

=====

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

—o0o—

LINDA SHAO, AKA YI TAI SHAO

*Petitioner - Appellant,*

vs.

California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Clerk Jorge Navarre, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, Mcmanis Faulkner Law Firm, Tsan-Kuen Wang, David Sussman, in the capacity as attorney of Tsan-Kuen Wang, Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge

Maureen Folan, Judge Rise Pichon

*Respondents- Appellees*

—o0o—

---

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to California Supreme Court regarding its order of May 17, 2022, which delayed adjudication by three months then summarily denied SHAO's vexatious litigant application for a petition for habeas writ of corpus that was filed on February 16, 2022 (S273215) by Acting Chief Justice who has conflicts of interest

---

**SUPPLEMENT TO REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF 8 JUSTICES (ALL  
OTHER THAN JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT)**

---

YI TAI SHAO, ESQ. *In pro per*

Mailing address: P.O. Box 280; Big Pool, MD 21711

Telephone: (408) 873-3888; FAX: (408) 418-4070

Email: [attorneyshao@aol.com](mailto:attorneyshao@aol.com)

2022 SEP 15 PM 1:09  
CW509

## Table of Contents

<b>I. ADDITIONAL FACTS THAT JUSTICE JACKSON SHOULD BE RECUSED.</b>	<b>1</b>
(1) JUSTICE JACKSON PERSONALLY PARTICIPATED IN THE 5/1/2020 EN BANC ORDER TO SUMMARILY DENY PETITION FOR REHEARING IN RELATED APPEAL NO.19-5014, SHAO V. ROBERTS, ET AL. SUCH THAT ANY REASONABLE PERSON WILL NOT BELIEVE THAT PETITIONER MAY HAVE A FAIR DECISION IN FRONT OF HER. ....	1
(2) RESPONDENTS JAMES MCMANIS, MICHAEL REEDY, MCMANIS FAULKNER'S ATTORNEY JAMES LASSART HAS ADMITTED TO THEIR CONSPIRACY WITH DC CIRCUIT IN DISMISSING APPEAL NO.19-5014, WHERE JUSTICE JACKSON PERSONALLY PARTICIPATED IN VOTING DENYING REHEARING ON 5/1/2020. ....	2
THE DC CIRCUIT'S ORIGINAL DOCKET TEXT FOR 1920120 .....	3
(3) IN NO. 21-5210 PROCEEDING, THE AMERICAN INNS OF COURT TACITLY ADMITTED TO THEIR BRIBERIES OF CHIEF JUDGE MERRICK GARLAND AND JUDGE PATRICIA MILLETT WHEN THEIR MOTION FOR SUMMARY AFFIRMANCE WAS PENDING IN 19-5014 BUT THE DC CIRCUIT AVERTED DECISION ON THIS MATERIAL ISSUE ON ITS 2/23/2022 ORDER WHERE JUSTICE JACKSON'S RECUSAL WAS AT ISSUE. ....	4
(4) IN NO.21-5210 PROCEEDING, THERE IS AN ISSUE ON WHETHER JUSTICE JACKSON SHOULD BE RECUSED WHERE JUSTICE JACKSON FAILED TO RESPOND TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JUDICIAL RECUSAL FILED IN ECF1922459, WHICH WAS CONTESTED, BUT THE DECISION OF DC CIRCUIT ON 2/23/2022 DENYING RECUSAL ON HER BEHALF, CONTRARY TO THE FACT THAT THE MATTER WAS UNCONTESTED AND SHOULD BE GRANTED. THIS RELATED ISSUE WILL BE ON THIS COURT. ....	7
1. <i>The 2/23/2022 Order ruled to the contrary to the court record of 1924935</i> .....	7
2. <i>The DC Circuit altered the docket entry for Notice of Non-Opposition of motion 1922495.</i> .....	10
(5) 21-5210 INCLUDES ADMISSION BY ALL APPELLEES OF 84 INCIDENTS OF THIS COURT'S VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(C), 2071(B), 1001, 371(¶1) THAT WERE CONSPIRED WITH MCMANIS FAULKNER, INCLUDING THE ISSUE OF 29 FELONIES COMMITTED BY THIS COURT IN PETITION 20-524 THAT INVOLVED THE PRESENT 7 JUSTICES/OFFICERS OF AMERICAN INNS OF COURT WHO FAILED TO DECIDE RECUSAL, AND FORGED ORDER AND JUDGMENT THAT JUSTICE JACKSON IS UNLIKELY TO BE IMPARTIAL AS SHE ALSO HAS AN ISSUE ON RECUSAL.....	11
<b>II. THIS COURT CONTINUES COMMISSION OF NEW FELONIES OF 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(C), 2071(B), 1001 AND 371, ¶1 AND NOW HAS COMMITTED 160 FELONIES LED BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS.</b> .....	<b>12</b>
A. THIS COURT BLOCKED FILING OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND/OR PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR PETITIONER'S APPEAL FROM 21-5210 DECISIONS BY BLOCKING PETITIONER'S ACCESS TO THE COURT--- UNREASONABLY RETURNED FILING ON AUGUST 18, 2022 .....	12

B. COURT CRIMES ALREADY SHOWN IN PETITION 22-28 WHICH CORROBORATED JAMES MCMANIS'S ADMISSION AND TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYER'S ADMISSION THAT THIS COURT CONSPIRED WITH THEM TO BLOCK PETITIONER'S ACCESS TO THE COURT BY DENYING EVERY PETITION AND APPLICATION THAT THIS PETITION 22-28 MUST BE CERTIFIED TRANSFER TO SECOND CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL TO A DISINTERESTED SENIOR JUDGE THERE WHO IS NOT A MEMBER OF AMERICAN INNS OF COURT AND NOT RELATED TO JAMES MCMANIS AND TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYER TO FORM AN IMPARTIAL APPELLATE PANEL TO CONDUCT A MEANINGFUL APPELLATE REVIEW OF THIS PETITION. ....	13
1. <i>This court has committed 164 felonies as shown by the table below, including 19 felonies in Petition 22-28:</i> .....	13
(C) CONCEALMENT OF FILING OF ALL APPENDIXES (EVIDENCE OF DISQUALIFICATION) FOR ALL OF THE 10 REQUESTS FOR RECUSAL, IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512, 2071(B), 1001 AND 371 AND SUPREME COURT'S GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, No.10. ....	24
2. <i>Already 19 felonies in Petition 22-28 that no one could believe there were no conspiracies.</i> .....	25
3. <i>Without a conspiracy, Chief Justice Roberts cannot have been persistent in concealment of Respondents' names that contributed significantly to the conspiracies of permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner.</i> .....	26
(1) <i>Judge Patricia Lucas:</i> .....	26
(2) <i>Judge Theodore Zayner</i> .....	27
(3) <i>Judge Rise Pichon</i> .....	27
(4) <i>Judge Maureen A. Folan</i> .....	28
C. BLOCKING 3 APPLICATIONS TO JUSTICE BARRETT TO GET IMMEDIATE CHILD CUSTODY RELEASE PROVED DIRECTLY THIS COURT'S AT LEAST 5 PRESENT JUSTICES' CONSPIRACIES WITH MCMANIS TO BLOCK CHILD CUSTODY RETURN SINCE 2012, AS ADMITTED BY TANI.....	28
D. THE ALREADY 19 CRIMES COMMITTED IN THE PROCEEDING OF PETITION 22-28, CONCEALED THE ENTIRE REQUEST FOR RECUSAL FROM PUBLICATION, AFTER HOLDING ABOUT 15 DAYS NOT TO ENTER INTO THE DOCKET, KEPT CONCEALING FILING, RAISE GREAT CONCERN OF RE-PLAY OF THEIR CRIMES IN 20-524. ....	29
<b>THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN KEPT CONCEALMENT BY THIS COURT IN PETITION NO. 22-28.....</b>	<b>29</b>

