TABLE OF APPENDIX

I. LAWS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

A. CONSTITUTION, First Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

B. CONSTITUTION, 5TH Amendment:

"No person shall... nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"

C. 28USC§144

Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.

The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than ten days before the beginning of the term [session] at which the proceeding is to be heard, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time. A party may file only one such affidavit in any case. It shall be accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith.

D. 28 USC §455(a) and (b)(1), (b)(5)(i)&(iii)&(iv)

(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate [magistrate judge] of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

(b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:
(1) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding
(5) He or his spouse, or a person within the third degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse of such a person:
(i) Is a party to the proceeding, or **an officer, director, or trustee of a party;**
.....
(iii) Is known by the judge to have **an interest** that could be **substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding**;
(iv) Is to the judge's knowledge likely to be **a material witness in the proceeding.**
E. 18 U.S.C.§1506
Whoever **feloniously steals, takes away, alters, falsifies, or otherwise avoids any record, writ, process, or other proceeding**, in any court of the United States, whereby any judgment is reversed, made void, or does not take effect; or
Whoever acknowledges, or procures to be acknowledged in any such court, any recognizance, bail, or judgment, in the name of any other person not privy or consenting to the same –
Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.
F. 18 U.S.C.§ 1512(c)
Whoever **corruptively-**
(1) **Alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so**, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an

official proceeding; or
(2) **Otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so**, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

G. 18 U.S.C.§2071(b)

Whoever, **having the custody of any such record,** proceeding, map, book, document, paper or other things, **willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same**, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years..."

H. 18 U.S.C.§1001

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any manner **within the jurisdiction** of the executive, legislative, or **judicial branch** of the Government of the United States, **knowingly and willfully**
(1) **Falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact**;
(2) Makes any **materially false**, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or
(3) Makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or **entry;**
shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years..

I. 18 U.S.C.§371,¶1:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against theUnited States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more

of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

J. F.R.C.P.15(a)(3):

(3) Time to Respond.

Unless the court orders otherwise, any required response to an amended pleading must be made within the time remaining to respond to the original pleading or within 14 days after service of the amended pleading, whichever is later.

K. U.S.D.C. in the D.C. Civil Local Rule 7(b)

(b) OPPOSING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.

Within 14 days of the date of service or at such other time as the Court may direct, an opposing party shall serve and file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the motion. If such a memorandum is not filed within the prescribed time, the Court may treat the motion as conceded.

L. U.S.D.C. in the D.C. Civil Local Rule 83.2(d)

(d) PARTICIPATION BY NON-MEMBERS OF THIS COURT'S BAR IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.

An attorney who is not a member of the Bar of this Court may be heard in open court only by permission of the judge to whom the case is assigned, unless otherwise provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

M. <u>For the People Act (H.R.1); H.R.4766; S.2512 "Supreme Court Ethics Act")</u> Chapter 57 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following

§964 Code of Conduct

"Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Judicial Conference

shall issue a code of conduct, which applies to each justice and judge of the United States, except that the code of conduct may include provisions that are applicable only to certain categories of judges or justices.

N. GUIDE TO JUDICIARY POLICY VOL.2C, Ch.6 Gifts to Judicial Officers and Employees §§620.25, 620.30, 620.35(b), 620.45, 620.50

§620.25: "Gift" means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance or other similar item having monetary value but does not include:

(g) scholarships or fellowships award on the same terms and based on the same criteria applied to all applicants and that are based on factors **other than judicial status.**

§620.30: *A* judicial officer or employee shall **not** solicit a gift from any person who is seeking official action from or doing business with the court or other entity served by the judicial officer or employee, or from any other person **whose interest may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance** of the judicial officer's or employee's official duties.

§620.35 (b)...a judicial officer or employee may accept a gift from a donor identified above in the following circumstances:

(7) ...so long as the gift is...and is not offered or enhanced because of the judicial officer's or employee's official position; or

(8) the gift (other than cash or investment interests) is to a judicial officer or employee other than a judge or a member of a judge's personal staff and has an aggregate market value of $50 or less per occasion, provided that

the aggregate market value of individual gifts accepted from any one person under the authority of this subsection shall not exceed $100 in a calendar year.

§620.45: Notwithstanding §620.35, a gift may be accepted by a judicial officer or employee if a reasonable person would believe it was offered in return for being influenced in the performance of an official act or in violation of any statute or regulation, nor may a judicial officer or employer accept gifts from the same or different sources on a basis so frequent that a reasonable person would believe that the public office is being used for private gain.

§620.50 **mandatory disclosure requirements** Judicial officers and employees subject to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the instructions of the Financial Disclosure Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States must comply with the Act and the instructions in disclosing gifts.

§620.60 **Disposition of Prohibited Gifts**

(a) A judicial officer or employees who has received a gift that cannot be accepted under these regulations **should return any tangible item to the donor,** except that a perishable item may be given to an appropriate charity, shared within the recipient's office, or destroyed.

(b) A judicial agency may authorize disposition or return of gifts at Government expense.

O. California Code of Civil Procedure §170.9

(a) A judge shall not accept gifts from a single source in a calendar year with a total value of more than two hundred fifty dollars ($250)

P. 28 U.S.C. §2109

If a case brought to the Supreme Court by direct appeal from a district court cannot be heard and determined because of the absence of a quorum of qualified justices, the Chief Justice of the United States may order it remitted to the court of appeals for the circuit including the district in which the case arose, to be heard and determined by that court either sitting in banc or specially constituted and composed of the three circuit judges senior in commission who are able to sit, as such order may direct. The decision of such court shall be final and conclusive. In the event of the disqualification or disability of one or more of such circuit judges, such court shall be filled as provided in chapter 15 of this title.

