filed	28
#9 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and JN-1 AMICUS CURIAE MOTION OF MOTHERS OF LOST CHILDREN altered by this Court, after refusing to decide	28
E. SUPREME COURT VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND DUE PROCESS OF CONSTITUTION IN DETERRING FILING OF AMICUS CURIAE MOTION OF MOTHERS OF CHILDREN TO BE FILED IN PETITION 17-82, IN CONSPIRACY WITH JAMES MCMANIS, MICHAEL REEDY AND MCMANIS FAULKNER	30

F. Temple Bar Scholarship was used to reward Judge Patricia Millett in conspiring with both American Inns of Court and its leading attorney/founder James McManis to dismiss the appeal of Shao v. Roberts where the present 5 Justices were all at default in Shao v. Roberts, et al., 1:18-cv-01233RC	30
#10FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Judge Patricia Millett And Judge Pillard Conspired With James Mcmanis To Dismiss The Entire Appeal of No.19-5014 where 5 Justices of this Court had been at default in the District Court case.	30
A. JUDGE PATRICIA MILLETT AND JUDGE PILLARD CONSPIRED WITH JAMES MCMANIS TO DISMISS THE ENTIRE APPEAL	32
#11 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: On July 31, 2019,James McManis, Michael Reedy, and McManis Faulkner law firm and their California cases' attorney Janet Everson and their federal attorney James Lassart conspired with at least Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Cornelius T.L. Pillard as majority of the Appellate Panel of 19-5014 at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal to summarily affirm the entire sua sponte dismissal order of Judge Rudolph Contreras of 1/17/2019 without conducting any appellate review on its merits and the actual dismissal of the entire appeal took place 74 days later on October 13, 2019.	32
B. Chief Justice Merrick Garland, Judge Millett and Judge Pillard are suspected to assist AIC to block Petitioner's access to the appeal process	35
#12 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE:American Inns of Court Foundation conspired with D.C. Circuit to take Petitioner's name off CM/ECF system on or about March 18, 2019 to avoid Petitioner to be given notice of AIC motion for summary affirmance, and put Petitioner back CM/ECF on April 9, 2019 to get Judge Patricia Millett's Order to Show Cause why not granted AIC's motion based on non-opposition of Petitioner, These facts were not disputed by any party in all the proceedings of 19-5014, 20-524, the 60(b) motion proceeding at the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. and 21-5210. These facts prove that American Inns of Court is very influential to the D.C. Circuit, even for commission of crimes of alteration of records of the Court. This may explain why Judge Millett got the reward from AIC for Fall 2019, the same year of these irregularities in 19-5014.....	35
#13 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Judge Millett And Pillard Refused To Decide Issues Of Change Of Venue, Petitioner's motion for summary reversal and response to order to show cause not to summarily affirm Judge Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019 and all new facts presented in each of the 3 Petitions for Rehearing	35
IV. SUBJECT OF PETITION 22-28	39
#14 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: SUBJECT OF PETITION 22-28.....	39
#15 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: All factual statements contained in Petitioner's Verified Statement for Disqualification of *California Chief Justice	

TaniCantil-Sakauye are true and irrevocable. California Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(4) ["when no answer is filed in response to a statement of disqualification, the facts set out in the statement are taken as true"]; Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County, 2 Cal.App.5th 10, pp.30&40 (2016) (not only all facts in the verified statements are irrevocably admitted to be true but all orders issued by the conceded judge are "void."); see also, Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc., 234 Cal.App.3d 4. 40

#16 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: MCMANIS ADMITTED TACITLY TO TANI'S ADMISSION AND ALL FACTS IN PETITIONER'S VERIFIED STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION; REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ECF26-1 as JN-2 .with document link of

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSlKyPrHH7ZrPf-g?e=3Rqxb6>..... 40

#17 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: The undisputed and irrevocable admission of California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye on 8/25/2021 through S269711 proceeding include 8 material facts which are recited by many documents in the proceedings of No.21-5210 and 2:22-cv-00325. E.g., the new complaint in Shao v. Roberts, et al., 2:22-cv-00325, ECF#1 with the document link of

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ60HZStTgEb2tRb?e=evTcFS>. The eight conceded facts in fact constitutes the major basis for the second lawsuit of Shao v. Roberts, et al. See i.d. ECF#1, ¶1, P.13, lines 14-17. The eight conceded facts were recited in ECF#1, ¶3, p.15-17. They are: 41

#18 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Facts admitted by McManis , Reedy, McManis law firm, their attorney Janet Everson, and James Lassart in ECF 1921981 43

#19 FACT FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: McManis Faulkner law firm's tacit admission in Petition 21-881 including the fact that they drafted Judge Patricia Lucas's child custody order of 11/4/2013: 44

~~#20 Petition 22-28 is related to all petitions filed by Petitioner~~ 51

#21 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Seven Justices of this Court must be recused for knowingly harbor the crimes conspired by Chief Justice Roberts Clerk Harris, and other deputy clerks to block 6 filings and failed to vacate 2/22/2022 order when it was undisputed that Chief Justice who has conflicts of interest had participated or led in voting on 2/22/2022 order in Petition 21-881 when "Motion to Transfer" was conspicuously noted on the cover of the Petition for Rehearing; JN-3 through 7, the five papers blocked from filing in 21-881. The concealment includes all appendix to the Request for Recusal as well as the following five motions: 51

V. MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IS PERMISSIBLE TO BE FILED IN

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI PROCEEDING

#22 Petitioner filed a Motion for Temporary Injunctive Relief or TRO with the USDC for Eastern California together with a new Complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et al, 2:22-cv-00325-JAM-AC, which was dismissed at the beginning of litigation within 3 business days of deposing the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i) as the judges are members/officers of Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court and closely socialized with California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye and James McManis; with the same style of dismissal by Judge Rudolph Contreras in 1:18-cv-01238RC--- all judges and justices violated willfully Due Process, First Amendment of Constitution and 28 U.S.C. 455 (a) and (b)(5)(i) and the Justices for DC

DC for Eastern Calif. together with which was dismissed at exposing the Justices of the U.S. 53

[hacker deleted]

<i>Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County</i> , 2 Cal.App.5th 10, pp.30&40 (2016) 4,	39
<i>Lowe v. Letsinger</i> , 772 F.2d 308, 313 (7 th Cir. 1985)	53
<i>McDonald v. Smith</i> , 472 U.S. 479, 484 (1985).....	53
<i>Snyder v. Nolen</i> , 380 F.3d 279 (7 th Cir. 2004),	53
<i>State v. Allen</i> , 2010 WI 10 at page 35 (2010).	27
<i>Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.</i> , 234 Cal.App.3d 4 (1991)	39

Statutes

(b)(5)(iv)	7
18 U.S.C. §1506 and §2071	8, 35
18 U.S.C. §1506 and §2071	28
18 U.S.C. §371	27
28 U.S.C. §455(a)	2, 9, 18, 19
28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i)	passim
28 U.S.C. §455(a)	6, 9, 28
28 U.S.C. §455(a) and (b)(1)	6
28 U.S.C. §455(a),	30
28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i)	30, 32, 50, 52
28 USC §455(b)(5)(i)	51
42 U.S.C. §1983	53
California Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(4)	4, 39

Other Authorities

Judge Socrates Manoukian	2, 9, 10
--------------------------------	----------

Rules

Rule 5-300(a) of California Rules of Professional Conduct	40
Supreme Court Rules Rule 10	53
Supreme Court Rules Rule 5	53

Regulations

Guide of Judicial Policy Vol.2C, §620.45	26
the Guide of Judicial Policy, Vol.2C §620.35(7)	26

**MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE AND REQUESTS FOR RECUSAL OF
ALL JUSTICES EXCEPT JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT
TO THE RESPONDENTS AND ALL JUSTICES OF THIS COURT INCLUDING
TO EIGHT JUSTICES REQUESTED FOR RECUSAL (Chief Justice John G.
Roberts, Jr., Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice Samuel Alito,
Associate Justice Elena Kagan, Associate Justice Sonia Sotomeyer, Associate
Justice Neil Gorsuch, Associate Justice Brett Kavanaugh And Associate Justice
Kanji Jackson):**

In support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari No.22-28, Application to
Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett and Request for Recusal of Chief Justice John
G. Roberts, Jr., Associate Justices Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Elena Kagan,
Sonia Sotomeyer, Neil Gorsuch And Brett Kavanaugh, Petitioner filed a separate
motion for judicial notice and further respectfully requests judicial notice being
taken regarding the following documents and 22 facts which had been undisputed
or admitted in many proceedings filed by Petitioner with this Court, D.C. Circuit
(Appeal No. 19-5014 and Appeal No. 21-5210), U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (1:18-cv-
00123RC) which shows evidence of direct conflicts of interest of Chief Justice
Roberts, Associate Justices Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer, Thomas, Gorsuch and
Kavanaugh that they must be disqualified from deciding on Petition for Writ of
Certiorari No.22-28 pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(a) and (b)(1) (“has a personal bias or
prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts
concerning the proceeding; (b)(3)(material witness concerning the proceeding), and
(b)(5)(iii) [is known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially

affected by the outcome of the proceeding], and (b)(5)(iv) ["likely to be a material witness in the proceeding"]. Given the grave manipulation of James McManis and American Inns of Court as proven below by the facts to be taken judicial notice of, there is a reasonable appearance that the new Justice Jackson will not be able to be fair and impartial and unable to be rid of the manipulation of American Inns of Court Foundation and/or McManis due to her reported long membership with the American Inns of Court, when Petitioner's lengthy parental deprivation as the subject of this Petition 22-28 is contributed significantly by the American Inns of Court.

I. IN THIS PETITION 22-28, ACTUAL PREJUDICE OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS HAS ALREADY BEEN SHOWN BY THE UNUSUAL DELAY IN DOCKETING AND POSTING THIS PETITION NO. 22-28 ON THE COURT'S WEBSITE.
#1 REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF FACTS

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. has the duty to supervise the daily operation of the U.S. Supreme Court, including in charge of the Clerk's Office and the work of Clerk Scott S. Harris. Chief Justice Roberts conspired with Scott S. Harris, Deputy Clerk Danny Jordan Bickell, Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins and Deputy Clerk Emily Walker to block filing, conceal from filing and not record on the docket of Petition 21-881 of 6 documents, including returned unfiled Petition for Writ of Mandamus [28 U.S.C. §1651] and "Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett to Immediately Stay the Proceeding and Issue a Writ of Mandamus to Correct the _____ Docket, to Declare 2/22/2022 [Order] to be Void, and Transfer the Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Second Circuit Court of Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1651(a)." <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU-2UwmrDUYdRt2t?e=Hl5GKF>.