#### Cases

Critchley v. Thaler, 586 F.3d, 318 (5t Cir. 2009) .....	26
Jenkins v. Anderson, 447 US 231 (1980).....	2
Jenkins v. Anderson, 447 US 231 (1980).....	2
Kane v. Yung Won Han, 550 F.Supp 120 at 123 (New York 1982).....	26
Kornman v. Securities and Exchange Commission, Case No. 09-1074, January 15, 2010 (D.C. Circuit). ....	11
Liljeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp. (1988) 486 U.S. 847.....	6

LSLJ Partnership v. FritoLay, 920 F.2d 476 (7th Cir. 1990) .....	6
<i>Ringgold Lockhart v. County Of LA.</i> , 781 F.3d 1057 (9 Cir. 2014).....	29
Seghers v. SEC, 548 F. 3d 129, 133 (D.C. Cir. 2008).....	10
Shalant v. Girardi, 51 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1164.....	27
Standard Oil Co. v. California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976).....	6
<i>Thaler</i> .....	28
Wickware v. Thaler, 404 Fed. Appx. 856, 862 (5th Cir. 2010).....	26
<b>Statutes</b>	
§455 .....	7
§455(a).....	7
§455(a), .....	7
17 C.F.R. § 201.250(b).....	10
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1.....	20
18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371, ¶1. ....	1
18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(C), 2071(b), 1001, 371 ¶1 .....	11
18 USC §§1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371, ¶1 .....	12
28 U.S.C. § 455.....	8
28 U.S.C. §1927.....	3
28 U.S.C. §455.....	8
28 U.S.C. §2109 ¶2 .....	20
28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i).....	5
F.R.C.P. 60(b)(3), (4) and (6) .....	6
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Fifth Amendment Due Process .....	26
<b>Regulations</b>	
Guide to Judiciary Policy, Vol. 2B, Ch. 2, Published Advisory Opinion No. 52 (2009) .....	8

This is to supplement the Request for Recusal that was filed on 7/24/2022, but was withheld 16 days from the date the Clerk's Office received, 7/26/2022 until 8/9/2022 when this Court eventually entered into the docket, but discriminatively failed to post, which is equivalent to concealment of filings, a felony under 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371, ¶1.

**I. Additional facts that Justice Jackson should be recused.**

Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson should be recused, not only because she is a member/officer of the American Inns of Court, as mentioned in the Request for Recusal filed on 7/24/2022, but also for the following additional facts that Petitioner did not notice earlier on 7/24/2022:

(1) **Justice Jackson personally participated in the 5/1/2020 En Banc Order to summarily deny Petition for Rehearing in related Appeal No.19-5014, Shao v. Roberts, et al.** such that any reasonable person will not believe that Petitioner may have a fair decision in front of her.

Shao v. Roberts, et al. is arising from same facts of this underlying habeas corpus action, that the courts conspired with James Mcmanis, the leading attorney and one of the founders of American Inns of Court, in helping him to achieve his top priority to suppress the crimes involved in his plot of permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner, to block court reporter for the child custody trial, Julie Serna, from filing her child custody trial transcripts, to purge the court record of Serna's filed Certificate of Court Reporter waiving deposit (App.25) from Petitioner's family case, to block Petitioner access to the family case by taking it off from the court's website by 10 months from February 2017 and to forge false notices that Petitioner's child custody appeal (H040395) be procedurally dismissed for failing to procure the child custody trial transcript, and conspired with all courts including many Justices of this Court to deny all Petitions and applications, totally 11 in the past, to ensure Petitioner not getting her child custody back.

The child custody appeal that McManis managed to block access to the courts is to appeal from Judge Patricia Lucas's permanent child custody deprivation order of

11/4/2013 which was drafted by his law firm McManis Faulkner, as he had recently conceded in ECF1921981 in the related appeal of 21-5210 (DC Circuit) and tacitly admitted to in Petition No.21-881.

As Justice Jackson has participated in denying Rehearing in Appeal No. 19-5014, there is a public view that she is unlikely to be unbiased or impartial in deciding Petition No. 22-28.

(2) Respondents James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner's attorney James Lassart has admitted to their conspiracy with DC Circuit in dismissing Appeal No.19-5014, **where Justice Jackson personally participated in voting denying rehearing on 5/1/2020.**

McManis Appellees' attorney James Lassart filed a motion for summary affirmance (ECF1918497) on 8/12/2021 reciting a fact that the DC Circuit granted their motion for summary affirmance on 7/31/2019 in 19-5014 but the docket does not show such motion; however, in corroborating with Lassart's admission, on 7/31/2019, DC Circuit did issue a *sua sponte* Order to Show Cause to adopt the *entire* Judge Rudolph Contreras's 1/17/2019 Order and 104 days later *sua sponte* dismissed the appeal on 11/13/2019.

Petitioner filed an Opposition with Circuit Rule 27(c) counter motion for affirmative relief (ECF1920120) in response to ECF1918497. Lassart did **not** deny existence of such motion, refused to provide the motion to Petitioner upon 3 times of email requests (ECF1920126) from 10/25-10/27 of 2021 when he did respond to Petitioner's emails on other related matters, did **not file a Reply nor an Opposition** to 1920121 regarding Petitioner's severe criminal accusation on conspiracy to dismiss 19-5014 appeal. During the 6 months from the time of admission, 10/18/2021, to closure of the proceeding, McManis Appellees tacitly admitted 20+ times of the conspiracy and never denied such conspiracy. See, *Jenkins v. Anderson*, 447 US 231 (1980).

Moreover, recently, with the 12<sup>th</sup> alteration being on 6/27/2022, It was recently discovered by Petitioner that **DC Circuit altered the docket entry of 1920120 to conceal McManis admission** which DC Circuit, while Jackson was still

employed, omitted from mentioning this material fact from its 2/23/2022 Order dismissing 21-5210 appeal. Such alteration constitutes an act of spoliation of evidence, which further caused an **adverse inference** that DC Circuit did conspired with McManis to dismiss 19-5014 appeal and is purging such evidence, under the spoliation of evidence doctrine.