In any other case brought to the Supreme Court for review, which cannot be heard and determined because of the absence of a quorum of qualified justices, if a majority of the qualified justices shall be of opinion that the case cannot be heard and determined at the next ensuing term, 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 affirmance by an equally divided court.

The Historical Note for ¶2 of §2109 is:
"The second paragraph of the revised section is new. It recognizes the necessity of final disposition of litigation ***in which appellate review has been had*** and further review by theSupreme Court is impossible for lack of a quorum of qualified justices."

Footnote 13 to United States v. Wills, 449 U.S.200 (1950).:

The original version of this section was designed to ensure that the parties in antitrust and Interstate Commerce Commission cases, which at that time could be appealed directly to this Court, **would always have some form of appellate review.** See H. R. Rep. No. 1317, 78th Cong., 2d Sess., 2 (1944). Congress broadened this right in the 1948 revision of Title 28 to include **all cases** of direct review. H. R. Rep. No. 308, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., A175-A176 (1947).

This Court stated: "And in this Court, when one or more Justices are recused but a statutory quorum of six Justices eligible to act remains available, see 28 U. S. C. § 1, the Court may continue to hear the case. Even if all Justices are disqualified in a particular case under § 455, 28 U. S. C. § 2109 authorizes the Chief Justice to remit a direct appeal to the Court of Appeals for final decision by judges not so disqualified. i.d., at p.212.

"The House and Senate Reports on § 455 reflect a **constant assumption that upon disqualification of a particular judge, another would be assigned to the case**. For example: "[I]f there is [any] reasonable factual basis for doubting the judge's impartiality, he should disqualify himself and let another judge preside over the case." S. Rep. No. 93-419, p. 5 (1973) (emphasis added); H.R. Rep. No. 93-1453, p. 5 (1973) (emphasis added). The Reports of the two Houses continued: "The statutes contain ample authority for chief judges to assign other judges to replace either a circuit or district court judge who become disqualified [under § 455]." S. Rep. No. 93-419, supra, at 7 (emphasis added); H.R. Rep. No. 93-1453, supra, at 7 (emphasis added). The congressional purpose so clearly expressed in the

Reports gives no hint of altering the ancient Rule of Necessity, a doctrine that had not been questioned under prior judicial disqualification statutes. **The declared purpose of § 455 is to guarantee litigants a fair forum in which they can pursue their claims.** ...[omitted]
And we would not casually infer that the Legislative and Executive Branches sought by the enactment of § 455 to foreclose federal courts from exercising "the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is." Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 177 (1803). " Id, p.216-7.

In United States v. District Court for Southern Dist. Of N.Y., 334 U.S. 258 (1948), this Court stated: The United States brought a proceeding against the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) and others to prevent and restrain certain violations of the Sherman Act. 26 Stat. 209, as amended, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2, 4. After trial the District Court dismissed the complaint. 44 F. Supp. 97. The case came here by appeal, after which we ascertained that due to the disqualification of four Justices to sit in the case, we were without a quorum. Accordingly, we transferred the case to a special docket and postponed further proceedings in it until such time as there was a quorum of Justices qualified to sit in it. 320 U.S. 708. Thereafter Congress amended the statute which provides for a direct appeal to this Court from the District Court in antitrust cases. The Act of June 9, 1944, c. 239, 58 Stat. 272, 15 U.S.C. (Supp. V. 1946) § 29, passed to meet the contingency of the lack of a quorum here, provides:[1]

"In every suit in equity brought in any district court of the United States under any of said Acts, wherein the United States is complainant, an appeal

from the final decree of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court and must be taken within sixty days from the entry thereof: *Provided, however,* That if, upon any such appeal, it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, **the case shall be immediately certified by the Supreme Court to the circuit court of appeals** of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought which court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to hear and determine the appeal in such case, and **it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge of said circuit court of appeals, qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, to designate immediately three circuit judges of said court**, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the court, so comprised, to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to hear and determine the same, and the decision of the three circuit judges so designated, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.

"If, by reason of disqualification, death or otherwise, any of said three circuit judges shall be unable to participate in the decision of said case, any such vacancy or vacancies shall be filled by the senior circuit judge by designating one or more other circuit

judges of the said circuit next in order of seniority *261 and, if there be none such available, he shall fill any such vacancy or vacancies by designating one or more circuit judges from another circuit or circuits, designating, in each case, the oldest available circuit judge, in order of seniority, in the circuit from which he is selected, such designation to be only with the consent of the senior circuit judge of any such other circuit.

"This Act shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on the date of its enactment."

Q. standard in applying 28 U.S.C. §455: Moran v. Clarke

In denying recusal, the court is required to set out all relevant facts. Moran v. Clarke (8th Cir., 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517.

Failure to properly handle a request for recusal is an independent ground for reversal. Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Loviae (1986) 475 US 813.

R. Cal. Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(4)

California Code of Civil Procedure §170.3

(c)(3) Within 10 days after the filing or service whichever is later, the judge may file a consent to disqualification in which case the judge shall notify the presiding judge or the person authorized to appoint a replacement of his or her recusal as provided in subdivision (a), or the judge may file a written verified answer admitting or denying any or all of the allegations contained in the party's statement and setting forth any additional facts material or relevant to the question of disqualification. The clerk shall forthwith transmit a copy of the judge's answer to each party or his or her attorney who has appeared in the action.