Emily Walker returned the Application and Petition regarding 28 U.S.C. §1651(a) with a false ground that the Court has no jurisdiction, which violated Supreme Court Rules Rule 20, 22 and 23 of the Supreme Court Rules.

Again, about five months later, they conspired to delay docketing this Petition No. 22-28 (filed at 6:06 a.m. on 7/4/2022) by at least 4 days in order to “review” the Petition, which was eventually entered into the docket on July 8, 2022 but did not post the contents until Petitioner’s requests, on July 13, 2022.

RELEVANCY This fact proves that actual prejudice of Chief Justice Roberts has been shown in the *beginning* of this proceeding of Petition 22-28 which corroborated the admission of Respondent California Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye’s irrevocable admission on 8/25/2021 in S269711 (see Petition No.21-881) that she **conspired with James McManis to influence all Justices of the United States Supreme Court to ensure permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner.**

This Petition arising from the conspiracies that Tani’s used the Prefiling Order that she knew was fraudulent and a voidable order, to block Petitioner’s access to the court to get habeas corpus—her child Lydia back. The Prefiling Order issue was willfully suppressed, or blocked access to court by 7 Justices of this Court in conspiracy through Petition 18-800 and 21-881, where the justices failed to decide Requests for Recusal.

This is also relevant to prove that Chief Justice Roberts is responsible for this Court’s 84 felonies of 18 U.S.C. §1506 and §2071 mentioned in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Application to Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett filed in Petition 22-28.

#2 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and II: There Were 4 Orders Since December 2015 Regarding Recusal based on Judges' Membership At American Inns Of Court Foundation Under 28 U.S.C. §455(a): (1) Judge Peter Kirwan's Order Of 12/15/2017 At Santa Clara County Superior Court In Shao v. Mcmanis, et al. (2012-1-Cv-220571), (2) Judge Socrates Manoukian's Order Of 12/2/2015 (2012-1-Cv-220571), (3) California Supreme Court's Order Of 8/25/2021 In S269711 Showing Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye's Not Participating In Voting; And (4) Supreme Court Order Of 12/14/2020 In Petition No. 20-524 Showing Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Stephen Breyer, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Sonia Sotomeyer DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN VOTING; therefore all justices, except Justice Amy Coney Barrett, must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a).

In the case of Shao v. McManisFulkner, LLC, James McManis, Michael Reedy, and Catherine Bechtel (2012-1-cv-220571), Judge Peter Kirwan issued an order to recuse himself in response to Petitioner's Verified Statement of Disqualification. He wrote:

"in light of the undersigned's participation in the volunteer organization American Inns of Court with a named defendant in this matter, the undersigned will recuse himself."

Two years preceding Kirwan, in the same case, Judge Socrates Manoukian, recused Santa Clara County Court when he was assigned as the jury trial judge because his wife Justice Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian is a member of American Inns of Court. Santa Clara County Court and has had monthly meetings with Michael Reedy for 10+ years and the fact that James McManis admitted in his deposition transcript of his being an attorney of Santa Clara County Court and "some" judges/justices at Santa Clara County Court, Sixth District Court of Appeal and California Supreme Court, including 25, more or less, judges, Clerk, courtroom clerks, deputy bailiffs, court reporters at Santa Clara County, 1 unidentified Justice

at the Sixth District Court of Appeal and 1 unidentified Justice at California Supreme Court (this corroborated with California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye's admission on 8/25/2021).

In 2015, Judge Patricia Lucas (the judge having McManis Faulkner drafted the child custody order of 11/4/2013) was the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court. The 12/2/2015 Order of Manoukian to recuse Santa Clara County Court was removed from the docket of the civil case, apparently by the conspiracy of Presiding Judge Patricia Lucas, Supervising Judge Theodore Zayner and James McManis, and his firm McManis Faulkner. Judge Socrates Manoukian wrote to recuse "the Court":

"Upon review of the file in the above-entitled matter, the court will recuse itself because a person aware of the facts might reasonably entertain a doubt that the judge would not be able to be impartial."

#3 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: JUDICIAL CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE PETITIONER OF CHILD CUSTODY BY CALIFORNIA COURTS AS DIRECTED BY MCMANIS FAULKNER LAW FIRM, JAMES MCMANIS AND MICHAEL REEDY

At that time Respondents Lucas, Zayner and Mcmanis had plotted to dismiss the child custody appeal by a false excuse that Petitioner did not procure the child custody trial transcripts. In order to use such fraudulent excuse to dismiss child custody appeal (H040395) they plotted to purge the filing of "Notice of Court Reporter's Waiver of Deposit" that was filed by Court Reporter Julie Serna on 5/8/2014 with the divorce case of 2005-1-FL-126882, took the divorce case off from the court's website for about 10 months so that Petitioner was blocked from access, then kept directing the Appellate Unit (supervised by Susan Walker, with the same

last name as Emily Walker in this Court) to keep generating false notices falsifying a fact that Petitioner failed to pay the court reporter's transcripts and thus the child custody appeal must be dismissed. With repeated false notices, the child custody appeal was eventually dismissed by Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood, the wife of Judge Edward Davila, the starter of the judicial abduction of Lydia to plot "Permanent parental deprivation"; there is no doubt that Davila received a large sum of bribery from Respondent Tsan-Kuen Wang and was willing to do child abduction with his judicial power on a Case Management Conference (8/4/2010) without notice, motion or evidentiary hearing, when no judge in the US ever issued a substantive order on a case management conference. There is no doubt of the bribery and conspiracy corrupted with Davila, (Wang told social worker Misook Oh to call Family Court screener Jill Sardeson Wang's "bottom line", who then drafted the parental deprivation order, previewed by Davila, fraudulently induced Petitioner to take the 5 year old Lydia to the court, locked Lydia in Sardeson room by 3 hours, and abducted, put into Wang's car at about 5:50 p.m. of August 4, 2010, in front of all deputy policemen of Sunnyvale police at the court. See Petition 22-24, App.91-94.

Davila's order was vacated based on Petitioner's motion for extrinsic fraud and violation of due process. But Zayner, as manipulated by their American Inns of Court long term close friends, Michael Reedy and James McManis, maintained Davila's vacated order for another 2 years and replaced it with Lucas's 11/4/2013 "permanent child custody deprivation order", who then plotted to create fraudulent

notices to dismiss the child custody appeal. As of dismissal on 5/10/2018, not a piece of records on appeal was prepared by the Appellate Unit of Santa Clara County Court, with the supervisor being Susan Walker. Emily Walker never responded to Petitioner's inquiry whether she is a relative to Susan Walker.

Santa Clara County Court also blocked Petitioner from taking deposition of Tsan-Kuen Wang in contravention with California Family Code Section 218 which expressly authorizes discovery automatically reopen for post-divorce disputes. The parties's divorce judgment was 5/8/2018. After that, the court caused Petitioner's motion to compel deposition or motion to take deposition of Wang to be delayed by more than a year, then used Prefiling Order obtained by McManis, Respondent Judge Rise Pichon issued an order of 5/27/2016 to block Petitioner from filing a motion at her family case. (App.245) This is related to the subject to habeas corpus in Petition 22-28.

It was a miracle of God to direct Petitioner to issue a subpoena to CIGNA asking for all claims records of Wang and children. Then it came out about 275 pages of psychological claim records of Wang on 9/15/2014, which requires immediate child custody deprivation from Wang to Petitioner. McManis then influences all courts involved to summarily denied all requests of Petitioner (Petition 14-7244) and misused Prefiling Order obtained from his attorney Judge Maureen A. Folan, without any supporting Statement of Decision, to block child custody return.

All these judges, justices were bribed by American Inns of Court where McManis is the leading attorney, to an extent to conspire to sacrifice a life of a child, who has had no mother for 12 years!

Such judicial conspiracy of parental deprivation directed by “McManis Faulkner law firm, if not their individual attorneys” was attested by Attorney Meera Fox as an expert in the civil case, based on three relationship James McManis, Michael Reedy have had with the courts: attorney-client relationship where James McManis is Santa Clara County Court’s attorney and an attorney to 25 more or less judicial officers including judges at Santa Clara County Court, Sixth District Court of Appeal, James McManis is a long term quasi employee of Santa Clara County Court as a Special Master, and the William A. Ingram American Inn of Court, a child to American Inns of Court foundation, where there were about 100-110 members, about 30 judges/justices and about 70 attorneys who closely interacted.

Meera Fox attested to the public view of judicial conspiracy to dismiss child custody appeal of Petitioner as manipulated by James McManis and Michael Reedy through the American Inns of Court. Meera Fox’s declaration has been taken judicial notice of twice by California Supreme Court and no one ever made any objections to Fox’s declaration in all proceedings, California or federal. See Petition 22-28, App.161, et seq.

Respondent Judge Rise Pichon was the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court. She sua sponte, without any motion, nor hearing, issued a sua sponte order on May 27, 2016 (Petition 22-28, App.245) to require all motions to be

filed by Petitioner in her preexisting divorce case to get the preapproval of the Presiding Judge of the Court based on the Prefiling Order procured by McManis in the civil case. It was discovered in or about July 2021 that the judge issuing the Prefiling Order without being supported by a Statement of Decision, Respondent Judge Maureen A. Folan, was the attorney of record for James McManis and McManis Faulkner law firm on legal malpractice defense for at least 2.5 years.

The Prefiling Order was generated for the purpose to stop child custody return to Petitioner because the laws require immediate child custody change when Wang who stole the child custody on 8/4/2010 by corrupting with Edward Davila must be deprived of all custody until psychological evaluation; which he would not do as he has been very sick and let his attorney Sussman to conspire with Judge Mary Ann Grilli to take off the original order to require him to do psychological evaluation from 10/31/2011 Order. Sarcastically, while Petitioner was blocked and denied to file any motion to change child custody in her family court case, in the civil case where the Prefiling Order was from, Petitioner, however, continued being able to file motions without a need to get preapproval.

Pichon's order of 5/27/2016 was made after the All purpose judge Judge Joshua Weinstein's April 29, 2016 Order which had no proof of service, appearing faxed from extrajudicial source, ordered to take off from calendar all 4 motions of Petitioner, which included to vacate 5/3/2013 child support order, to modify child custody, to get Wang to be deposed and to change venue. Any reasonable person

will believe such crazy faxed order was from McManis Faulkner law firm to stall child custody return.[See Petition 22-28, App.244.]