The title of ECF1920120 motion is:

“Appellant’s Opposition To Motion For Summary Affirmance Filed By Appellees James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, Janet Everson And Mcmanis Faulkner, LLP. (#1918497); Plaintiff’s Counter Motion For Affirmative Relief Under Circuit Rule 27 (c) To

(1) Vacate All Orders Of This Court In The Proceeding Of 19-5014 Based On Violation Of Due Process And Extrinsic Fraud And Reactivate The Appeal Of 19-5014

(2) Change Venue To U.S. Court Of Appeal In New York;

(3) Request For Terminating Sanction For Summary Reversal Of Judge Rudolph Contreras’s Order Of 8/30/2021 (Ecf168 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 DC Circuit’s original Docket Text for 1920120:**

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1920120] to motion for summary affirmance [1918497-2]

combined with a MOTION for attorneys fee, to transfer case, to remand case, to vacate filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/28/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 7788 words in 28 pages which is under the limits of 7800 words and 30 pages per Circuit Rule 27. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai)

Present docket entry is:

22-28 Supplement to  
Request for Recusal filed on 7/24/2022

MOTION [1920120] to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions filed by Yi Tai Shao[Service Date: 10/28/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 7788 words. [21-5210]--[**Edited 10/29/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/28/2021 06:49 PM]

(3) **In No. 21-5210 proceeding, the American Inns of Court tacitly admitted to their briberies of Chief Judge Merrick Garland and Judge Patricia Millett when their motion for summary affirmance was pending in 19-5014 but the DC Circuit averted decision on this material issue on its 2/23/2022 Order where Justice Jackson's recusal was at issue.**

Following James Lassart's admission to conspiracy with unidentified judges at the DC Circuit to dismiss 19-5014 appeal, Petitioner discovered briberies and **commented these briberies crimes in about 20+ papers filed in 21-5210 proceeding and no one Respondent/Appellee objected to such severe criminal accusations.**

American Inns of Court actually had tacitly admitted to their briberies to the judges at DC Circuit committed when its motion for summary affirmance in 19-5014 was pending.

On 3/18/2019, while Petitioner was overseas on missionary, DC Circuit's Operation Manager Scott Atchue took Petitioner's name off from the CM/ECF user list to allow American Inns of Court appellees to file their defective motion for summary affirmance without notice. Then on 4/9/2019, Atchue put Petitioner's name back on CM/ECF to allow Judge Patricia Millett issue an Order to Show Cause why Not Grant American inns of Court Appellees' motion for summary affirmance as it was unopposed by Petitioner.

In May 2019, two filed records of Temple Bar Scholars and Reports["TBSR"] filed in support of Petitioner's motion to change venue, were altered in the court records, while AIC's website reflected the same alteration. Then simultaneously when Atchue promised Petitioner that the court did not alter the records, the AIC



also changed the TBSR back to its original posting. There were 6 alterations of records as ground of recusal raised by Petitioner, where 4 incidents among the 6 were involved with AIC. The panel that is later discovered to be composed of two AIC officers who concealed their violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) refused to decide these issues, despite 3 Petitions for Rehearing asking them to decide within 11 months' span.

On 6/20/2019, pending AIC's motion for summary affirmance while it had been undisputed by all parties that AIC's motion was filed without notice to Petitioner, that AIC's motion must be denied by prevailing law, AIC let Chief Judge Merrick Garland present 2019 AIC Professionalism Award to Garland's nominated friend AJ Kramer on behalf of AIC. [Garland may be the one assigned 19-5014 to two officers of AIC, Judge Patricia Millett and Judge T.L. Pillard to willfully violated 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i).]

In mid-2019, Judge Patricia Millett's clerk, who could be the same writing 7/31/2019 order dismissing AIC got Temple Bar Scholarship as sponsored by Millett, a gift from the AIC with value exceeding \$7,000. AIC's motion should have been denied as undisputedly made without notice but was granted on 7/31/2019.

On 10/18/2021, James Lassart filed a motion for summary affirmance (1918497) exposing McManis Appellees' conspiracy with DC Circuit which granted their *undocumented, secret, motion for summary affirmance* on 7/31/2019. Indeed, besides granting AIC's defective motion, Millett further issued an Order to Show Cause on 7/31/2019 to adopt the entire order of 1/17/2019, and *sua sponte dismissed* the appeal summarily, without adjudicating on merits, 104 days later on 11/13/2019.

19-5014 was appealed to this Court in petition 20-524. On 12/14/2020, an order was issued to misapply 28 U.S.C. §2109 to summarily affirm DC Circuit's sua sponte dismissing appeal order. This court, including 5 present Justices, and two supervising deputy Clerks Jeff Atkins, and Jordan Danny Bickell, after being served with Petition for Rehearing on 1/8/2021, intercepted the mail by 8 days from 1/8/2021, rushed 1/15/2021 Mandate/Judgment, withheld Petition for Rehearing

that arrived much later on 1/17/2021 (there is a record no one would pick up the mail on 1/16/2021) without filing for 11 days, then upon being served with a Motion to File Petition for Rehearing on 1/29/2021, this Court returned de-filed Petitioner's Petition for rehearing. On 3/2/2021, this Court conspired with DC Circuit to return to Petitioner Motion to File Petition for Rehearing. There were 29 felonies committed.

Between 1/12/2021 and 1/17/2021, this Court took off from 20-524 docket 3 times the order and judgment. See ECF161-6. See App.67; also, document link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglPQ086A-x4RRI7N>

As Supreme Court failed to rule on the Petition for Writ of Certiorari 20-524, and the merits of her complaint was blocked from access to the court, pursuant to the holdings of LSLJ Partnership v. FritoLay, 920 F.2d 476 (7th Cir. 1990), and Standard Oil Co. v. California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976), Petitioner filed with the USDC for the D.C. a Rule 60(b) motion to vacate 1/17/2019's Order and to change venue [ECF161, 161-1 through 161-9].(App.87-137).

Petitioner's motion is based on F.R.C.P.60(b)(3), (4) and (6) according to Liljeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp. (1988) 486 U.S. 847 and William v. Pennsylvania, 136 S. Ct. 1899, 579 US \_\_\_, 195 L. Ed. 2d 132 (2016). All grounds for the motion were omitted from discussion by Judge Rudolph Contreras, who persisted on not recusing himself, in repeated violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) and Chief Judge Howard allowed that despite two notices from Petitioner (ECF163 and 165 in 1:18-cv-01233RC). This caused the second round of appeal, Appeal No.21-5210.

In 21-5210 proceeding, in Reply to Petitioner's accusation of bribes, AIC tacitly admitted and did not deny these bribes. (See ECF 1924925 filed on 12/1/2021) As mentioned above, no one Appellee ever objected to Petitioner's 20+ times' accusation that AIC bribed judges at the DC Circuit in dismissing 19-5014 appeal.

Likewise, James McManis's conspiracies with the DC Circuit to dismiss the entire appeal 19-5014 summarily, without deciding on the merits, were tacitly admitted by them 20+ times. California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye's irrevocable admission to her conspiracies with James McManis, her attorney, in

blocking Petitioner's access to the courts to seek grievance about unconstitutional deprivation of her child custody was also tacitly admitted at least 5 times by all appellees.

Yet, the 2/23/2022 Order dismissing appeal, which was willfully composed by three AIC officers in quadruple violations of 28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i) and 455(a), the DC Circuit did not rule on any of the undisputed admissions, bribes, but in the same order, the court denied recusal on behalf of Justice Jackson even though she failed to respond to Petitioner's Motion for judicial recusal filed in ECF1922459.

This related issue will be on this Court soon.