(4) **A judge who fails to file a consent or answer within the time allowed shall be deemed to have consented to his or her disqualification** and the clerk shall notify the preceding judge or person authorized to appoint a replacement of the recusal as provided in subdivision (a).

Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa Valley, 2 Cal.App.5th 10 (2016)

"In short, Urias, Oak Grove, and the cases they rely upon stand for the proposition that **the facts alleged in a statement of disqualification must be considered true** where, as here, the judge whose impartiality was challenged fails to consent to or challenge the allegations of the statement of disqualification."

Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc., 234 Cal.App.3d 415 (1991), Oak Grove School Dist. v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 217 Cal.App.2d 678; Calhoun v. Superior Court (1958) 51 Cal.2d 257, 262.

S. Adoptive admission: Ca. Evidence Code §1221 and §1230

§1221: Evidence of a statement offered against a party is not made inadmissible by the hearsay rule if the statement is one of which the party, with knowledge of the content thereof, has by words or other conduct manifested his adoption or his belief in its truth.

§1230: Evidence of a statement by a declarant having sufficient knowledge of the subject is not made inadmissible by the hearsay rule if the declarant is unavailable as a witness and the statement when made, was so far contrary to the declarant's pecuniary or proprietary interest, or so far subjected him to the risk of civil or criminal liability, or so far tended to render invalid a claim by him against

another, or created such a risk of making him an object of hatred, ridicule, or social disgrace in the community, that a reasonable man in his position would not have made the statement unless he believed it to be true.

T. Tacit Admission must be considered: F.R.E.801(d)(2)

F.R.E.801(d) Statements That Are Not Hearsay. A statement that meets the following conditions is not hearsay:

(2) An Opposing Party's Statement. The statement is offered against an opposing party and

(A) was made by the party in an individual or representative capacity;

(B) is one the party manifested that it adopted or believed to be true

(c) was made by a person whom the party authorized to make a statement on the subject;

(D) was made by the party's agent or employee on a matter within the scope of that relationship and while it existed; or

(E) was made by **the party's coconspirator** during and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

The statement must be considered but does not by itself establish the declarant's authority under (C); the existence or scope of the relationship under (D); or participation in it under (E).

Tacit admission if a statement made in the party's presence was heard and understood by the party, who was at liberty to respond, in circumstances naturally calling for a response, and the party failed to respond. E.g., Jenkins v. Anderson, 447 US 231 (1980); Alberty v. United States, 162 US 499, 16 S. Ct. 864, 40 L. Ed. 1051 (1896).

II. 5/9/2022 ORDER OF D.C. CIRCUIT SUMMARILY DENYING REHEARING DOC#1946024

Filed On: May 9, 2022

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT No. 21-5210 September Term, 2021
1:18-cv-01233-RC
Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees

---

BEFORE: **Henderson, Tatel, and Pillard, Circuit Judges**

O R D E R

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing, it is ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk
BY: /s/ Daniel J. Reidy Deputy Clerk

III. 2/23/2022 ORDER OF D.C. CIRCUIT SUMMARILY DISPOSING APPEAL WITHOUT DECIDING ON THE MERITS NOR ANY ISSUES [DOC#1936331]

Filed On: FEB. 23, 2022

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT No. 21-5210 September Term, 2021 1:18-cv-01233-RC
Filed On: February 23, 2022 Yi Tai Shao, Appellant
v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees

BEFORE: Henderson, Tatel, and Pillard, Circuit Judges

O R D E R

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
FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk BY: /s/ Manuel J. Castro Deputy Clerk

IV. Table Of 49 Felonious Acts Of The D.C. Circuit In Two Appeals Of Appeal Nos.19-5014 & 21-5210 (Shao v. Roberts, et al.)

CASE NO.	Number of acts	acts
19-5014 (totally 31 criminal acts)	**13 acts.** 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	**6 alterations of court records + 6 tacit admitted conspiracies on these alterations among AIC, James McManis, Chief Justice Roberts, hacker Kevin L. Warnock, Judge Rudolph Contreras and Scott Atchue conspired to alteration of court records** [6 alterations were stated in ECF1791001 but D.C. Circuit refused to decide and further refused to decide despite 3 additional requests of decision by Petitioner in her 3 Petitions for Rehearing (12 acts); **1 forged En Banc order of 5/1/2020** stated in ECF 1791001 that D.C. Circuit refused to explain nor decide repeatedly 4 times (including 3 Petitions for Rehearing filed in 2019 and 2020); see App.99-106 (ECF 161-1) that no court ever decided.
19-5014	1 act 18 U.S.C.	3/2/2021: DC Circuit's Clerk's Office sent to US Supreme Court's Clerk Petitioner's

	§1001 & §371,¶1	Motion to File Petition for Rehearing, to conspire with US Supreme Court administration (Chief Justice Roberts) to return, de-filed the Motion filed in 20-524 proceeding (Supreme Court concealed this filing)
Admission by James Lassart, McManis Appellees' attorney and all parties for at least 20 times in Appeal No. 21-5210 since 10/18/2021	**8 acts (4 orders and 4 conspiracies)** 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	**7/31/2019 order which is a fruit of conspiracies between James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm, Janet Everson, their attorney James Lassart, with a secret Motion for Summary Affirmance that was "granted" by at least Judge Patricia Millett at the DC Circuit.** **Fruits of 7/31/2019's conspiracies:** **) 11/13/2019 Order of sua sponte affirming Judge Rudolph Contreras's sua sponte dismissal order of 1/17/2019** **) 2/5/2020 Order summarily denying rehearing** **) 5/1/2020 order summarily denying rehearing.**
Tacitly admitted by America	4 acts (2 orders and 2 briberies	American Inns of Court did not object nor deny Petitioner's accusations of bribery of then-Chief Judge