As declared by Meera Fox about the motivation for the judicial conspiracy of California Six District Court of Appeal, Santa Clara County Court's clerk (under supervision of Susan Walker, the same last name as Emily Walker now handling this case filing) under direction of McManis Faulkner law firm (Petition 22-28,P.8; App.190) to dismiss child custody appeal (H040395; Petition for Writ of Certiorari No. 18-569):

"Since being sued by Ms. Shao for his malpractice, it has become important to Mr. Reedy and the law firm of McManis Faulkner, for whom Mr. Reedy works, to ensure that Ms. Shao not regain custody of her child, since as long as she does not get her child back, they can argue that their failure to advocate for her did not cause the damage that she suffered." (Petition 22-28,p.1; App.161)

James McManis, Michael Reedy and McManis Faulkner's procuring the Prefiling Order in June 2015 was after a wave of Petitioner's requests for emergency relief at all courts to get her child custody back based on the undisputed evidence of CIGNA subpoenaed psychological claims records of Respondent Tsan-Kuen Wang that Diplomat of American Forensic Psychologist Association, Dr. Jeffrey Kline declared that the claims records showed about 6 mental illnesses of Wang, and among them was a very dangerous mental disease that may pose imminent risk of life and harm to the minor and that disease started at the time of the minor's complaint of crazy child abuse by Respondent Wang: choked her neck,

poured water gun into her eyes, pulled her upside down and dropped her head against the hardwood floor, tripped her to cause many bruises, etc.

On 8/5/2010, after Lydia cried out loud to the policemen at Sunnyvale court parking lot when she was judicially abducted into her father's car "Father, You Liar!", on the ensuing evening, she was found to have two large purple eye bag below her beautiful eyes with one inch length and her hands were hidden in a coat, trembling, when her brother Louis asked the Sunnyvale police to stand by in order to say goodbye to his little sisi. (Petition 22-28, App.206-208)

With at least 30 Amicus Curiaes zealously tried to save Lydia in writing Amicus Curiae letters to California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye in 2011 when Respondent Theodore Zayner refused to return the child to Petitioner after Davila's 8/4/2010 order was vacated for violation of due process and extrinsic fraud.

On 8/25/2021's Order in S269711, a Petition for Review on illegal dismissal of the civil case, when was 10 years later after parental deprival, Tani eventually admitted irrevocably, by operation of law that she conspired with James McManis, his attorney, to deny all Petitions for Review to let the child be released to her mother. Tani recused herself implied but failed to file an answer. The Request for Recusal alleges her relationship with James McManis through the American Inns of Court membership.

In retaliation of Petitioner's exposure of Tani's irrevocable admission mandated by California Code of Civil Procedure Section 170.3(c)(4), knowing she

has direct conflicts of interest, without any notice, Tani signed an order on 1/25/2022 to suspend Petitioner's California Bar License. After she signed, a letter unsigned by anyone from California State Bar mailed a notice of suspension enclosing Tani's letter to suspend Bar License, based on the child support order of 5/3/2013 which is based on Davila's 8/4/2010 parental deprivation order that had been vacated. All local child support agencies and state bar staffs implemented the wish of Tani and refused to issue a release. When California Franchise Tax Board eventually would refund the imputed tax done by Tani and State Bar of California, without notice nor hearing, the thousands of money was immediately robbed by local child support agency, and who knows where the money went to as Wang is a very rich Engineering Manager at Intel Corporation.

Tani admitted that she influenced Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and other Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court (as being President of Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court of American Inns of Court) to ensure parental deprivation of Petitioner. Thus, this Court denied granting relief in Petition 11-11119 and Petition 14-7244 even after learning Dr. Kline's undisputable evidence of Wang's posing imminent danger to the minor. This very contentious child custody appeal where the courts purged the direct evidence that Petitioner had paid the child custody trial transcripts (i.e., Notice of Court Reporter's Waiver of Deposit filed on 5/8/2014), concealed Petitioner's divorce case from accessible by the public by 10 months, and issued false notices faking ground of dismissal based on Petitioner having not paid the reporter's transcript, went into the Supreme Court in 2018 with

Petition No. 18-569. What happened was--- all Justices refused to decide either the Request for Recusal nor the duly filed Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children. A year later, Chief Justice Roberts conspired with James McManis and Clerk Harris to alter the docket to purge from the court's record existence of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children.

The fourth order is 12/14/2020 order of this Court in Petition 20-524 where the present 5 Justices did not participate in voting, tacitly admitted to their relationship with James McManis through the American Inns of Court membership.

RELEVANCY

Therefore, all Justices of this court, except Justice Amy Coney Barrett, totally 8 Justices, are long term members or officers of American Inns of Court and reasonably appear to be unable to be impartial that the 8 Justices must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a).

#4 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and III: #4 Facts For Judicial Notice: All Seven Justice Failed To Perform Their Paramount Constitutional Duty To Decide On Requests For Recusal Because Of Undisputable Illegal Gifts Of Temple Bar Scholarship And Their Participation Of The Illegal Function Of Mentorship Of American Inns Of Court Foundation That Caused Them To Violate The Ethical Rules Of Avoiding Ex Parte Communication; As their failure to decide the Requests for Recusal took place in each Peitions that are related to this Petition, They Must Be Recused From Handling This Petition 22-28.

A. FIVE PRESENT JUSTICES, CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES THOMAS, ALITO, KAGAN, SOTOMEYER WHO ARE DEFENDANTS AND RESPONDANTS IN THE RELATED CASE/APPEAL OF SHAO V. ROBERTS, ET AL MUST BE RECUSED BASED ON DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) (U.S.D.C. for the D.C. with case number of 1:18-cv-01233 RC and U.S.D.C. for the E.Calif. with case number of 22-cv-00325-JAM-AC) AS THE LAWSUITS ARE RELATED TO PETITIONS 11-11119, 14-7244, 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-639, 20-524, 21-881 AND 22-28.

#5 REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE (whole section): Petition 21-881 is Related To This Petition 22-28 As The Fraudulent Prefiling Order That Came From 21-881 Was Used To Block Petitioner's Right To Access The Court to get her child custody back, that the conflicts of interest involved in 21-881 require 7 present Justices (other than Associate Justice Barrett and Associate Justice Jackson) to be recused.

McManis's conspiracies with the courts on dismissal as well as prefiling order in the Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al (2012-1-cv-220571) proceeding is Appeal Case No. H048651 at California Sixth District Court of Appeal and Petition for Review No. S269711 at California Supreme Court, and Petition for Writ of Certiorari No. 21-881 at this Court. As stated above, all Petitions arising from 220571 case is directly related to all Petitions arising from the divorce case of 2005-1-FL-126882 as the lengthy parental deprivation was caused by that civil case

whereMcManis procured a Prefiling Order from that civil case to deter child custody return to Petitioner by way of the “ridiculous”¹ May 27, 2016 Order of Respondent Rise Pichon until present.

Irregularities in Petition 21-881, as an appeal from S269711:

-
- (1) In Petition 21-881, Chief Justice, Clerk and three deputy clerks conspired to block, conceal from filing 6 documents in Petition 21-881;
 - (2) while 5 present Justices already impliedly recused themselves on 12/14/2020, they failed to decide for the 9th time the Request for Recusal and kept the case in their control in an apparent effort to **suppress the merits of Shao v. McManis et al from being decided**. In this regard, Petitioner’s First Amendment Right to Access the Court and Due Process Right were prejudiced by seven of them, Chief Justice Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer. The five Justices had failed to decide recusal 9 times plus two Amicus Curiae motions of Mothers of Lost Children. Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh also joined their conspiracies in not deciding on recusal.
 - (3) The 7 justices who failed to recuse, willfully retain in the case and willfully ignored the crimes committed by Chief Justice, even though “Request to Consider Motion to Transfer” was conspicuously noted on the cover for the Petition for Rehearing.

¹This word was used by California Supreme Court in Shalant v. Girardi, 51 C.4th 1164 (2011) [Petition 22-28, App.6] regarding the court used Prefiling Order to require preapproval of each motion in a preexisting case.

- (4) When Justice Roberts implied recused himself in the rehearing procedure, the other six Justices did not vote to vacate the 2/22/2022 Order where Roberts either led or voted with knowledge of his conflicts of interest.
- (5) The Petition for Rehearing was once taken off from the docket, on 3/22/2022, after being entered into the docket, which is a re-play of the felonies committed by this Court in Petition 20-524, where the 12/14/2020 order and 1/15/2021 judgment were taken off three times and Petition for Rehearing was blocked from filing.
- (6) James Mcmanis's name was again concealed from being enlisted as a Respondent on the docket of 21-881; with requests and 3 letters of notices, Chief Justice Roberts persisted on not to correct the docket of 21-881 (despite numerous requests, including to the US Attorney, this Court's felonies in removing the Amicus Curiae Motion from docket 18-569 and altering the docket remained there for 2 + years without correction. .

The identity of Respondents in Petition 17-82 shown on the docket of 17-82 was changed after October 2017 in that this Court removed the names of James McManis, Michael Reedy but kept only McManis Faulkner law firm as the Respondent.

As stated in Supplement Appendix filed on October 30 2017 with this Court in Petition No. 17-613, as the first thing in the morning on October 25, 2017, Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins talked to Deputy Clerk Michael Duggan to de-file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari just docketed in Petition 17-613, told him to change

the date of decision to be 6/28/2017 from 4/28/2017 and instructed Duggan never posted the individual names of James Mcmanis and Michael Reedy but only McManis Faulkner law firm. Such Supplement Appendix was never objected to by any person.

After Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. Clerk Scott Harris, Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins and Deputy Clerk Denny Jordan Bickell repeatedly ignored 3 letters of Petitioner regarding the crimes of concealment of filing of six papers, including later returned filing of the Petition for Writ based on 28 U.S.C. 1651(a) and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett by Deputy Clerk Emily Walker, Petitioner filed against them a Motion for Temporary Injunctive Relief or Temporary Restraining Order, together with the new complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et. al, 2:22-cv-00325. Yet to avoid deposition, it is obvious that Roberts directed Judge John A. Mendez to keep there in the case despite conflicts of interest and dismissed the case promptly on 4/20/2022, after Supreme court counsel was told the need to file a motion for protective order. They chose to do an easier way--- judicial corruption.