(4) **In No.21-5210 proceeding, there is an issue on whether Justice Jackson should be recused where Justice Jackson failed to respond to Petitioner's Motion for judicial recusal filed in ECF1922459, which was contested, but the decision of DC Circuit on 2/23/2022 denying recusal on her behalf, contrary to the fact that the matter was uncontested and should be granted. This related issue will be on this Court.**

On 11/15/2021, in Appeal No.21-5210, Petitioner filed a motion, ECF 1922459 with the title of:

**"Appellant's Motion To Transfer All Dispositive Motions To The Court Of Appeal In New York And Request For En Banc (Excluding Disqualified Judges) Decision On This Motion; Motion To Disqualify Chief Judge Sri Srivasan, Judge David S. Tatel, Judge Patricia A. Millett, Judge Cornelia T.L. Pillard, Judge Neomi Rao, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, Judge Harry R. Edwards, Judge Douglas H. Ginsburg, Judge David B. Sentelle, Judge A. Raymond Randolph, And The Judges Who Are Officers Or Members Of The American Inns Of Court Based On 28 U.S.C. §455(a), §455 (b)(5)(i) And/Or §455(B)(6)(iii)."**

For 100 days, no appellees ever filed an objection to this motion. Specifically, Petitioner filed a Notice of Non-Opposition to this motion 1922459 with docket number 1924935.

**1. The 2/23/2022 Order ruled to the contrary to the court record of 1924935**

On 2/23/2022, the DC Circuit issued the order as below that willfully omitted all issues on appeal, and the undisputed admissions to conspiracies of dismissing 19-5014, undisputed evidence of the conspiracies of deterring child custody return to Petitioner, undisputed admission of Tani Cantil-Sakauye's conspiracies with McManis in summarily denying all Petitions for Review at the California Supreme Court and all Petitions for Writ of Certiorari at this Court. The 2/23/2022 Order states:

"Upon consideration of the motions to recuse members of this court and transfer this appeal to a new venue, and the request for en banc consideration of one such motion; the motions to re-open appeal No. 19-5014 and vacate orders therein, the response thereto, and the reply; the motion for summary reversal, the response thereto, and the reply; the motions for summary affirmance, the responses thereto, and the reply; the motion for sanctions; and the supplements filed by appellant, it is

**ORDERED** that the request for en banc consideration be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that en banc consideration is warranted. See Fed. R. App. P. 35(a). It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motions to recuse and transfer be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that transfer is warranted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1631 (court may, in the interest of justice, transfer appeal to any court in which the appeal could have been brought). Furthermore, **appellant has not demonstrated that recusal is warranted**. See 28 U.S.C. § 455. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motions to reopen appeal No. 19-5014 and vacate orders therein be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that reopening is warranted, because she has failed to show bias on the part of the prior panel, either directly or as a result of their organizational associations. See 28 U.S.C. §455; Guide to Judiciary Policy, Vol. 2B, Ch. 2, Published Advisory Opinion No. 52 (2009). It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion for sanctions be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that such relief is warranted. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion for summary reversal be denied, the motions for summary affirmance be granted, and, **on the court's own motion, the district court's order entered August 30, 2021, be affirmed as to all remaining appellees.** The merits of the parties' positions are so clear as to warrant summary action. See Taxpayers Watchdog, Inc. v. Stanley, 819 F.2d 294, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam). Appellant has raised no arguments with respect to the district court's denial of her motion to strike and for sanctions, or her request to transfer included in her motion for post-judgment relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). See United States ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (arguments not raised on appeal are forfeited).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant's motion for relief pursuant to Rule 60(b). See Smalls v. United States, 471 F.3d 186, 191 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (denial of Rule 60(b) motion reviewed for abuse of discretion).

**Appellant's allegations with respect to a wide-ranging conspiracy throughout the judiciary are conclusory and unfounded, and she has not demonstrated that the district court was required to recuse itself.**

Appellant thus failed to establish that the judgment from which she sought relief was void or the product of fraud, or that extraordinary circumstances justified relief. See Shepherd v. American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., 62 F.3d 1469, 1477 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (“[A] litigant seeking relief from a judgment under [Rule 60(b)(3)] based on allegations of fraud upon the court must prove the fraud by clear and convincing evidence.”); United States v. Philip Morris USA Inc., 840 F.3d 844, 847 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (“[R]elief under Rule 60(b)(4) is available only in the rare instance where a judgment is premised either on a certain type of jurisdictional error or on a violation of due process.” (internal citation omitted)); Kramer v. Gates, 481 F.3d 788, 790 (D.C. Cir. 2007) (Rule 60(b)(6) is reserved for “extraordinary circumstances”).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

**2. The DC Circuit altered the docket entry for Notice of Non-Opposition of motion 1922495.**

The DC Circuit altered 12 times of the docket of 21-5210 with the last time being 6/27/2022, 49 days after closure of appeal. See the altered docket printout in **Exhibit B.**

Among at least 9 altered entries of this docket, Petitioner's Notice of Non-Opposition of ECF1922459 was also concealed its nature. It is ECF 1924935, but an "SRJ" altered the entry. Among the issues is Justice Jackson be recused.

The 2/23/2022 dismissal of 21-5210 is contrary to the unopposed uncontested 3 dispositive motions of Petitioner to transfer court (1920120, 1922201, and 1922459).

Justice Jackson did not respond to 1922459 motion but the order denied recusal for Jackson.

In 1924935, Footnote 2, Petitioner wrote:

"By analogous to 17 C.F.R. § 201.250(a), "the respondent, or the interested division may make a motion for summary disposition of any or all allegations of the order instituting proceedings with respect to that respondent.... **The facts of the pleadings of the party against whom the motion is made shall be taken as true.**" Seghers v. SEC, 548 F. 3d 129, 133 (D.C. Cir. 2008) By analogy, a motion for summary disposition may be granted **where there is "no genuine issue with regard to any material fact and the party making the motion is entitled to a summary disposition as a matter of law."** 17 C.F.R. § 201.250(b); Kornman v.

Securities and Exchange Commission, Case No. 09-1074, January 15, 2010 (D.C. Circuit).”

The 2/23/2022 Order in 21-5210 should therefore be reversed based on clearly abuse of discretion—unsupported by the records. DC Circuit’s alteration of 1924935 should constitute a spoliation of evidence that the doctrine of spoliation of evidence should come into play to reverse 2/23/2022 order and create an adverse inference that Justice Jackson indeed was biased and prejudicial that she should have been recused.

**(5) 21-5210 includes admission by all appellees of 84 incidents of this Court’s violations of 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(C), 2071(b), 1001, 371 ¶1 that were conspired with McManis Faulkner, including the issue of 29 felonies committed by this Court in Petition 20-524 that involved the present 7 Justices/officers of American Inns of Court who failed to decide recusal, and forged order and judgment that Justice Jackson is unlikely to be impartial as she also has an issue on recusal.**

In the underlying case of Shao v. Roberts, et al., 1:18-CV-01233 RC, 7 present colleagues of Justice Jackson who are officers/members of American Inns of Court are at default, including Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Justices Thomas, Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer, Deputy Clerks Jeff Atkins and Jordan Danny Bickell. 111 felonies raised in Petitioner’s 60(b) motion were uncontested by all appellees in 21-5210, including the 29 felonies in Petition 20-524. In ECF1921981, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner and their California attorney Janet Everson did not object nor deny to severe criminal accusations of their conspiracies with this Court in causing the 84 felonies, and this is undisputed.