n Inns of Court in 21-5210 proceeding	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	Merrick Garland and Judge Patricia Millett in dismissing AIC appellees from 19-5014 appeal: 6/27/2019: bribery to Chief Judge Merrick Garland, allowing him to give luxury award to Garland's nominated friend attorney Kramer. Summer /Fall 2019: Temple Bar Scholarship to Judge Millett's clerk as sponsored by Judge Millett.
	5 acts 18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371,¶1	Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Cornelius T.L. Pillard willfully concealed their direct conflicts of interest and issued 5 orders in 19-5014 appeal proceeding
21-5210 (totally 18 criminal acts)	**13 acts of alterations of docket entries, plus 12 acts of conspiracies,** 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b),	delayed docketing by 8 days put the wrong date of filing of Notice of Appeal (App.26) Attempted to alter the docket of 21-5210 on 11/13/2021 (App.48-49) Docket alteration of 21-5210 on 6/17/2022, 49 days after closure of the case (App.17-23) 9 docket entries were silently altered including notably the nature of proceeding of ECF 1920120 to conceal the admission of James Lassart

	§1001 & §371,¶1	and his clients, James Mcmanis, McManis Faulkner, Michael Reedy and Janet Everson. and altered ECF 1924935 to conceal the fact of Non-opposition to Motion in 1922459 (to transfer all dispositive motions to the Second Circuit, to recuse judges at the DC Circuit and vacate orders in 19-5014). (Please see Question Presented No. 14 for complete name of the motion of 1922459)
	5 acts 18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371,¶1	Chief Judge Sri Srinavason willfully would not transfer the appeal, knowing non-opposition through Petitioner's email of 12/24/2021, but willfully conspired with American Inns of court to empanel 3 judges who are officers of American Inns of Court, including Judge Cornelius T.L. Pillard who was a panel judge at 19-5014; all three judges concealed their direct conflicts of interest in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i) and issued 2 orders, willfully failed to discuss material issues of the

		admission on conspiracies of dismissing 19-5014 appeal.

V. ALTERED DOCKET OF APPEAL NO. 21-5210 on 6/17/2022, 49 days after closure of the appeal:

A "Full Docket" print-out where all entries after 10/29/2021 were removed

Pages 1-6 [omitted] in this docket printout are statements of appearance for each party in 21-5210

Page: 7

Yi Tai Shao, Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

John G. Roberts, Chief Justice; Anthony M. Kennedy, Associate Justice; Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice; Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Associate Justice; Stephen G. Breyer, Associate Justice; Samuel A. Alito, Jr., Associate Justice; Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice; Elena Kagan, Associate Justice; Jordan Bickell; Jeff Atkins; U.S. House Judiciary Committee; U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee; Eric Swamwell, House Representative; Diane Feinstein, Senate; United States Supreme Court; William A. Ingram, American Inn of Court; American Inns of Court; San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court; James McManis; Michael Reedy; McManis Faulkner, LLP; Janet Everson; Santa Clara County Superior Court of California; Rebecca Delgado; Susan Walker; David H. Yamasaki; Lisa Herrick; California Sixth District Court of Appeal; Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal; Conrad Rushing, Justice; Eugene Premo, Justice; Franklin Elia, Justice; Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Justice; J. Clifford Wallace, Judge; Edward Davila, Judge; Patricia Lucas, Judge; Rice Pichon; Theodore Zayner,

Judge; Joshua Weinstein, Judge; Mary Ann Grill, Judge; Maureen Folan; Lucy H. Koh, Judge; Peter Kirwan, Judge; Gregory Saldivar, Commissioner; Darryl Young; Mary L. Murphy; Sarah Scofield; Jill Sardeson; Misook Oh; BJ Fadem; John Orlando; David Sussman; Tsan-Kuen Wang; Elise Mitchell; Carole Tait-Starnes; Department of Family and Children Services; Youtube, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Google Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Kevin L. Warnock; Esther Chung; Does 4-50; Supreme Court of California, Doe Dft. No. 4; Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice as Doe Dft No. 5; Adrienne M. Grover, Doe Dft. No. 1; Rudolph Contreras; County of Santa Clara; Jackie Francis; California Supreme Court as Doe No. 2,
Defendants - Appellees
Page 8 of 9 **(all docket entries after 10/29/2021 were removed; when two entries on 10/28/2021 about Petitioner's counter motion for affirmative defense and the first Supplement which had been altered by "SRJ", who is likely the Chief Judge, to conceal 120120 was to respond to McManis appellees' motion [1918497] and frame like their motion was unopposed.**

09/29/2021	US CIVIL CASE docketed. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:38 PM
09/29/2021	NOTICE OF APPEAL [1916104] seeking review of a decision by the U.S. District Court in 1:18-cv-01233-RC filed by Yi Tai Shao. Appeal assigned USCA Case Number: 21-

	5210. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:39 PM]
09/29/2021	CLERK'S ORDER [1916107] filed directing party to file initial submissions: APPELLANT docketing statement due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT certificate as to parties due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT statement of issues due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT underlying decision due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT deferred appendix statement due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT entry of appearance due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT transcript status report due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT procedural motions due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT dispositive motions due 11/15/2021; directing party to file initial submissions: APPELLEE certificate as to parties due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE entry of appearance due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE procedural motions due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE dispositive motions due 11/15/2021, Failure to respond shall result in dismissal of the case for lack of prosecution; The Clerk is directed to mail this order to appellant by certified mail, return receipt requested and by 1st class mail. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:42 PM
09/29/2021	DOCKETING STATEMENT [1916171] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 09/29/2021] [21-5210]