Petitioner's motion for TRO regarding the crimes in 21-881 was summarily denied without ever spending time of reading by Magistrate Judge Allison Claire and further affirmed summarily by Judge John A. Mendez, in willful violation and disregard of 28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i) as the two judges have direct conflicts of interest in being officers or members of the Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court of the American Inns of Court Foundation, which is a defendant in the very same case in front of them, and are regular friends to California Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye, retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy who are their close friends through Anthony M. Kennedy American Inn of Court of the American Inns of Court, who are both defendants in the case in front of them. (Motion for judicial notice)

This habeas corpus issue in this Petition as well as the crimes in 21-881 were both brought up via TRO motions in the same case. How Respondents in this case caused lengthy habeas corpus include:

- (1) Willfully blocked child custody return for nearly 2 years
- (2) Forged Judge Lucas's "permanent child custody order" on 11/4/2013
- (3) Disallowed the court reporter to file the transcripts of child custody trial of July 2013; purged Julie Serna's filing of Notice of Waiver of Deposit; disallowed Julie Serna to file the reporter's transcript; forced Julie Serna to alter the reporter's transcript to remove Judge Lucas's apologies about what happened and promised return of child on July 11, 2013; took the family case off, and forged false notices of default or non-compliance.
- (4) Delayed hearings or disallowed hearings on motions of Petitioner in Family Case. Then used Pichon to issue an order to apply Prefiling Order to the family case to block Petitioner from getting child back since 2015.
- (5) Influenced the American Inns of Court friend Justices to deny all review or certiorari.
- (6) Blocked all appellate reviews for all appeals arising from the family case or the civil case.

As stated above the habeas corpus is caused by Respondent Pichon's using the Prefiling order in Petition 21-881, to block Petitioner's fundamental right to access the court and stalled Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by 3 months then asked their American Inns of Court comrade justice to act on behalf of Tani to summarily deny the vexatious litigant application, which is now in front of this Court with Petition 22-28.

RELEVANCY

Therefore, the Justices of this Court who are Respondents in this same case should be recused from participating in the consideration of Petition No.22-28 including Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Associate Justice Thomas, Alito, Kagan and Sotomeyer.

Two Associate Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh must be recused because:

- (1) They were employees of retired associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and recommended by Kennedy to be justices of the U.S. Supreme Court that they have conflicts of interest.

- (2) They both are officers or members of the American Inns of Court.
 - (3) Justice Gorsuch bribed by American Inns of Court by soliciting and accepted the illegal gift of Temple Bar Scholarship.
-
- (4) Gorsuch participated in the conspiracies led by Chief Justice Roberts not to decide twice the Requests for Recusal in Petition 18-569 (related child custody appeal case) and twice Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in Petition 18-569 and Petition 20-524.
 - (5) Kavanaugh participated in the conspiracies led by Chief Justice Roberts not to decide twice the Requests for Recusal in Petition 18-569 (related child custody appeal) and Request for Recusal in Petition 21-881, and Amicus Curiae motion in Petition 20-524.

B. ALL SEVEN JUSTICES PARTICIPATED IN AIDING AND ABETTING THE 111 FELONIES WHILE CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS WAS INVOLVED WITH 84 FELONES AT THIS COURT

#6 Facts for judicial notice: All defendants in the two civil lawsuits of Shao v. Roberts have tacitly admitted to 111 felonies committed by the federal courts (including 84 felonies committed by this Court and countless court crimes committed by California courts orchestrated by James McManis, when the courts and all involved judges and justices have been related to McManis by way of American Inns of Court Foundations.

HOW THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT CORRUPTED THE U.S. JUDICIARY WITH THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT WHERE PETITIONER IS A VICTIM.

Chief Justice Warren Burger promoted the American Inns of Court who also established Warren Burger American Inn of Court and accepted donations from attorneys practicing in front of the Supreme Court. In or about 1985 or 1986, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Anthony M. Kennedy, became the initial founders of American Inns of Court and set up “children” of the tax-exempt “American Inns of Court Foundations”. McManis and Reedy founded William A. Ingram American Inn

of Court in Silicon Valley and actively participated in San Francisco Intellectual Property Rights Inn of Court, and closely connected with Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court.

One year later, in 1987, the American Inns of Court, including McManis, sponsored Kennedy to enter into the U.S. Supreme Court. Next, they sponsored Ruth Bader Ginsburg (who also has a Ruth Bader Ginsburg Inn of Court) into the U.S. Supreme Court. In 2017, Justice Elena Kagan also established one.

It is obvious, American Inns of Court Foundation is just a big judiciary corrupted powerful club that have been used by McManis to manipulate numerous judges and justices to commit these court frauds and corrupted the judiciary of the U.S.

C. ALL SEVEN JUSTICES CONSPIRED TOGETHER NOT TO DECIDE ON REQUESTS FOR RECUSAL BECAUSE THEY WERE UNABLE TO DENY THEIR FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT BY THE ILLEGAL GIFT OF TEMPLE BAR SCHOLARSHIP.

#7 Fact for Judicial Notice Temple Bar Scholarship is an illegal gift which had been distributed frequently to the US Supreme Court Justices as shown in the table

In or about 1995 or 1996, many key members including McManis, Kennedy, Ginsburg created Temple Bar Scholarship that bribed majorly the attorneys working as Clerks to write opinions for the US Supreme Court Justices. Kennedy who is closely connected with McManis and California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye with his Inn located in Sacramento, California, got the most benefit from Temple Bar Scholarship, which include at least \$7000 each person including

roundtrip international flight tickets, unknown amount of cash stipend,
accommodations overseas in England for a four-week vacation.

TABLE OF GIFTS ALLOCATED TO JUSTICES OF THE U.S.

The time of implementation of the gift is Fall annually. From 1996 until 2021, the gifts are allocated among related Justices as shown below:

Chief Justice Robert S	Justice Kennedy	Justice Thomas	Justice Ginsburg	Justice Alito	Justice Breyer	Justice Kagan	Justice Sotomayor	Justice Gorsuch
5	10	8	8	8	9	2	5	2
2008 2011(2)) 2012 2019	1997, 1998, 2001, 2010-13, 2016, 2017, 2018	2002-03, 3005, 2011-12, 2015-16, 2019	1996, 2006, 2008,-9, 2011-14	2009, 2014-16, 2017 (2), 2019, 2020,	1999, 2001 (2), 2002-03, 2014-15, 2020, 2021	2013, 2017	2012, 2019, 2020, 2021	2018, 2021

Temple Bar Scholarship is a key function of American Inns of Court Foundation. Temple Bar Scholarship, however, is *not* exempt from being a “gift” pursuant to “Judicial Conference Regulations on Gifts & Honoraria” in Guide of Judicial Policy, Vol.2C, §620.25(g) because the “scholarship” is **based on factors of “judicial status.”** The qualification for such “Scholarship” is a Clerk at the U.S. Supreme Court or major Courts of Appeal, the attorney writing opinions for the Justices or judges and donated by attorneys appearing in front of them.

Temple Bar Scholarship is an illegal gift forbidden by the Guide of Judicial Policy, Vol.2C §620.35(7) as **it is offered “because of the judicial officer’s or employee’s official position.”**

Acceptance of the gifts violated Guide of Judicial Policy Vol.2C, §620.45 as these Justices accepted gifts **from the same source “on a basis so frequent that**

a reasonable person would believe that the public office is being used for private gain.”

#8 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: All seven justices other than Justice Barrett and Jackson had conspired together that not one of them would decide on any of petitioner’s Request for Recusal when Chief Justice Roberts conspired with Clerk Scott Harris and Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins not to file/post any of the appendix which contain evidence for these Requests for Recusal; in Petition 20-524, Petitioner’s Request for Recusal was altered to appear there were no appendix filed.

It is impossible for all justices asked to be recused in 9 times since 2017 (Petition Nos. 17-256, 17-613(x2), 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524 and 21-881 would not have any order at all, whether denied or granted recusal because, when it has been the custom practice of this Court to let the individual justice to decide their own recusal, as what was researched by Wisconsin Supreme Court in *State v. Allen*, 2010 WI 10 at page 35 (2010).

RELEVANCE This is relevant to show that the present five Justices’s irregularities in not deciding Requests for Recusal include the crimes of their “conspiracies” in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371 have caused direct conflicts of interest with Petitioner that they are disqualified from deciding on this Petition 22-28. Justice Gorsuch and Kavanaugh’s participation of such conspiracies twice proved they are unable to have judicial independence and unable to stand firm to Constitution with the clear intent to harbor the issues and harbor the fellow Justices’ crimes.

#9 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE and JN-1 AMICUS CURIAE MOTION OF MOTHERS OF LOST CHILDREN altered by this Court, after refusing to decide

1. The seven Justices as well as the retired Justice Stephen Breyer, conspired together not to decide 2 Amicus Curiae Motions of Mothers of Lost Children duly filed electronically by Amicus Curiae attorney Christopher W. Katzenbach, Esq. in Petitions for Writ of Certiorari Nos. 18-569 and 20-524 and further aided and abetted to the conspiracies of McManis Faulkner law firm, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Clerk Scott Harris in purging the court record of the filed Mothers of Lost

Children and further altered the docket to remove the filing record, at a time after May 2019 and have been persisted on not to recover the docket of 18-569. See Shao v. Roberts, 1:18-cv-01233 RC, ECF161-1.

All of the seven Justices knew such removal of filed Amicus Curiae Motion and change of docket violated 18 U.S.C. §1506 and §2071 as well as Supreme Court Rules Rule 1, ¶2 ["The Clerk maintains the Court's records and will not permit any of them to be removed from the Court building except as authorized by the Court. Any document filed with the Clerk and made a part of the Court's records may not thereafter be withdrawn from the official Court files."]

Chief Justice Roberts refused to put the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children purged from Petition NO. 18-569 back to the docket of 18-569, despite numerous requests by Petitioner.

The file name for the purged Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in the U.S. Supreme Court's database is "20181108221244899_amicus%20curiae%2018-569%202.pdf". See also, 2:22-cv-00325, ECF 13-1, p.93 of 168; 1:18-cv-01233 RC, ECF161-5, P.30 of 158. The original docket of 18-569 before alteration is in 2:22-cv-00325, ECF 13-1, p.91, that was originally filed with the D.C. Circuit in the 19-5014 appeal proceeding in ECF1787004 on 05/09/2019.