When Justice Jackson has an issue on recusal, and this Petition 22-28 is all amount lack of impartial tribunal and blockage of access to the court, no reasonable person could believe that Justice Jackson can be impartial.

Therefore, for the above five(5) additional reasons, Justice Jackson has conflicts of interest in deciding this Petition 22-28, which is the underlying complaint of judiciary conspiracies causing 12 years' parental deprivation of Petitioner for Appeal No.21-5210 and Appeal 19-5014. An impartial decision on Petition 22-28 will adversely impact on the orders of 19-5014, including the 5/1/2020 Order which Justice Jackson participated.

**II. This court continues commission of new felonies of 18 USC §§1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371, ¶1 and now has committed 160 felonies led by Chief Justice Roberts.**

**A. This Court blocked filing of Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Petition for Writ of Certiorari for Petitioner's appeal from 21-5210 decisions by blocking Petitioner's access to the court— unreasonably returned filing on August 18, 2022**

On 8/12/2022, Petitioner submitted

“Petition for Writ of Mandamus [Rule 20; 28 U.S.C. §1651(a)], or, Petition for Writ of Certiorari with Motion for Extension to Justice Amy Coney Barrett pursuant to Rule 30 Under the Most Extraordinary Circumstances (Rule 22 Application to Justice Barrett and Request for Recusal all other 8 Justices will be filed)” ([https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTWmgQiXRbXUC6w1\\_h0](https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTWmgQiXRbXUC6w1_h0)).

with

“Application To Honorable Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett For A Short Extension Of Time To File Petition For Writ Of Certiorari [Rule 30.2]; To Decide On The Petition, And Other Relief The Justice Deems Appropriate [Rules 20, 22, 23]” (<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTWmgR3OFTnUYd0GVPsy>).

Despite the Petition was mainly for Writ of Mandate which is timely and the untimely caused by interferences is for Certiorari, this Court as led by Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. returned the above on 8/18/2022 alleging that Petition



for Writ of Mandamus may not be combined with Certiorari, and that application for extension on the alternative Petition for Writ of Certiorari is disallowed after passing due date for the Petition for Writ of Certiorari; these grounds is unsupported by any authorities. See **Exhibit A** for a copy of the letter of return without any legal basis, by Emily Walker, who refused to disclose her conflicts of interest, whether she is related to Susan Walker, a respondent in Shao v. Roberts, et al.

**B. Court crimes already shown in Petition 22-28 which corroborated James Mcmanis's admission and Tani Cantil-Sakauyer's admission that this Court conspired with them to block Petitioner's access to the court by denying every petition and application that this Petition 22-28 must be certified transfer to Second Circuit Court of Appeal to a disinterested senior judge there who is not a member of American Inns of Court and not related to James Mcmanis and Tani Cantil-Sakauyer to form an impartial appellate panel to conduct a meaningful appellate review of this Petition.**

1. **This court has committed 164 felonies as shown by the table below, including 19 felonies in Petition 22-28:**

Acts	Case No.	incidents
1	11-11119	18 U.S.C §1001&§371,1 Conspiracy with Tani, McManis to summarily deny
2	14-7244 &14A677	18 U.S.C §1001&§371,1 Conspiracy with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny both Petition and Application 14A677
1	16A863	18 U.S.C §1001 & §371,¶1 Conspiracy with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny both Petition and Application 14A677
10	17-82	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b) §1001 & §371,¶1 Conspired with James McManis <u>and removed from the docket</u> the name of James McManis as a respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. Conspired with James McManis to block filing and concealed filing of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers

		§1506, §1512(c), §2071(b) §1001 & §371, ¶1	of Lost Children <i>twice</i> ; did not enter into the docket for rejection of filing either (4 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
11	17-256	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b) §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with James McManis <i>and</i> concealed from the docket the name of James McManis as a respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b) §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and changed Amicus Curiae clerk with a new deputy clerk in order to reject filing of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children and failed to enter into the docket (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b) §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed Appendix to Request for Recusal from posting on the docket (1 act)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis and 8 Justices jointly did not decide Request for Recusal (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
11	17-613	18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Jeff Atkins conspired with McManis to alter Decision Date from 4/28/2018 to 6/8/2018 And instructed Mike Duggans to return the Petition (he did not and informed Petitioner of the bizarre instruction)(1 act)

		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed two sets of Appendixes to two Request for Recusal from posting (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis & Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis in not deciding two Requests for Recusal (4 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Withhold filing of Request for Recusal and Motion for Amicus Curiae until threatened with 42 U.S.C. 1983 lawsuit. (2 acts)
11	18-344	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with James McManis and Concealed from the docket the name of James McManis as a respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed filing of the first Request for Recusal, Motion for Judicial Notice and Concealed Appendix to the re-filed Request for Recusal from posting (3 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis in jointly not decide Request for Recusal (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
13	18-569	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed Appendix of Request for Recusal and Appendix for Petition for Rehearing (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis and all Justices in jointly not deciding Request for Recusal (2 acts)

		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis and all Justices not to decide Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with McManis to removed filed Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children and altered the docket after closure of 18-800 proceeding (3 acts)
11	18-800	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with James McManis and Concealed from the docket the name of James McManis as a respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed (1) Appendix to Petition for Writ of Certiorari (posted only 35 out of 202 pages), (2) entire Appendix to Request for Recusal, and (3) Appendix to Petition for Rehearing (posted only 9 out of 65 pages) (3 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired to conceal and Concealed filing of Motion for Judicial Notice (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
12	19-639	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed (1) Appendix to Petition for Writ of Certiorari (posted only 26 out of 177 pages) (2) entire appendix to Request for Recusal, (3) entire appendix to Petition for Rehearing (3 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b),	Conspired, Concealed posting Request for Recusal by 23 days; required re-submission of 10 additional sets as a condition to accept filing of Request for Recusal (1 act)

		§1001 & §371, ¶1	
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and Concealed filing of Motion for Judicial Notice (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy with James McManis and all 8 Justices (now are present 5 Justices) in jointly not to decide Request for Recusal (2 acts)
29	20-524	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and Concealed names of 67 Respondents except Chief Justice John G. Roberts (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and altered the docket 6 times in taking off 3 times the 12/14/2020 order and 1/15/2021 judgment and put them back, during 1/12—1/17, 2021; Adverse inference that the order/judgment was forged, not really decided by Gorsuch, Kavanaugh and Barrett (14 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and Concealed not only the entire Appendix but misrepresented there being an appendix to Request for Recusal (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy of 7 Justices and McManis in not deciding on (1) Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children and (2) requests for recusal, and 5 Justices conspired to “not to participate in voting”, (3) conspired to use inapplicable statute of 28 USC 2109 to summary affirm dismissal decision of US Court of Appeal DC Circuit in 19-5014 (5 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired in (1) mail interception to block filing of Petition for Rehearing and second Request for Recusal, (2) rushing 1/15/2021 Judgment despite being informed 3 times of Petitioner’s filing of