	(Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 09/29/2021 05:25 PM]
09/29/2021	CERTIFIED AND FIRST CLASS MAIL SENT [1916209] with return receipt requested [Receipt No.70190700 0000 5269 2475] of order [1916107-2]. Certified Mail Receipt due 11/01/2021 from Yi Tai Shao.[21-5210] [Entered: 09/30/2021 10:22 AM]
10/08/2021	CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT [1917870] received from Lily for order [1916209-2] sent to Appellant Yi Tai Shao[21-5210] [Entered: 10/13/2021 01:14 PM]
10/18/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1918497] filed by James A. Lassart on behalf of Appellees Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy [21-5210]] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:28 AM]
10/18/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1918492] filed by Janet Everson, James McManis, McManis Faulkner, LLP and Michael Reedy [Service Date: 10/18/2021] [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:30 AM]
10/18/2021	MOTION [1918497] for summary affirmance filed by Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy

	(Service Date: 10/18/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail) Length Certification: 782 words. [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:34 AM]
10/18/2021	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITS [1918627] for motion [1918497-2] filed by Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy. [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 03:55 PM]
10/28/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920033] filed by Michael E. Barnsback on behalf of Appellees American Inns of Court, San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court and William A. Ingram. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 10/28/2021 01:41 PM]
10/28/2021 **** see below for original entry****	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]
10/28/2021	PROPOSED JUDGMENT [1920121] submitted by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/28/2021]

	[21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/28/2021 06:52 PM]
10/28/2021 **** see below for original entry****	SUPPLEMENT [1920126] to MOTION [1920120] to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210]--**[Edited 10/29/2021 by SRJ]** (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/28/2021 11:29 PM]
10/29/2021	STATEMENT OF ISSUES [1920222] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:38 PM]
10/29/2021	NOTICE [1920223] to supplement record filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:41 PM]
10/29/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920228] filed by James S. Aist on behalf of Appellee Carole Tait-Starnes.[21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:57 PM]
10/29/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1920230] filed by Carole Tait-Starnes[Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:58 PM]
10/29/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920272] filed by Drew T. Dorner on behalf of Appellees Patricia Bamattre- Manoukian, California Sixth District Court of Appeal,

	Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Clerk's Office of California

PACER Service Center			
Tra			
DC Circuit (USCA) - 06/17/2022 16:50:30			
PACER Login:	shaolawfirm	Client Code:	
Description:	Docket Report (full)	Search Criteria:	21-5210
Billable Pages:	10	Cost:	1.00

B. 6/17/2022 docket shows an altered entry for ECF1920120 – the court concealed the nature of ECF1920120 to be in response to Mcmanis Appellees' Motion for Summary Affirmance (1918497) where McManis did not oppose nor object, but *admitted* to Petitioner's accusations about McManis's attorney's admission in 1918497 to their conspiracy with DC Circuit to dismiss 19-5014 appeal on 7/31/2019; in fact, this also shows that they tacitly admitted to their conspiracies with McManis in dismissing Appeal No.19-5014.

**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)

Cp: altered present docket entry

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]

**Original Docket Text for 1920126 before "SRI" altered it was:

SUPPLEMENT [1920126] to motion for attorney fees [1920120-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6] filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai)

Altered by SRI:

SUPPLEMENT [1920126] to MOTION [1920120] to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions filed

VI. Petitioner's "NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION" [ECF 1924935] that was altered docket entry by "SRJ" to hide the fact that Petitioner's 1922459 motion was unopposed (See, App.18-22 for the table of all crimes of D.C. Circuit)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT Case #21-5210 Document **#1924935** Filed: 12/01/2021

YI TAI SHAO, ESQUIRE, Appellant vs. CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., et al. Appellees

"**Notice Of Non-Opposition By Appellees** To **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) (ECF#1922459)"

TO THE COURT AND ALL APPELLEES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: **Please take notice that this motion (#1922459) has not been opposed by any appellees** after they were duly served on November 15, 2021 within the due date in Circuit Rule 27. **All arguments and facts provided in #1922459 are undisputed which include:**

(1) Appellees James McManis, McManis Faulkner, PC, Michael Reedy and Janet Everson

["McManis Appellees"] **admitted through their agent, attorney of record, of their ex parte undocumented motion for summary affirmance that was "approved" by this D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal on 7/31/2019 pursuant to F.R.E.801(d)(2)(D)** and had knowingly maintained tacit or silence when such severe accusation usually calls for a response; moreover, McManis Appellees had admitted at least twice by silence or adoption about their conspiracy with this D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal of dismissal of the Appeal Case No. 19-5014 **which caused undisputed direct conflict of interest of this D.C. Circuit court of appeal to handle this appeal**; **this same issue was raised in Appellant's Affirmative Relief (#1920120)**, regarding which, McManis Appellees also failed to oppose and had legally admitted by silence of the accused criminal conspiracy when such accusation will call for a response; on Page 7 of #1922459, McManis Appellees were reminded that ""**McManis Appellees" did not file any responding paper to dispute the accused conspiracy with this court that was raised by SHAO in #1920120"** and again, **McManis Appellees had full opportunity to oppose and chose to admit** a second time by tacit, silence or adoption1;

(2)This D.C. Circuit committed a crime of attempting alteration of the docket on November 13, 2021 **with evidence shown on Pages 27 through 44 of 148**