2. Attached in **Exhibit JN-1** is a copy of the filed "Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children" for Petition No. 18-569.

RELEVANCE This is relevant to show that the present seven Justices's irregularities and crimes extended to conspiracies in not deciding two Amicus Curiae Motions duly filed with this Court, in addition to the nine (9) Requests for Recusal, which caused direct conflicts of interest with Petitioner that the seven justice must be disqualified from deciding on this Petition 22-28 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and (b).

E. SUPREME COURT VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND DUE PROCESS OF CONSTITUTION IN DETERRING FILING OF AMICUS CURIAE MOTION OF MOTHERS OF CHILDREN TO BE FILED IN PETITION 17-82, IN CONSPIRACY WITH JAMES MCMANIS, MICHAEL REEDY AND MCMANIS FAULKNER

In September 2017, Deputy Clerk Danny Jordan Bickell brought a clerk to interfere with the filing of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in Petition for Writ of Certiorari No. 17-82, which was duly re-filed by Mr. Katzenbach by paper filing, did not enter into the docket of such filing, and never returned the unfiled 40 copies of booklets of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children of 17-82 to Mr. Katzenbach. The docket of 17-82 did not show the record of either filing or rejection of filing of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children.

All Justices in existence in December 2017 knew or should have known Mr. Bickell's blocking and concealing from filing of the Amicus Curiae Motion in Petition No. 17-82 as reported by Petitioner in Petitioner's Petitions for Rehearing filed in 17-82, 17-256 and/or 17-613, but no Justice took an action.

RELEVANCY This is relevant to show James McManis manipulated Supreme Court and deter child custody return and that the five justices as well as Justice Gorsuch must be recused.

F. Temple Bar Scholarship was used to reward Judge Patricia Millett in conspiring with both American Inns of Court and its leading attorney/founder James McManis to dismiss the appeal of Shao v. Roberts where the present 5 Justices were all at default in Shao v. Roberts, et al., 1:18-cv-01233RC

#10FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Judge Patricia Millett And Judge Pillard Conspired With James Mcmanis To Dismiss The Entire Appeal of No.19-5014 where 5 Justices of this Court had been at default in the District Court case.

Judge Patricia Millett's Clerk received Temple Bar Scholarship gift award in Fall of 2019, after Millett harbored the American Inns of Court Foundation's motion for

summary affirmance and affirmed their dismissal on July 31, 2019 despite the law requires AIC's motion being denied for lack of notice, and conspired with James Mcmanis to dismiss the entire appeal of No.19-5014 where Chief Justice Roberts, retired Justice Kennedy, deceased Justice Ginsburg, retired Justice Breyer, present Associate Justices Thomas, Breyer, Alito, Kagan and Sotomeyer as well as Deputy Clerk Bickell and Atkins were all at default for Shao v. Roberts et al, 1:18-cv-01233RC where but for Judge Rudolph Contreras's interference, defaults would have been entered--- declarative relief that they should be impeached for violation of the First Amendment of Constitution.

RELEVANCE The Scholarship is being used to bribe justices and judges. Judge Patricia Millett, a judge at the D.C. Circuit, in willful violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and 28 U.S.C. §455(a), **as an officer of the American Inns of Court Foundation, granted the American Inns of Court Foundation's defective motion for summary affirmance** on July 31, 2019 and further illegally issued an Order to Show Cause on July 31, 2019 to affirm Judge Rudolph Contreras's sua sponte dismissal (also in willful violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) where he decided on his own case when he is a named defendant and had been in default as well) the entire appeal bypassing the normal appeal process, infringing Petitioner's right to appeal, and dismissed sua sponte the entire appeal on October 13, 2019 without any statement of decision, without discussing any issues of recusal, without discussing any issues on appeal but only conclusion of dismissal. She and Judge Cornelius P.T.

Pillard are both officers of Edward Coke Inn of American Inns of Court where Chief Justice Roberts and Alito are also long term members/officers.

Millett appeared to be immediately rewarded by Appellee American Inns of Court Foundation in Fall of the same year of 2019 with Temple Bar Scholarship. As the new case of Shao v. Roberts et al was dismissed sua sponte before depositions and discovery, it is not clear if the clerk receiving the gift as sponsored by Millett is the Clerk who drafted the 7/31/2019 Order to Show Cause and 10/13/2019 Judgment.

Chief Judge of the DC Circuit at that time was Merrick Garland. He has been acted as an agent for Appellee American Inns of Court but failed to disclose nor change venue. Then the panel was assigned to two officers of Appellee American Inns of Court. Judge Pillard who was President of Edward Coke Inn in 2019, again served at the panel in 2022 to dismiss appeal the second time, in egregiously repeated violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and §455(a).

A. JUDGE PATRICIA MILLETT AND JUDGE PILLARD CONSPIRED WITH JAMES MCMANIS TO DISMISS THE ENTIRE APPEAL

#11 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: On July 31, 2019, James McManis, Michael Reedy, and McManis Faulkner law firm and their California cases' attorney Janet Everson and their federal attorney James Lassart conspired with at least Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Cornelius T.L. Pillard as majority of the Appellate Panel of 19-5014 at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal to summarily affirm the entire sua sponte dismissal order of Judge Rudolph Contreras of 1/17/2019 without conducting any appellate review on its merits and the actual dismissal of the entire appeal took place 74 days later on October 13, 2019.

On 10/13/2021, Respondents James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm and McManis's California attorney Janet Everson (when 8 Justices of the US Supreme Court including present 5 Justices are also Respondents in the same case) filed a motion for summary affirmance (ECF#1918497) at Appeal No.21-5210 at the D.C. Circuit, their attorney of record James Lassart, stated and signed on the written motion that Respondents had made a motion for summary affirmance on July 31, 2019 in Appeal No. 19-5014, that was "approved" by unidentified judges.

Such motion is a secret motion and not shown on the docket of Appeal No.19-5014. With 3 requests in writing for a copy of the alleged motion for summary affirmance, James Lassart and his office have refused to give Petitioner a copy of such "motion for summary affirmance" that he got the DC Circuit approved on July 31, 2019. Henever denied existence of such motion, and further did not respond to eight (8) subsequent filings of papers by Petitioner where Petitioner made severe criminal accusations on their conspiracies with D.C. Circuit judges to dismiss appeal, blocking Petitioner's reasonable access to the court, when they have full opportunities to make objection if Petitioner's severe accusations were not true.

From James Lassart's disclosure (ECF#1918497), Petitioner discovered that two of the panel judges concealed from disclosure their direct conflicts of interest and should have recused themselves as mandated by 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) as they are officers of American Inns of Court who is an appellee appearing in front of its officers, these two judges.

Their repeated non-responses to severe accusations to criminal conspiracies constitute tacit admission of James Lassart, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner and his colleague Janet Everson to the accused conspiracies with the D.C. Circuit and entered into a conspiracy with at least two appellate panel judges Judge Millett and Judge Pillard who are their friends at the American Inns of Court. Millett and Pillard issued an Order to Show Cause to summarily affirm the sua sponte dismissal of Judge Rudolph Contreras's 1/17/2019 Order which led to actual dismissal 74 days later on October 13, 2019, such that there was never a meaningful appeal and no review on the merits.

B. Chief Justice Merrick Garland, Judge Millett and Judge Pillard are suspected to assist AIC to block Petitioner's access to the appeal process

#12 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: American Inns of Court Foundation

conspired with D.C. Circuit to take Petitioner's name off CM/ECF system on or about March 18, 2019 to avoid Petitioner to be given notice of AIC motion for summary affirmance, and put Petitioner back CM/ECF on April 9, 2019 to get Judge Patricia Millett's Order to Show Cause why not granted AIC's motion based on non-opposition of Petitioner, These facts were not disputed by any party in all the proceedings of 19-5014, 20-524, the 60(b) motion proceeding at the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. and 21-5210. These facts prove that American Inns of Court is very influential to the D.C. Circuit, even for commission of crimes of alteration of records of the Court. This may explain why Judge Millett got the reward from AIC for Fall 2019, the same year of these irregularities in 19-5014.

#13 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Judge Millett And Pillard Refused To Decide Issues Of Change Of Venue, Petitioner's motion for summary reversal and response to order to show cause not to summarily affirm Judge Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019 and all new facts presented in each of the 3 Petitions for Rehearing

Despite Petitioner filed three Petitions for Rehearing (See the third one in ECF1834621²) with the D.C. Circuit in Appeal No.19-5014 (Shao v. Roberts, et al.), the DC Circuit's appellate panel persisted on refusing to decide

² ECF1834621 is titled

"Petition for Rehearing on the Order of Feb. 5, 2020 summarily denying rehearing and suggestion for En Banc, based on extraordinary circumstances of this Circuit's Adoptive Admissions from Refusing to Rule on the Issues in #1791001 & #1797225 Motions and her Response in #1799946 and on New Evidence of Conspiracies that is Beyond Reasonable Doubt"

(1) any and all issues raised by Petitioner's Amended Motion to Change Venue to the Second District Court of Appeal (ECF1791001) requested for at least 10 months through 3 Petitions for Rehearing, including six felonies of alterations of the court records (18 U.S.C. §1506 and §2071): (a) and (b): alterations of CM/ECF record removing Petitioner quietly on 3/18/2019 then putting her back quietly on 4/9/2019, (c) deletion of the 2nd and 3 pages of Temple Bar Scholars and Report in Doc.#26 of #1787004, which appeared to conceal from the public that Chief Justice Roberts got two big gifts in a year of 2011;(d) deletion of the docket sheet of 18-800 where the respondents are James McManis, Michael Reedy and McManis Faulkner law firm, (e)alteration of Judge Contreras's date of signature portion on Page 63 of the 4th Document of #1787004, which is the cover of ECF41 of the underlying District Court case, which has been used as evidence of Contreras's forging Clerk's Office's stamp to cover up ECF38's ex parte communication (BJ Fadem's motion went to the chamber directly bypassing the Clerk's Office) and (f) the 2nd an 3rd pages of Temple Bar Scholars and Reports at the last two pages of ECF1787225, which again, removed the record that Chief Justice Roberts got two big gift of Temple Bar Scholarship in a year of 2011.

which was filed by Petitioner on 03/21/2020 with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal in Appeal No. 19-5014, as the third and the last Petition for Rehearing because the DC Circuit's appellate Panel persisted on not deciding on the issues of 6 felonies of the court in alteration of the records of the court contained in Petitioner's **motion to change venue (#1791001 and #1797225).**

- (2) Petitioner's Motion for Summary Reversal (ECF1797225) filed on 5/10/2019 which was supported by about 600 pages of evidence, and
- (3) Petitioner's Response to Order to Show Cause Not to Summarily Affirm Judge Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019 (ECF 1799946 filed on 8/31/2018)
- (4) any and all new facts stated in each of the 3 Petitions for Rehearing; including direct evidence of Kevin L. Warnock's conspiracies with James Mcmanis and Santa Clara County Superior Court to hack Petitioner's electronic devices, the Supreme Court's deterrence of filing of Request for Recusal and eventually the 7 Justices conspired the 8th time not to decide on Petitioner's Request for Recusal.