			<p>petition for rehearing, (3)&amp;(4) conspired to return Petition for Rehearing and Second Request for Recusal, (5) conspired with DC Circuit to return de-filed Motion to File Petition for Rehearing.</p> <p>Conspired not to post on the docket of the rejections of filing.</p> <p>(6 acts)</p>
28	21-881	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and Concealed James McMamas's name being posted as a Respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Concealed and blocked filing of (1)motion to transfer,(2)motion for judicial notice, (3) motion to file motion to transfer, (4) Petition for Writ of Mandate (28 USC 1651(a)) (5) & (6) 2 Applications to Justice Amy Coney Barrett on 1/24/2022 and 3/20/2022 (7) Appendix to Request for Recusal; (8) entire appendix of Petition for Rehearing (16 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with McManis and all 7 Justices in not deciding Request for Recusal, and refused to be recused (while they had impliedly recused themselves in 20-524.) (1 act)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy in not vacate 2/22/2022 order where Chief Justice Roberts had participated in voting (1 act)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracy among at least Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Scott Harris, Jeff Atkins, and Jordan Danny Bickell and Emily Walker to return, de-filed Petition for writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Barrett on 1/26/2022 with a false excuse that the court had no jurisdiction, which is in conflict with Rule 20 and 22 of the Rules of Supreme Court of the U.S. and 28 U.S.C. §1651(a). Also concealed filing and failed to enter into the docket for rejection of filings. (4 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspiracies with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing (4 acts)
19	22-28	18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Assigned to special agent Emily Walker (did not deny conflicts of interest) who delayed docketing by 4 days, and delayed posting the Petition for Writ of Certiorari until a week later. (2 acts)

	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with Emily Walker to <b>conceal posting Respondents' names shown on Page v. of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari</b> , including the names of Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Theodore Zayner, Judge Rise Pichon, Judge Maureen A. Folan, in disregard of at least 5 requests of Petitioner to Emily Walker to post the Page v. (1 act)
	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	<b>Conspired and Concealed filing of Request for Recusal</b> after withholding for 15 days, and further refused to post the Request for Recusal. (2 acts)
	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Jeff Atkins and Jordan Danny Bickell conspired with Lorie Wood (Attorney) to try to find fault in the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett which is <b>beyond the ministerial duty to file of the Clerk's Office</b> , violated Rule 22.1 willfully and returned on 8/4/2022, after withholding 6 days, the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett; further <b>refused to enter into the docket of the rejection of filing</b> (2 acts) See <b>Exhibit C for Wood's 8/4/2022 letter.</b>
	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Emergency Application attorney Robert Meek conspired with Roberts, Harris, Atkins, Bickell to illegally block filing of Application to Justice Amy Barrett on <b>8/24/2022 and again on 9/7/2022</b> in violation of Rule 22.1 stating the ground being that Lorie Wood had returned; which demonstrated Wood's return was only a false excuse but her true intent was to block Petitioner's access to the court. ===== <p>Refused to enter into the docket of such rejections of filing (4 acts) See <b>EXHIBIT D</b> for Petitioner's letters and Meek's letters, <b>beyond the ministerial duty of the Clerk's Office to block filing, when the Application includes an emergency request to immediate return of child custody to Petitioner.</b></p>
	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b),	After withholding 12 days from filing, in conspiracy, Emily Walker returned, de-filed a motion for judicial notice, with false excuse that the motion is beyond jurisdiction of this Court (when this Court had filed motion for Judicial Notice before at least in 2 other

		§1001 & §371, ¶1	cases); and further refused to enter into the docket of rejection of filing (6 acts) See <b><u>Exhibit E for her two letters of returning Motion for Judicial Notice on 8/5/2022 and 9/8/2022.</u></b>
		18 USC §1001 & §371, ¶1	With an intent to block Petitioner's access to the court, knowing Barrett being the only justice who is impartial, the Court set for conference on 8/24/2022, immediately when Robert Meek returned, blocking the second filing of the amended Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, in violation of Rule 22.1, meaning to deprive Petitioner's right to seek grievance in front of Justice Barrett in accordance with Rule 20 and 22. (2 act)
4	21-5210 appeal With case number to be assigned	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired and return in willful violation of Rule 22.1 (1) Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Petition for Writ of Certiorari, and (2) Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett for extension and other relief, in violation of Rule 30 (with statement of existence of very extraordinary circumstances, 20 and 22. And failed to enter into the docket (which should be a docket created as in 16A863) (4 acts)

84 among the above 164 felonies had been admitted, conceded and undisputed by all appellees in Appeal No.21-5210 proceeding at the D.C. Circuit. Among all, the egregious crimes include:

(A) purging Amicus Brief of Mothers of Lost Children in 18-569 after present 7 Justices conspired not to decide this motion

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVWR3-XraIA4PNqg?e=J2x7tM>;

(B) Using inapplicable statute of 28 U.S.C. §2109 ¶2 in Petition 20-524 to block Petitioner's appeal from Shao v. Roberts, et al.; McManis Appellees' attorney admitted on 10/18/2021, to their conspiracy with DC Circuit judges to block appeal in the underlying Appeal No.19-5014 when DC Circuit further conspired with this Court to return Motion to File Petition for Rehearing, when they conspired to block appeal and did not want to expose the wrong citation of 28 U.S.C. §2109 in the forged order of 12/14/2020 Order and 1/15/2021 Judgment which were taken off from the docket three times:



First time: 1/13/2021 7:15 a.m. Eastern Time (Taiwan time 1/13/2021 7:15pm); 2  
*minutes later, the Order was put back to the docket!*

Search documents in this case:

**No. 20-524**

**Title:** Yi Tai Shao, Petitioner  
v.  
John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, et al.

**Docketed:** October 20, 2020

**Lower Ct:** United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

**Case Number:** (19-5014)

**Decision Date:** November 13, 2019

**Rehearing Denied:** February 5, 2020

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Jul 02 2020	Petition for a writ of certiorari filed. (Response due November 10, 2020)  Petition    Appendix    Certificate of Word Count    Proof of Service
Oct 22 2020	Waiver of right of respondents Roberts, John G., et al. to respond filed.  Main Document
Nov 04 2020	Request for recusal from petitioner received.  Main Document
Nov 09 2020	Amicus brief of Mothers of Lost Children submitted.  Main Document
Nov 24 2020	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 12/11/2020.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
<b>Attorneys for Petitioner</b>		
Linda Shao	4900 Hopyard Road, Suite 100 Pleasanton, CA 94588-7101	(408) 873-3888
Party name: Yi Tai Shao		
<b>Attorneys for Respondents</b>		
Jeffrey B. Wall Counsel of Record	Acting Solicitor General United States Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001  SupremeCtBriefs@USDOJ.gov	202-614-2217
Party name: Roberts, John G., et al.		