---

1 Tacit admission of a statement made in the party's presence was heard and understood by the party, who was at liberty to respond, in circumstances naturally calling for a response, and the party failed to respond. E.g., Jenkins v. Anderson, 447 US 231 (1980); Alberty v. United States, 162 US 499, 16 S. Ct. 864, 40 L. Ed. 1051 (1896).

of #1922459, such that **this D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal has direct conflict of interests as Appellant is the victim of such felony;**
(3)As a matter of law all judges at this Circuit cannot be entirely impartial based on colleague relationship within a Court;
(4)The **present two Justices of the US Supreme Court (Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas) are alumni judges** of this Circuit which creates appearance of conflicts of interests;
(5) This Circuit is closely associated with Appellee American Inns of court including receiving financial benefits that must be disqualified. Chief Judge Sri Srinivasan, Judge Patricia Millett, Judge Cornelia T.L. Pillard, Judge Douglas H. Ginsburg, **Judge *Ketanji Brown Jackson***, Judge David B. Sentelle, Judge Harry T. Edwards, Judge A. Raymond Randolph and other judges **who <u>are or were officers of Appellee the American Inns of Court</u>** must be recused, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) (officers of a party in the proceeding) as well as 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(6)(iii); (6) Judge Neomi Rao who received financial interest from Appellee American Inns of Court must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(6)(iii);
(7) Judge David Tatel who is a member of Appellee American Inns of Court should be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(6)(iii);
(8) The unidentified judges who had conspired with McManis Appellees in granting their undocumented motion for summary affirmance in an ex parte manner on July 31, 2019 besides Judge Millett and Judge Pillard (and ex-Chief Judge Merrick Garland) must be recused, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and (b)(6)(iii).

As having been raised by Appellant twice in page 6 and page 12 of 148 of #1922459 which is undisputed, "**Admission during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy can be offered against co-conspirators.**" F.R.D.801(d)(2)(e); U.S. v. Inadi (1986) 475 U.S. 387; U.S. v. Haldeman (D.C. Cir. 1976) 559 F.2d 31; U.S. v. Handy (8th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 407." Therefore, McManis Appellees' at least twice silent admission to such severe accusation of conspiracy with this D.C. Circuit Court should be offered against this D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal.

Based on non-opposition of all appellees, this motion to transfer to New York should be granted in its entirety2. Appellant's relief requested in Page 10 of #1922459 should be granted; that is, all dispositive motions should be transferred to the New York Court of Appeal, to have En Banc decision on this motion to transfer done by **un-recused judges**, and if quorum is insufficient, transfer all dispositive motions to the Second Circuit in New York.

Dated: December 1, 2021 Respectfully submitted, /s/

---

2 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).

XII. American Inns of court["AIC"] tacitly admitted to their briberies upon Chief Judge Merrick Garland and Judge Patricia Millett in dismissing them from the 19-5014 appeal BUT the orders of 21-5210 omitted this undisputed facts/admission:

(1) Kathryn Wynbrandt who got the award of Temple Bar Scholarship from AIC in Fall 2019 is likely the clerk who wrote the orders of April 9, 2019, July 30, 2019 in Appeal No.19-5014 dismissing AIC Appellees.

(2) When Appellee American Inns of Court's motion for summary affirmation (dismissal) was pending in Appeal 19-5014 in 2019, AIC bribed then-Chief Judge Merrick B. Garland by giving him a gift to allow him to issue award to his nominated friend Kramer by way of the 2019 American Inns of Court Professionalism Award for the D.C. Circuit.

AIC's NEWS POSTING of 6/20/2019:

J. Kramer, Esquire, to Receive the 2019 American Inns of Court Professionalism Award for the D.C. Circuit

June 20, 2019 09:15 AM Eastern Daylight Time

ALEXANDRIA, Va.--(BUSINESS WIRE)—

A.J. Kramer, Esquire has been selected to receive the prestigious 2019 American Inns of Court Professionalism Award for the D.C. Circuit. **Chief Judge Merrick B. Garland of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit will present the award during the Judicial Conference of the D.C. Circuit on June 27** in Cambridge, Maryland. Kramer has been the federal public defender for Washington, D.C., since the office was created in 1990. "Over the course of his almost 30 years as our federal public defender, Mr. Kramer has displayed

sterling character, unquestioned integrity, and dedication to the highest standards of the legal profession and the rule of law," says **Garland, who nominated Kramer for the award.** "Mr. Kramer's reputation in the legal community is stellar."
(omitted the rest)

American Inns of Court's posting of "Temple Bar Scholars and Reports" regarding awarding Judge Millett's clerk in the very same year of dismissal of 19-5014 appeal. That clerk could be the same who wrote the corruptive 4/9/2019 Order to Show Cause why not grant AIC motion for summary affirmance because Appellant did not oppose, and the 7/31/2019 order dismissing AIC.

Kathryn L. Wynbrandt is a law clerk for Judge Patricia A. Millett of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit..
Temple Bar Scholars and Reports
2019
.....(omitted 4 other recipients)
Kathryn L. Wynbrandt Sponsored by **Judge Patricia A. Millett,** Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit

VIII. USCA Case #21-5210 Document #1918497 Filed: 10/18/2021 with the D.C. Circuit— James Lassart's admission to 7/31/2019 conspiracy of dismissing 19-5014 appeal, which the 2/23/2022 order willfully omitted.