Petitioner presented evidence in the undecided ECF1791001 that the American Inns of Court's website about Temple Bar Scholars and Reports was changed in the same way as how it was reflected on the altered court records. After such conspiracy was pointed out by Petitioner to the Operation Manager of DC Circuit, Petitioner also caught evidence of American Inns of Court's recovering its Temple Bar Scholars and Reports to be from 1996, before alteration, or, in another words, the AIC's trying to purge evidence of such conspiracy.

RELEVANCY The requested facts proved the conflicts of interest of the present remaining five Justices at this Court and the tacit admission of the court crimes committed by D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal, Judge Patricia Millet and Pillard in conspiracy with the American Inns of Court, Judge Rudolph Contreras, James McManis and Michael Reedy and McManis Faulkner and Chief Justice John G.

Roberts. Not only all accused parties were silent in response to Petitioner's severe criminal accusations of conspiracies, there are no other reason to explain why the court records would be changed this way beside that the appeal dismissal in No.19-5014 is really a conspiracy related to James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner, American Inns of Court and Chief Justice Roberts with at least the two panel judges, Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Cornelius T.L. Pillards, especially when Roberts, Millett and Pillards are all buddies Edward Coke Inn of the American Inns of Court for many years; Pillard was President, Millett was President Elect, and Roberts has been in that Inn way before he became a Judge at the DC Circuit. There is no reason why Merrick Garland, the Chief Judge at the DC Circuit, who has been acting as an agent for the American Inns of Court for many years to issue award on the site of DC Circuit would not know this lawsuit and the appearance of bias and prejudice to have this lawsuit being decided at the DC Circuit.

Each and every Request for Recusal mentioned the Justices' relationship with McManis and appearance of conspiracy of permanent parental deprivation to satisfy the quest of McManis in view of the civil lawsuit of breach of fiduciary duty brought up by Petitioner, and especially the Temple Bar Scholarship. the appellate panel at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal (Millett and Pillard) persisted on not to decide, not to investigate nor account for the 6 felonies of alterations of the records happened in ECF, which shall be deemed tacit admission by the DC Circuit of conspiracies with James McManis, Judge Rudolph Contreras,

Chief Justice John G. : One is about McManis where the entire docket of 18-800 was purged to become blank; another one is about alteration of the cover of ECF 41 at the USDC case which was to alter the evidence of Judge Rudolph Contreras's forging court record and his signature date on ex parte communication with Defendant BJ Fadem; 4 of the 6 felonies are related to American Inns of Court Foundation. Out of the four incidents regarding American Inns of Court, two are CM/ECF user changes and the remaining two records are concerning dix that included Temple Bar Scholars and Reports list were altered in two places where the list was redacted to remove those from 1996 to 2011. And, simultaneously with the court's records' alterations, the American Inns of Court was doing the same alteration on that list on their website.

IV. SUBJECT OF PETITION 22-28

#14 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: SUBJECT OF PETITION 22-28

The subject of Petition No. 22-28 is—California Supreme Court Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye conspired with all other Respondents named in Petition No. 22-28, i.e., California Supreme Court Clerk Jorge Navarrete, Mary J. Greenwood, Presiding Justice of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner at Santa Clara County Superior Court of California, Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Maureen A. Folan, Judge Rise Pichon, James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm, and Tsan-Kuen Wang, **to block habeas corpus from being considered on its merits** with the voidable Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order, after willfully delayed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by 3 months, she had conceded that she conspired with James McManis to block Petitioner's access to the court by summarily denying ALL petitions for review filed by Petitioner arising from this habeas corpus arising from Judge Edward Davila's judiciary corruption with Respondent Tsan-Kuen Wang and his attorney

David Sussman on August 4, 2010 and James McManis was sued for choosing to betray Petitioner but covering up Edward Davila, a member of the William Ingram American Inn of Court of the American Inns of Court where Michael Reedy is the registered founder.

#15 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: All factual statements contained in Petitioner's Verified Statement for Disqualification of California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye are true and irrevocable. California Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(4) ["when no answer is filed in response to a statement of disqualification, the facts set out in the statement are taken as true"]; *Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County*, 2 Cal.App.5th 10, pp.30&40 (2016) (not only all facts in the verified statements are irrevocably admitted to be true but all orders issued by the conceded judge are "void."); see also, *Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.*, 234 Cal.App.3d 4 (1991)

#16 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: MCMANIS ADMITTED TACITLY TO TANI'S ADMISSION AND ALL FACTS IN PETITIONER'S VERIFIED STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION; REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ECF26-1 as JN-2 .with document link of <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSlKyPrHH7ZrPf-g?e=3Rqxb6>

James McManis, Michael Reedy and McManis Faulkner law firm tacitly admitted to the severe accusations of crimes and their conspiracies with California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye by not filing any opposition when they were given full opportunity to do so within 50 days when Petitioner's Request for Recusal/Verified Statement of Disqualification was pending, and further tacitly admitted at least 5 times in the Appeal No.21-5210 (Appeal from Judge Rudolph Contreras's willful denial of Rule 60b motion filed after the six Justices/Respondents blocked Petition 20-524 from being decided on the merits), in ECF1920120, ECF1921294, ECF1921981, ECF 1922201, ECF1922455, and ECF1922459. The table for McManis defendants/respondents' admission tacitly to Tani's irrevocable admissions have been quoted in many documents. E.g., 2:22-cv-00325 (Shao v. Roberts et al), ECF 26-1, pp.37-38.

#17 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: The undisputed and irrevocable admission of California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye on 8/25/2021 through S269711 proceeding include 8 material facts which are recited by many documents in the proceedings of No.21-5210 and 2:22-cv-00325. E.g., the new complaint in Shao v. Roberts, et al., 2:22-cv-00325, ECF#1 with the document link of

<https://ldrv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ60HZStTgEb2tRb?e=evTcFS>. The eight conceded facts in fact constitutes the major basis for the second lawsuit of Shao v. Roberts, et al. See i.d. ECF#1, ¶1, P.13, lines 14-17. The eight conceded facts were recited in ECF#1, ¶3, p.15-17. They are:

- (i) Tani is James McManis's client.
- (ii) Tani is an officer of American Inns of Court was a President of Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy American Inn of Court, having failed to disclose her regular social relationship with James Mcmanis through the American Inns of Court.
- (iii) Tani knowingly refused to investigate the severe conflicts of interest suffered by Petitioner after Tani was made known to such conflicts in 2017. (Attorney Meera Fox testified to the conspiracy to dismiss child custody appeal on April 1, 2017)
- (iv) Tani assisted James McManis in blindly denying review of all petitions filed by Petitioner and conspired with Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and US Supreme Court Justices in denying Petitioners' Petitions for Writ of Certiorari 11-11119, 14-7244, and applications regarding immediate child custody change in view of Respondent Tsan-Kuen Wang's dangerous mental illness, in order to secure permanent parental deprivation, which was used by McManis as the only defense to the breach of fiduciary duty/legal malpractice case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, and Catherine Bechtel (case no. 2012-1-cv-220571 at Santa Clara County Court; Petitions for Writ of Certiorari No. 17-82, 18-800, 21-881 at US Supreme Court.)
- (v) Tani conspired with James McManis to stay a State Bar enforcement case of 15-O-15200 against McManis (based on his admission of providing free legal services which are gifts, to the judges and justices. in violation of Rule 5-300(a) of California Rules of Professional Conduct, during his deposition taken by Petitioner on 7/20/2015) for three years and then quietly closed the case on 9/25/2019 taking

advantage of Petitioner's overseas missionary, and removed the providing gifts to judiciary from the Rule 5-300(a) such that there was no law in California to ban an attorney to provide free gifts to the judiciary; after discovery, then Tani put the deleted portion back to the current renumbered Rule in 2021.

(vi) Regarding Petitioner's complaint against James McManis, Janet Everson and Suzie Tagliere regarding their conspiracy with Santa Clara County Superior Court to be able to file their motion to dismiss quietly without clearing the hearing date with Petitioner and making reservation for the hearing as required by then Local Rule 8(c) and further conspired with Santa Clara County Court to alter the efilng stamps of their motion to dismiss and alter the docket about the filing date of their motion to dismiss, Tani conspired with 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 records, and to direct her Korean comrade Attorney Roy Kim, to promptly close State Bar complaints against McManis' two attorneys, Janet Everson and Suzie Tagliere. These issues are the same issues in S269711 (**Petition 21-881 that was suppressed by the 6 Justices of this Court who refused to be recused.**)

(vii) Tani conspired with James McManis and State Bar of California in issuing a premature order and caused Clerk Jorge Narrette to create a new case docket (S263527) quietly to suspend Petitioner's California bar license, on the date of July 27, 2019, the same date then- Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Superior Court granted Petitioner's Vexatious Litigant application to file the Notice of Appeal from the civil case Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel.

(viii) Tani conspired with James McManis to direct State Bar of California's director for Attorney Regulations to send letters to California Franchise Tax Board to illegally impute income and income tax against Petitioner and Shao Law Firm, PC, without any notice nor hearing for tax years 2017 until 2021.

#18 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Facts admitted by McManis , Reedy, McManis law firm, their attorney Janet Everson, and James Lassart in ECF 1921981

As stated in ¶4 of ECF#1, they tacitly admitted to about 12 matters and failed to make any objection to Petitioner's document ECF#1921981 entitled

“Appellant's second supplement to #1920120—Appellant's “Opposition to Motion for Summary Affirmance filed by Appellee James McManis, Michael Reedy, Janet Everson and McManis Faulkner, LLP (#1918497); Plaintiff's Counter Motion for Affirmative Relief Under Circuit Rule 27(c) to (j) and to (1) vacate all orders of this Court in proceeding of 19-5014 based on violation of due process and extrinsic fraud of this court, Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Nina Pillard in failing to disclose conflicts of interest and reactivate the appeal of 19-5014; (2) request for terminating sanction for summary reversal of Judge Rudolph Contreras's Order of 8/30/2021 (ECF 168 and 169) and Monetary Sanction Against Appellees and Their Attorney of Record James Lassart for filing a frivolous motion in violation of 28 U.S.C. §1927 and committed extrinsic fraud in conspiring with this court in dismissing the entire appeal as early as on July 31, 2019.”