## Details



January 13, 2021 7:15 PM



Screenshot\_20210113-191546\_Samsung  
Internet.jpg

/Internal storage/DCIM/Screenshots



## SEARCH RESULTS

Search documents in this case:	
No. 20-524	
Title	Vi Tai Gosa, Petitioner v John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, et al.
Doct date	October 20, 2020
Lower Ct	United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Cause number	(18-5014)
Decision date	November 18, 2020
Rehearing denied	February 5, 2021

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Jul 02 2020	Petition for writ of habeas filed (Reopened the November 19 2020)
	Receives: <a href="#">agencies</a> <a href="#">Certificate of Writ Court</a> <a href="#">Final of</a>
	<a href="#">Request</a>
Oct 20 2020	Review of rights of respondents Roberts, John G., et al. to request filed
	Multi Document
Nov 05 2020	Request for removal from petitioner court
	Multi Document
Nov 09 2020	Amicus brief of Mothers of Lost Children submitted
	Multi Document
Nov 24 2020	Oral Briefed by Conference of Justices
Dec 14 2020	Decrease the Court has a question 2014 5 (1) 31, and now the different Justices are of the opinion that the case cannot be heard and determined at the same time of the Court, the judgment is affirmed under 28 U.S.C. § 1210, which provides that under those circumstances "the court shall enter its order affirming the judgment of the court from which the case was brought for review with the same effect as upon a rehearing by an equally divided court." The Chief Justice, Justice Thomas, Justice Breyer, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor, and Justice Kagan took part in the deliberation or decision of this petition.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
Attorneys for Petitioner		

### Details

January 13, 2021 7:17 PM

Screenshot\_20210113-191749\_Samsung Internet.jpg

Second time: 1/16/2021 4:13pm (Taiwan time 1/17/2021 4:13am), the judgment was put back docket 42 minutes later. Please see evidence in Request for Recusal filed in Petition 21-881, p.20 and p21.

Third time: 1/16/2021 at 10:29 PM (6 hours after second removal) Please see evidence in Request for Recusal in Petition 21-881, p.22

See, undisputed documentary evidence of screenshots in ECF 161-1, p.38 of 44; and ECF 161-6: Petitioner's Motion to File Petition for Rehearing as returned by

Supreme Court which was directed by DC Circuit Court of Appeal in conspiracy:<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglPQ086A-x4RRI7N>

(c) Concealment of filing of all Appendixes (evidence of disqualification) for all of the 10 Requests for Recusal, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512, 2071(b), 1001 and 371 and Supreme Court's Guidelines for Electronic Submission, No.10. **(also, conspired not to decide).**

(d). Concealment of filing of 7 records in Petition 21-881 which cannot be done without conspiracies with James Mcmanis; all 6 justices other than Chief Justice and Justice Barrett conspired to **harbor Chief Justice Roberts's court crimes in concealing filing**, in not deciding on recusal, misusing the illegal voting power to suppress all crimes of McManis and their American inns of Court friends in California in this Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. They knew the 2/22/2022 Order involves Chief Justice's vote and that is unqualified, but refused to vacate 2/22/2022 order.

12/10/2022	Motion to transfer court to Second Circuit Court of Appeal	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVGB6rx_Q1xA_txv?e=jixATR">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVGB6rx_Q1xA_txv?e=jixATR</a>
12/10/2022	Appendix to Request for Recusal, which are evidence as the grounds of recusal of the 7 Justices of this Court.	<a href="https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU50Ydme-jI8Mgph?e=53YLaR">https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU50Ydme-jI8Mgph?e=53YLaR</a>
12/30/2022	Petitioner's <b>Motion For Leave To File</b> 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"	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVleVRdA6WjRwRpz?e=KUjMNg">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVleVRdA6WjRwRpz?e=KUjMNg</a>
1/6/2022	Petitioner's Motion for Judicial Notice	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVO_FsCV2sbP5dLC?e=pPuIM9">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVO_FsCV2sbP5dLC?e=pPuIM9</a>
1/24/2022	Petition for Writ of Mandate [28 U.S.C. §1651(a)] based on this Court's <b>concealment of the name</b>	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVAHmvPNd_VrIBp?e=1NPd4v">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVAHmvPNd_VrIBp?e=1NPd4v</a>

	<b>of James McManis as a Respondent, and concealed filings.</b>	
1/24/2022	<b>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)</b>	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU-2UwmrDUYdRt2t?e=3k4iy9">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU-2UwmrDUYdRt2t?e=3k4iy9</a>
3/30/2022	<b>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 to be Void and Transfer the Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Second Circuit Court of Appeal Pursuant to Congressional Policy Underlying 28 U.S.C. §455, 15 USC§29&amp; 28 USC§2109, ¶1 [28 U.S.C. §1651(a)] filed on 3/30/2022</b>	<a href="https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTwMgQ14mRF-1bZY5QMz?e=kWWyFU">https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTwMgQ14mRF-1bZY5QMz?e=kWWyFU</a>

Chief Justice Roberts received three letters about these crimes in 21-881, but failed to make corrections. See document link of a letter:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgViRgI8i3fb3pJa9?e=SVRs1y>

**2. Already 19 felonies in Petition 22-28 that no one could believe there were no conspiracies.**

The court crimes in 22-28 appear to have been authorized or led by Chief Justice John G. Roberts and further involved Legal Counsel, Laurie Wood, Robert Meek, Clerk Scott S. Harris, Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins, Deputy Clerk Jordan Danny Bickell and Emily Walker. See **Exhibit F** for letter of 8/2/2022.

There were totally 8 times of this Court's history blocking filing of Motion for Judicial Notice (18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881, 22-28 two times), and 7 times of this Court's blocking Petitioner's seeking grievance in front of Justice Amy Coney Barret (20-524 by blocking filing of the second request for recusal, 21-881 twice, 22-28 three times, the Application regarding appeal from 21-5210 on 8/18/2022 (Exhibit A)).

Concealment of filing has been decided to be violation of both First Amendment right to access the court as well as Fifth Amendment Due Process. E.g., *Critchley v. Thaler*, 586 F.3d, 318 (5th Cir. 2009) and *Wickware v. Thaler*, 404 Fed. Appx. 856, 862 (5th Cir. 2010) (The clerk has a ministerial duty to file and that a delay in filing constitutes a violation of Due Process). The clerk is not allowed to tamper with the court's records and refused to record filing. E.g., *Kane v. Yung Won Han*, 550 F.Supp 120 at 123 (New York 1982).

**3. Without a conspiracy, Chief Justice Roberts cannot have been persistent in concealment of Respondents' names that contributed significantly to the conspiracies of permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner.**

In disregard of *at least 5 times' objections*, this court persisted on concealing Respondents' names on the second page of "Parties in the proceeding". The hidden judges being named as Respondents all helped McManis significantly by misusing their judicial power to commit the felonies and violate the due process of Petitioner and her child; such concealment demonstrated the judicial conspiracies among California courts and this Court with James Mcmanis. In view of the irrevocable admission of California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Tani and McManis had influenced this Court in blocking child custody return in the past 12 years:

**(1) Judge Patricia Lucas:**

Lucas allowed McManis Faulkner law firm to draft her parental deprivation child custody order of 11/4/2013. As the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara county, Lucas purged Julie Serna's 5/8/2014 "Certificate of Court Reporter's Waiving Deposit" (App.25), blocked Serna from filing the transcripts, blocked Petitioner from accessing her Family Case Docket for 10 months when Serna's Certificate was purged, and kept fabricating false notices pretending Petitioner not yet paid the reporter's fees, and let the Sixth District Court of Appeal to use the false notices as the sole ground to dismiss the child custody appeal(H040395), an appeal to review her fraudulent 11/4/2013 order.

Lucas was appointed by Tani as a Committee member at California Supreme Court.