YI TAI SHAO, ESQUIRE, Appellant, v. JOHN G. ROBERTS, CHIEF JUSTICE, et al., Appellees.	Case No.: 21-5210 MOTION FOR SUMMARY AFFIRMANCE

Appellees Michael Reedy, James McManis, Janet Everson and McManis Faulkner LLP (collectively referred to as "Appellees") oppose Appellant Yi Tai Shao's ("Shao") September 21, 2021 Notice of Appeal of the lower Court's denial of her Motion to Vacate Judgment, Change of Venue, Motion to Strike and for Sanctions.

Appellant appealed the initial dismissal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in 2019. **On July 31, 2019, the Court of Appeals granted Appellees' Motion for Summary Affirmance; and dismissed the Appeal**. Appellant sought a rehearing, which was denied on February 5, 2020.

...(omitted)....

DATED: October 18, 2021

MURPHY, PEARSON, BRADLEY & FEENEY

By **/S/ James A. Lassart**

James A. Lassart (61500)

MURPHY, PEARSON, BRADLEY & FEENEY

580 California Street, Suite 1100

San Francisco, CA 94104

(415) 788 1900 (Telephone)

(415) 393 8087 (Facsimile)

jlassart@mpbf.com
Counsel for Appellees MCMANIS FAULKNER, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, JAMES MCMANIS MICHAEL REEDY, and JANET EVERSON

IX. USCA Case #21-5210 Document #1920120 Filed: 10/28/2021—Petitioner's first accusation among 20+ accusations, also the first tacit admission by James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner and Janet Everson and their attorney James Lassart, about McManis's conspiracies with the DC Circuit in dismissing 19-5014 Appeal on 7/31/2019; DC Circuit altered this docket entry to conceal McManis's undisputed admissions when *DC Circuit actually also tacitly admitted to such conspiracies by willfully avoiding mentioning this issue in 2/23/2022 order*. This 1920120 was supplemented with 8 papers.

YI TAI SHAO, ESQUIRE, Appellant

vs.

CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., et al. Appellees

Case Number: 21-5210 (D.C. Circuit)

"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 Appellant respectfully requests hearing be held"

Table of Contents **(page numbers omitted here)**

A. **Appellees admitted to illegal ex parte communications with this Court of Appeal on July 31, 2019 and revealed that this Court of Appeal had "granted" their undocumented Motion for Summary Affirmance on July 31, 2019 which indicates this Court of Appeal had pre-determined dismissal on July 31, 2019 in issuing a fraudulent Order to Show Cause sua sponte to adopt the entire order of Judge Contreras which is illegal per se** (for violating 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i)). .

B. There are 4 orders established the rule that Judges' regular social relationship with Appellees through the American Inns of Court is a ground of recusal, which was explicitly decided by two judges at Santa Clara County Superior Court in Linda Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel, and "implied conceded" by 7 Justices including California Chief Justice in S269711, as well as 6 Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court in 20-524

1.Two recusal orders at Santa Clara County Court

2. James McManis is a leading attorney of the American Inns of Court, that enabled him to be an attorney of Santa Clara County Court and Justices at all level in California and was able to manipulate all courts involved in this case and even California State Bar!

3. US Supreme Court Justices impliedly recused themselves based on grounds stated in the Request for Recusal filed in 20-524 which includes the ground of conflicts of interest arising from their relationship with Appellees

4. California Chief Justice "impliedly recused herself" in S2697001 on 8/25/2021

C. **It shocks the conscience of any reasonable person at this court's willful concealment of its direct conflicts of interest about their close relationship with appellees and American Inns of Court which constitute extrinsic fraud in the proceeding of 19-5014**

D.**Based on doctrine of spoliation of evidence, all orders in 19-5014 should be reversed**

IV.CIRCUIT RULE 27 AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF:

Appellees and/or their attorney of record Mr. Garland[3] should be **sanctioned under 28 U.S.C. §1927 for filing the frivolous motion and leading the corruptions**

Certificate of compliance with Rule 27

Certificate of service

[Table of Authorities]

Wear v. United States, 218 F.2d 24 (D.C. Cir.1954)

28 U.S.C.§ 455(b)(5)(i)

28 U.S.C.S.§455 (b)(5)(i)

Alexander v. United States of America, 121 F.3d 312 (7th Cir. 1997)

Alpern v. UtiliCorp United, 84 F.3d 1525, (8th Cir. 1996)

Battocchi v, Washington Hosp. Center, 581 A.2d 759, 766 (D.C. 1990)

Cascade Broadcasting Group, Ltd. v. FCC, 822 F.2d 1172, 1174 (D.C. Cir. 1987)(per curiam)

Cascade Broadcasting Group, Ltd. v. FCC, supra

Circuit Rule 27(c)

Estate of Parsons v. Palestinian Auth., 952 F.Supp.2d 61 (D.D.C. 2013) at footnote 6

Hartman v. Lubar, 49 A.2d 553, 556 (D.C. 1946)

---

[3] McManis's hacker Kevin L. Warnock altered the word of Petitioner's writing. It should not be "Mr. Garland".

Hartman v. Lubar, 49 A.2d 553, 556
Lebron v. United States, 229 F.2d 16 (D.C. Cir. 1995)
Lijeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp. , 488 U.S. 847 (1988)
LSLJ Partnership v. Frito-Lay, 920 F.2d 476 (7th Cir. 1990)
Mandel v. Bradley, 432 U.S. 173, 176, 97 S.Ct. 2238, 2240 (1977)
Metromedia, Inc. v. San Diego, 453 U.S. 490, 499, 101 S.Ct. 2882, 2888 (1981)
Moran v. Clarke (8th cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517
People v. McKenna, 116 Cal.App.2d 207 (1953)
Standard Oil Co. v. California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976)
Tendler v. Jaffe, 203 F.2d 14, 19 (D.C. 1952)
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 US 510 (1927)
United States v. Cote, 51 F.3d 178, 180-181 (9th Cir. 1995)
William v. Pennsylvania, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 579 US (2016)
Williams v. Craig, 1 U.S. 313 (1788).