The admitted and undisputed facts include (See ECF#1, pp.17-19):

- (i) McManis respondents conspired with Judge Patricia Lucas to purge court reporter Julie Serna's Certificate of Court Reporter Waiving Deposit, from the family case in order to generate false notices to dismiss Petitioner's appeal from Lucas's child custody order of 11/4/2013.**
- (ii) Admission that Tani had conceded to the eight matters on 8/25/2021 order in S269711.**
- (iii) Conspired with Tani to deny child custody appeal (H040395);**
- (iv) Conspired with Tani and Judge Rudolph Contreras in dismissing the case of Shao v. Roberts, et al, 1-18-cv-01233RC**
- (v) Conspiracy among McManis defendants to dismiss the civil case of Shao v. McManis et al. (Petition No.21-881) where Janet Everson actively conspired with them in filing “Notice of Non-Opposition in Motion to Dismiss” on 9/30/2019 when in altering the e filing stamp, Everson re-filed the motion to dismiss after 9/19/2019 with knowledge that her filing of Notice of Non-Opposition being fraudulent.**

(vi) Conspired with this Court in causing felonies of alteration of documents, concealing filing, alterations of dockets and in causing the Justices not to decide the 9 Request for Recusal and 2 Amicus Curiae motions that were properly filed and submitted to this Court.

(vii) Conspired with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal to dismiss the appeal of No.19-5014,

(viii) Conspired with California Supreme Court, California Sixth District Court of Appeal and Santa Clara County Court and Judge Maureen A. Folan, their prior attorney before taking the judicial seat, **to issue a fraudulent prefiling order** with an antedated signature of June 16, 2015 which was unsupported by a statement of decision.

(ix) When Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court is Judge Theodore Zayner, the close friend of Michael Reedy and James McManis, the Civil Local Rule 8(c), evidence of Santa Clara County court's conspiracy to file the motion to dismiss in the civil case of 2012-1-cv-220571, was removed and changed; Zayner used the new Civil Local Rule 8(c) to block Petitioner from having a hearing or decision on her recent motion to set aside dismissal and prefiling order, that was based on the undisclosed conflicts of interest of Judge Christopher Rudy and Judge Maureen A. Folan.

(x) Conspired with Tani and State Bar staffs to create the fraudulent case of S263527 to suspend Petitioner's bar license

(xi) Conspired with Tani in purging the State Bar complaint case of 20_O-7258 against McManis.

#19 FACT FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: McManis Faulkner law firm's tacit admission in Petition 21-881 including the fact that they drafted Judge Patricia Lucas's child custody order of 11/4/2013:

Petition 21-881 is an appeal to this Court, after California Supreme Court Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye noted in the 8/25/2021 order denying review that she did not participate in voting, but California Supreme Court did not have any

record that may show the order of 8/25/2021 had a voting record by each Justice. Its procedural background is:

In the civil case for breach of fiduciary duty and legal malpractice and discrimination that Petitioner sued McManis Faulkner law firm, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel, which has a case number of 2012-1-cv-220571, pending with Santa Clara County Superior Court where Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, President of Ingram Inn of the American Inns of Court, has blocked Petitioner's motion to vacate dismissal and prefiling order by refusing to give out a hearing date since November 4, 2021 based on the new facts that Petitioner discovered that the judges issuing these orders failed to disclose their conflicts of interest: (1) Judge Maureen A. Folan who issued the prefiling order without any statement of decision when the purported statement of decision did not mention the statute of C.C.P. §391.7 for prefiling order, was actually the attorney for James McManis and McManis Faulkner for at least 2.5 years regarding legal malpractice defenses and is likely sponsored by McManis to get her judicial seat; Judge Christopher Rudy is a pupil leader of the Ingram Inn of the American Inns of Court where Michael Reedy is the registered founder and James McManis is the leading attorney and initial founder of the American Inns of Court.

When Petitioner was overseas, McManis respondents filed a motion to dismiss silently without conferring with Petitioner in violation of the then-Local Rule 8(c) on 9/18/2019 to rush Rudy to dismiss the case on 10/8/2019 which was the only day that Rudy may substitute the Law and Motion department judge assigned for this case to cut in to work for them. Yet there was less than the minimum notice (16 working days); so that the record showed that Santa Clara County Court altered the efilings stamps with complicated steps including requiring their attorney Janet Everson to re-file after 9/19/2019. The Certificate of Service to day still showed the original efilings date of 9/18/2019 which was crossed out and added on 9/12/2019 as the new efilings date.

Rudy granted the dismissal based on non-opposition by Petitioner (who was overseas) even though the stay requested by McManis was not lifted.

The Superior Court's then Presiding Judge approved Petitioner's vexatious litigant application to file the Notice of Appeal and filed the Notice of Appeal on 7/27/2020. The appeal includes the crimes on dismissal and irregularities in vexatious litigant appeals. The issues of vexatious litigant prefilng order is Petition for Writ of Certiorari 18-800.

The Civil supervising clerk of Santa Clara Court, Ms. Rodriguez, who is suspected client of James McManis, delayed transferring the Notice of Appeal until August 10, 2020. Presiding Judge Mary J. Greenwood who is Edward Davila's wife but concealed disclosure of such conflicts of interest, and hided the Notice of Appeal by 4 months. The appeal was eventually docketed by the Court of Appeal's supervising clerk with case number of H048651. Greenwood then required a second approval by her for filing the appeal, without any legal basis. 5 months later, on 5/26/2021, using her active Justice-comrade, to deny the application, blocking Petitioner from accessing the court, to suppress the merits of the case from adjudication. It was appealed to California Supreme Court with case number of S269711. Then Petitioner appealed the 8/25/2021 Order to this Court with Petition 21-881

In the 8/25/2021 Order, Tani willfully not to render an answer to Petitioner's Request for Recusal; Verified Statement of Disqualification pursuant to C.C.P. Sections 170.1 and 170.3, that was filed and served 50 days prior to the order, on July 7, 2021. Under California laws, such fact triggered irrevocable admission of California Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauyeto all facts stated in the Request for Recusal, Verified Statements of Disqualification filed in S269711 that James McManis, Michael Reedy and Mcmanis Faulkner law firm failed to object when they had 50 days to make objection. . .

#20 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Petition 22-28 is related to all petitions filed by Petitioner since 2011

Petition 22-28 is related to all Petitions and Applications filed by Petitioner since 2012, including Petitions 11-11119, 14-7244, two applications (plus one Application for Emergency Relief which is not shown anywhere in the Supreme Court's files),

Petition 17-82, Petition 17-256, Petition 1-613, Petition 18-344, Petition 18-569, Petition 18-800, Petition 19-639, Petition 20-524 and Petition 21-881 and Applications 16A863 and 14A677.

Petition 11-11119 is Petitioner's appeal from California courts' summary denying petition for writ of mandate to return child custody to Petitioner, that, without any evidentiary hearing, the family case's judge Judge Theodore Zayner misused Judge Mary Ann Grilli's October 31, 2011 Order as an excuse to disallow child custody return after October 31, 2011 granting Petitioner's motion to vacate August 4 and 5 2010 orders. The order's second paragraph was to enforce the vacated Orders of August 4 and 5 of "2011". Grilli was supposed to sign the order drafted by Petitioner but with ex parte communication, signed the the order that was drafted by David Sussman, and omitted the order to require Wang to be psychologically evaluated (after Petitioner was ordered psychological evaluation on 8/4/2010).

Petition 14-7244 is to appeal from California Sixth District Court of Appeal's dismissal of Petitioner's appeal from October 31, 2011 and Zayner's order of October 31, 2011 to cancel evidentiary hearing but maintained the vacated Orders of August 4 and 5 of 2010.

Petition 17-82 is to appeal from the vexatious litigant order.

Petition 17-256 is to appeal from Judge Lucy Koh's dismissal of another civil case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al that was filed with the U.S.D.C. for the Northern California in San Jose, the same content as 2012-1-cv-220571 after MCManis influenced Judge Carol Overton, a member of Ingram Inn to dismiss sua sponte the civil case and Petitioner discovered the conflicts of interest that James McManis has attorney-client relationship with Santa Clara County Superior Court. Judge Koh failed to disclose her conflicts of interest.

Petition 17-613 is to appeal from Presiding Judge Conrad Rushing's order of April 12, 2016 in reactivating the child custody appeal, vacating his illegal dismissal of child custody appeal, but failed to decide the issues to reverse child custody order of 11/4/2013 and failed to rule on the issue to change venue of both

the trial court as well as court of appeal based on discovery of the conspiracy and conflicts of interest.

Petition 18-344 is an appeal from Judge Maureen A. Folan's denial of the 11th motion of Petitioner to change venue of the civil case based on undisputed direct conflicts of interest for the civil case to be retain in the jurisdiction of Santa Clara County Court where Greenwood simply dismissed it based on a false excuse of lack of civil cover sheet when the Court of Appeal concealed the civil cover sheet duly filed by Petitioner's attorney.

Petition 18-569 is an appeal from Greenwood's illegal dismissal of child custody appeal, where, as being subject of this appeal, California courts conspired together to purge Julie Serna's filing, concealed the family case docket, but issued false notices falsely accusing Petitioner not yet paid court reporter's transcript, delayed child custody appeal by 4.5 years without generating any piece of paper for records on appeal and fraudulently dismissed the child custody appeal without notice, where Presiding Justice of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Mary J. Greenwood concealed her conflicts of interest that she is the wife of Judge Edward Davila, who issued the 8/4/2010's unconstitutional parental deprivation order out of judicial corruption. As mentioned above, Tani and McManis conspired with all of the 9 Justices of this Court (Roberts, Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer, Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh) not to decide on Requests for Recusal, and not to decide the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children. Later after May 2019, after closure of this Petition No. 18-569, Chief Justice Roberts conspired with McManis and Clerk Harris to purge the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children and to alter the docket to remove the filing record of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children.