**(2) Judge Theodore Zayner**

Zanyer is the present Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court. On 10/31/2011, Zayner helped McManis to “revive” the set-aside parental deprivation orders of 8/4/2010 and 8/5/2010 which was illegally issued by Judge Edward Davila, *without* evidentiary hearing, declined Petitioner’s 15+ requests for evidentiary hearing raised in *each* hearing for 2 years, later assigned trial in front of Lucas in July 2013, plotting permanent parental deprivation; stole from jury trial chamber the court records of Shao v. McManis in 2016 the original deposition transcripts of James McManis and Michael Reedy during the stay, caused both child custody appeal and vexatious litigant order appeal to be dismissed summarily without an appellate review, conspired with McManis to dismiss the civil case to disallow Petitioner a day in court on McManis’s breach of fiduciary duty, altered Local Rule 8(c) to spoliage the evidence of judiciary conspiracies involved with dismissing the lawsuit of Shao v. McManis, and has been blocking Petitioner’s new motion to set aside dismissal (Shao v. McManis) and all orders of Judge Maureen Folan by not setting for hearing for already 10 months since 11/4/2021(See Footnote#3).

**(3) Judge Rise Pichon**

Pichon was the Presiding Judge who helped McManis issue an illegal sua sponte order of 5/27/2016 to apply Prefiling Order to family case only (Petitioner continues filing motions in civil case where the Prefiling Order was from), block Petitioner’s filing any motion in her pre-existing family case to ensure child custody not being released to Petitioner because Wang’s undisputable dangerous mental illnesses required immediate child custody change. Without Pichon’s illegal help, McManis would not be able to apply Prefiling Order to block Petitioner from filing a motion to change child custody. It is violates Shalant v. Girardi, 51 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1164 in applying to block motions to be filed in preexisting family case.

**(4) Judge Maureen A. Folan**

Folan concealed her conflicts of interest, being McManis's attorney of record for 2.5 years.

Folan helped McManis issue the Prefiling Order based on a fatally-flawed motion that had no declaration, without a Statement of Decision, and fraudulently backdated it to be 6/16/2015, with knowledge that it was used to block Petitioner's access to the family court to block child custody return.

**C. Blocking 3 Applications to Justice Barrett to get immediate child custody release proved directly this Court's at least 5 present Justices' conspiracies with Mcmanis to block child custody return since 2012, as admitted by Tani.**

On 8/24/2022, Chief Justice had an attorney Robert Meek to pretend him being a deputy clerk to block filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret in Petition 22-28 (**Exhibit D**), where Petitioner asked for immediate release of child custody to Petitioner based on parental deprivation and imminent child safety issue. Robert Meek kept silence and **refused to talk** in pick up Petitioner's call and failed to respond to Petitioner's 4 emails on 8/26/2022 for already 2 weeks. Meek continued failed to comply with Rule 22.1 in promptly giving it to Justice Barrett and concealed it from the docket and again returned de-filed the Application to Justice Barrett on 9/8/2022. Despite the cover letter of Petitioner in 9/5/2022 explicitly stated her modification, Meek went beyond the jurisdiction of the Clerk's Office knowingly issued a false notice to return the second time, in apparent purpose of joining the conspiracy led by James McManis to block child custody return to Petitioner.

Petition 22-28 is about Tani's illegal blocking Petitioner's access to the court by requiring the vexatious litigant order application to file Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, held it for 3 months, then summarily denied the vexatious litigant application on 5/17/2022 when Petitioner was on overseas mission.

Clerk's office has a ministerial duty to file; delay in filing violates due process. See, *Thaler*, supra.



This case has presented that all California courts are blocking Petitioner's access to the court and Petitioner in her modified application filed twice on 8/23/2022 and 9/5/2022 stated clearly but Meek still blocked filing, blocked the emergency relief request of Petitioner presenting to the only impartial justice of this Court, Justice Barrett. Chief Judge Roberts knew this but allowed these crimes to continue increasing. See emails to Justice Roberts in **Exhibit G**.

**D. The already 19 crimes committed in the proceeding of Petition 22-28, concealed the entire Request for Recusal from publication, after holding about 15 days not to enter into the docket, kept concealing filing, raise great concern of re-play of their crimes in 20-524.**

In denying habeas corpus on 5/17/2022, Tani already knew the lower courts' blockage of Petitioner's access to the court. Tani misused the fraudulent Prefiling Order to block Petitioner's First Amendment Right in the same facts as *Ringgold Lockhart v. County Of LA.*, 781 F.3d 1057 (9 Cir. 2014), which led to petition 22-28. Likewise, Petitioner's renewed motion to set aside dismissal and all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan had been blocked by **both lower courts for already 10 months since November 2021**. This motion is based on new facts that Judge Christopher Rudy who dismissed the civil case, is a member of William A. Ingram American Inn of Court, that the dismissal should be invalidated for conflicts of interest, and that Judge Maureen Folan who issued the prefiling order, was their prior attorney of record for legal mal defense for 2.5 years that all Folan's orders should be void and Julie Serna's "Certificate of Court Reporter Waiving Deposit".

The following documents have been kept concealment by this Court in Petition No. 22-28:

- (1) Motion for Judicial Notice filed on 7/24/2022 was illegally returned, ***after 12 days' "inspection"***, by Emily Walker on 8/5/2022 with a false ground of lack of jurisdiction. Emily Walker knew it was false and Chief Justice Roberts knew this was false but kept let Walker returning this Motion twice with the same false grounds. The court did have jurisdiction under Rule 21 and had filed motions for judicial notice in Petition 14-527 on Dec. 30, 2014 and in 22O129 on

July 22, 2003 (see also App.189). The body of the motion can be seen by this link  
<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDf3Jmx2ugpH1rFJ>

Exhibits JN-1 through JN-8:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDqfrJCK9hDSrp9F?e=IaK5ZW>

(2) Request for Recusal of 8 Justices filed on 7/24/2022 was eventually entered into the docket after 15 days' "inspection", but **was not posted**

<https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDtP4PAsZqOZZIbg?e=ayQPJh> (Part 1)

<https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDxc1karTcTkCJ-T?e=P7x8Aa> (Part 2)

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDbezJetiRNASjXc?e=sbarZ0> (Part 3—  
appendix JN1 and 2)

(3) Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret filed on 7/28/2022 was returned by Lorie Wood (Atty) on 8/4/2022 with excuse that needs to state jurisdiction and identify opinions, in violation of Rule 22.1:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDmJQYUV15TTb2cW?e=JI8rkI>

(4) Robert Meek, returned re-submitted Application to Justice Barrett twice on 8/24/2022 and 9/7/2022, with **clear conspiracy to block Petitioner's from filing**;

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTWmgS4np4jvYNkl554j?e=105dAy> Application  
part I (Ex. A to E);

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTWmgS83fCI2VpzGeUbM?e=x6YLHk>; Application  
Part II (Exh. F to K)

All of the unreasonable grounds stated by Wood were modified in the resubmitted Application, which was re-submitted on 9/5/2022 but Meek again returned in violation of Rule 22.1 and went beyond the jurisdiction of the Clerk's Office to block filing with fraudulent notices.

WHEREFOR, all 8 Justices should be recused from deciding on Petition 22-28.


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

Dated: September 15, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yi Tai Shao

Yi Tai Shao, Petitioner in pro per

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Yi Tai Shao', written over a horizontal line.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**