Petition 19-639 is an appeal from California Sixth District Court of Appeal's denial of H040977 appeal where Judge Theodore Zayner refused to hold an evidentiary hearing on remittitur about Judge Edward Davila's order of 2009, by "ghost-justice" when Presiding Justice Greenwood failed to disclose her direct conflicts of interest that she is the wife of Davila.

Petition 20-524 is an appeal from the fraudulent sua sponte dismissal of 19-5014 by appellate panel that is composed of two judges who had willfully violated 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) in refusing to recuse themselves when they are officers of Appellee American Inns of Court. In October 2021, in the second time appeal proceeding of No. 21-5210, McManis's attorney James Lassart revealed their conspiracies with some unknown judges at D.C. Circuit, who are likely Chief Judge Merrick Garland, Patricia Millett and Carnelius T.L. Pillard who are officers of American Inns of Court that the judges granted McManis's secret motion for summary affirmance of dismissal on 7/31/2019 when on that day, there was truly an order to show cause why not adopt the entire sua sponte dismissal order of Judge Contreras of 1/17/2019, and Judge Patricia Millett was later rewarded with Temple Bar Scholarship in Fall of 2019, while Chief Judge Garland also was rewarded with a gift given to his appointed attorney recipient under the color of American Inns of Court Professionalism award in June 2019, when American Inns of Court's motion for summary affirmance was pending. They are all officers of American Inns of Court but failed to disclose. That case is appealed to this Court in Petition 20-524. The Justices refused to decide and illegally affirmed the sua sponte dismissal of appeal--- there was never any adjudication on the merits and Petitioner was deprived a day in court. More egregiously, the 12/14/2020 order and 1/15/2021 judgment appeared to be faked by Chief Justice Roberts to pretend being order or judgment of Associate Justices Barrett, Gorsuch and Kavanaugh; they were taken off three times from the docket of Petition 20-524 and put back three times. The law cited by the faked order and judgment is in fact inapplicable and against the public policy. This Court appeared to conspired with McManis and Tani to hijacked Petitioner's mail of Petition for Rehearing. Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins, Clerk Harris and Chief Justice undoubtedly participated in the conspiracy to block Petitioner from filing her Petition for Rehearing (See in 1:18-cv-01233, ECF 161-5, pp.5-33 ; 2:22-cv-00325, ECF 13-1, p.68-95), second Request for Recusal of Associate Justice Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh (See in 1:18-cv-01233, ECF 161-5, pp.38- ; 2:22-cv-00325, ECF 13-1, pp.101-)and Motion to file Petition for Rehearing.

RELEVANCE

(1) As all Petitions filed by Petitioner in the past 12 years are related to Petition 22-28, the present 7 Justices who are involved with grounds of disqualification or conflicts of interests in any of these Petitions must be recused as the result of Petition 22-28 may affect any of these Petitions where they have conflicts of interest. **Very obviously, the present five Justices, Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer must be recused as they had already impliedly admitted to their recusal via the order of 12/14/2020 in Petition 20-524.**

(2) Associate Justice Kavanaugh and Associate Justice Gorsuch should be recused from deciding on Petition 22-28 because:

(a) as being closely connected with Associate Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, who is a Respondent in related lawsuit of Shao v. Roberts, et al, 2:22-cv-00325-JAM-AC, where Respondent TaniCantil-Sakauye is closely associated with, and they both were clerked with Associate Justice Kennedy, and were both members/officers of American Inns of Court

It is clear that James McManis, because of the civil case filed against him since March 11, 2012, has manipulated all level of courts, through this gigantic judiciary club, American Inns of Court, since the prelawsuit negotiations in October 2011, to conspire and effectuate permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner, a subject of Petition No. 22-28, that caused Petitioner unable to get her child custody returning to her after the initial parental deprivation order of Judge Edward Davila on August 4, 2010 was vacated.

#21 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE: Seven Justices of this Court must be recused for knowingly harbor the crimes conspired by Chief Justice Roberts Clerk Harris, and other deputy clerks to block 6 filings and failed to vacate 2/22/2022 order when it was undisputed that Chief Justice who has conflicts of interest had participated or led in voting on 2/22/2022 order in Petition 21-881 when “Motion to Transfer” was conspicuously noted on the cover of the Petition for Rehearing; JN-3 through 7, the five papers blocked from filing in 21-881. The concealment includes all appendix to the Request for Recusal as well as the following five motions:

(i) “Motion to Transfer Court to the Court of Appeal, Second Circuit” duly submitted on December 10, 2021, see document link (may copy and past on the browser) of

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVGb6rx_Q1xA_txv?e=96gAuH;

(ii) Motion for leave to file Motion to Transfer, to Post the Appendix for Request for Recusal and to Adjust the Briefing Schedule of Petition for Writ of Certiorari to be Corresponding to the filing of the “Motion to Transfer” duly submitted on Dec.30, 2021, <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVleVRdA6WjRwRpz?e=yFcPkJ>;

(iii) Motion for Judicial Notice submitted on Jan.6, 2022

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVO_FsCV2sbP5dLC?e=sgM0eb

(iv) Petition for Writ of Mandate [28 U.S.C.§1651] duly submitted on Jan.24, 2022, <https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU50Ydme-jl8Mgph?e=5rkuxX> ;

(v) Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett to Stay the Proceeding of Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Issue Writ of Mandate Pursuant to [28 U.S.C.§1651(a)] duly submitted on Jan.24, 2022, <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU-2UwmrDUYdRt2t?e=Hl5GKF>.

#22 FACTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE. Petitioner filed a Motion for Temporary Injunctive Relief or TRO with the USDC for Eastern California together with a new Complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et al, 2:22-cv-00325-JAM-AC, which was dismissed at the beginning of litigation within 3 business days of deposing the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) as the judges are members/officers of Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court and closely socialized with California

Chief Justice TaniCantil-Sakauye and James McManis; with the same style of dismissal by Judge Rudolph Contreras in 1:18-cv-01233RC— all judges and justices violated willfully Due Process, First Amendment of Constitution and 28 U.S.C. §455 (a) and (b)(5)(i) and the Justices for DC Circuit had twice willfully violated 28 USC§455(b)(5)(i). The document links for the new complaint and motion for TRO are

ECF 1	Complaint	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ60HZStTgEb2tRb?e=evTcFS
ECF 3	Checklist TRO	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQsq9uVOkKS13VtI?e=95u9Rn
ECF 3-1	MPA	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQcwK92dEezgSNTG?e=DYUI3u
ECF 3-2	affidavit	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTNVLZI-LmpJQDrW?e=KUoG9e
ECF 3-3	Proposed order	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQZA6H8N-uC-r62n?e=fzhSl7
ECF 10	Amended proposed order	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQzi-FODUmtx9pXt?e=rKo9rh
ECF 11	Amended Affidavit	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ30h5Bg70okGQpB?e=7s3xQK
ECF 12	Supplement al MPA	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ-nYnJiJTsb_Yxf?e=Zu2JgR
ECF 13	Request for Judicial Notice6	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTc-tZ5A3j8ejLRB?e=eg9FLr
ECF 13-1	Exhibits for the Request	https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpdH7-eXZn5LOwg0k?e=TBiIuO

	for Judicial Notice	
--	------------------------	--

The judge in 22-cv-00325, John A. Mendez, is a member and/or officer of Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court, and closely connected with California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, as well as retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy (retired two weeks following served with the First Amended Complaint in Shao v. Roberts, et al, 1:18-cv-01233) which are named defendants in the same case, but refused to be recused as required by 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and dismissed the case sua sponte.

The dismissal of the new case of Shao v. Roberts, et al., with case number 22-cv-00325 took place within 3 business days of the scheduled depositions for Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Associate Justice Stephen Breyer, Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice Elena Kagan, Associate Justice Sonia Sotomeyer, where the respondents of this Petition are also defendants in the same case, which took place on the ensuing date of conversing with Ethan V. Torrey, Counsel for US Supreme Court that they are required by law to file a motion for protective order if not willing to appear for depositions. (See Motion for Judicial Notice, JN-8; Request #14.

V. MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IS PERMISSIBLE TO BE FILED IN PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI PROCEEDING

This Court must file this Motion for Judicial Notice, pursuant to the Equal Treatment Clause of the First Amendment of Constitution as a Motion for Judicial Notice has been filed with this Court in other cases. E.g., Petition 14-527 on Dec. 30, 2014; in 22O129 on July 22, 2003.

In the past cases of Petition 18-800, 18-344, 19-639 and 21-881, Deputy Clerk Danny Jordan Bickel, Clerk Scott Harris and Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. blocked filing of Petitioner's motion for judicial notice of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children filed in 18-569, concealed the motion for judicial notice and did not return the motion when not filed, nor entering into the dockets, which

violated Supreme Court Rules, Guideline for Electronic Filing, First Amendment of Constitution. **This motion must be filed as required by Due Process and the fundamental right to access the court.**

First Amendment right to petition the government includes the right to file other civil actions in court that have a reasonable basis in law or fact. *McDonald v. Smith*, 472 U.S. 479, 484 (1985). In *Snyder v. Nolen*, 380 F.3d 279 (7th Cir. 2004), the 7th Circuit held that the clerk of court who refused to file pleading was not acting in “functionally comparable” way to judges, but breached the duty to perform the ministerial act of accepting technically sufficient papers and not covered by qualified absolute immunity for violation of the right to access to the court guaranteed by First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution in a 42 U.S.C. §1983 claim. See also, *Lowe v. Letsinger*, 772 F.2d 308, 313 (7th Cir. 1985) [absolute immunity does not apply to a clerk’s involvement in the concealment of the entry of a post-conviction order based on the same ministerial duty to file.


Supreme Court Rules Rule 10 states that all documents filed with this Court *will be made available to the public* on the court’s website, and that *if a document is not accepted for filing, the docket entry will reflect that* it is “Not Accepted for Filing”. Supreme Court Rules Rule 5 implies that the complete file of document must be posted: Documents larger than 100 MB that cannot be uploaded to the electronic filing system should be separate into multiple parts to allow each and every part filed to be posted.

Any reasonable person knowing all the facts will believe that all eight (8) Justices should be recused from deciding on Petition 22-28. The motion for judicial notice of the aforementioned 22 facts should be granted.

As the hacker hired by James McManis, American Inns of Court and possibly Chief Justice Roberts have aggressively altered the documents drafted by Petitioner for filing. If there were any typos, questions, comments, please do not hesitate to contact Petitioner or set this for hearing.

The undersigned swear under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of her knowledge.

Dated: July 24, 2011



Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Shao