Statutes

28 U.S.C. §1927
California Penal Code Sections 6200-01
Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986))

Rules

California Rules of Court Rule 3.650 (b)and (d)
CIRCUIT RULE 27
Civil Local Rule 8(c)
FRCP Rule 60(b)(3)(4)(5),
LCvR7
Rule 27(B)(iii
Rule 3.515(i)

OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY AFFIRMANCE (#1918497)

Pursuant to Circuit Rule 27(c), based on new discovery of extrajudicial conflicts of interest of this court and appellees' undocumented motion for summary affirmance to this court that caused this court to *predetermined* dismissal on 7/31/2019, Appellant requests affirmative relief to (1) vacate all orders in Appeal No. 19-5014 and reactivate the appeal of 19-5014, (2) issue terminating sanction and monetary sanction against Appellees and their attorney under 28 U.S.C. §1927 for committing extrinsic fraud in the proceeding of 19-5014 and concealing their relationship with this court that interfered the normal function of this Court in violation of 18 U.S.C.§371, and (3) summary reverse all orders of Judge Rudolph Contreras in ECF 48, 49, 153, 154 and 168, 169 and change venue to U.S.D.C. in Central New York District based on his willful violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) according to *Lijeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp.*, 488 U.S. 847 (1988) and the fact that even the Presiding Judge Howell ignored such violation after given notices twice (ECF163 and 167) by Appellant on Contreras's violation of due process and persisted on deciding his own case and failed to take an action.

I. APPELLEES' MOTION IS FATALLY FLAWED THAT MUST BE DENIED

Firstly, Appellees' motion completely *failed their burden of persuasion* that Appellees were seeking to summarily affirm nor presenting a valid ground for summary affirmance. The burden of persuasion is usually imposed on the moving party (e.g., *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)). This Court's Handbook, page 29, also states "The motion must

specify the grounds and the relief sought." Summary affirmance is appropriate where the merits are so clear as to justify summary action.

The moving party for a summary affirmance is required to "present their issues". In *Metromedia, Inc. v. San Diego,* 453 U.S. 490, 499, 101 S.Ct. 2882, 2888 (1981), the Supreme Court held that precedential value of a summary affirmance "extends only to '**the precise issues presented** and necessarily decided." [*emphasis added*]

Here, Appellees' motion(#1918497) failed to present any of the elements for a motion for summary affirmance and failed their burden of persuasion.

Secondly, Appellees failed to comply with F.R.A.P. 27(a)(2)(B)(iii) in attaching the order they were requesting relief and in their motion page 2 they misidentified the order to be "ECF171".

Thirdly, Appellees failed to contest Appellant's 60(b) motion proceeding that leads to this appeal, see, *supra*, *Metromedia, Inc. v. San Diego,* 453 U.S. 490, 499, 101 S.Ct. 2882, 2888 (1981) (precedential value of a summary affirmance "extends only to '**the precise issues presented** and **necessarily decided**." [*emphasis added*]) and thus shall be estopped from filing this motion for summary affirmance, when Appellees failed to present any issues for determination in Rule 60(b) motion that leads to this appeal. Also, a party seeking relief from an order from preceding motion for summary judgment is barred if the party had sufficient opportunity to submit evidence prior to ruling on motion but failed to do so. E.g., *Alpern v. UtiliCorp United,* 84 F.3d 1525, (8th Cir. 1996). Therefore, Appellees who failed to present any arguments in the

proceeding leading to this appeal at the District Court should be barred from seeking a summary dispositive motion.

Fourthly, Appellees' motion cannot be legally made based on ***repeating the opinion*** that is being challenged on this appeal but that is exactly what Appellees did. In *Mandel v. Bradley*, 432 U.S. 173, 176, 97 S.Ct. 2238, 2240 (1977), the Supreme Court held that "the rationale of the affirmance may not be gleaned solely from the opinion below." Here, the only reason presented by Appellees' motion for summary affirmance (#1918497, page 2 of 6) was to repeat Judge Rudolph Contreras's opinion that Appellant's motion was to revisit "already-decided question" (ECF169, p.7, first full paragraph) and thus Appellees' motion must be denied for failure to present a valid ground for summary affirmance.

Fifthly, Appellees' motion frustrates the purpose of summary affirmance that no reasonable judge could use the 2-3 pages' short motion that fails to identify or attach the order as required by F.R.A.P. 27(a)(2)(B)(iii), fails to present a valid ground, fails to present any issue nor any merits, nor presenting argument that the merits could be so clear to warrant summary affirmance, to substitute a brief for appeal.

The purpose of summary affirmance was to substitute a brief for appeal with a qualified motion. In *Cascade Broadcasting Group, Ltd. v. FCC*, 822 F.2d 1172, 1174 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam), a case cited by this Court's Handbook, this Court of Appeal reasoned that:

"The Commission has filed a motion for summary affirmance of its action. Upon consideration of the parties' filings supporting and opposing the motion

for summary affirmance, we have concluded that we are able to give the merits of this appeal "the fullest consideration necessary to a just determination" without plenary briefing or oral argument. ... Consequently, **we have treated the motions papers as briefs** and decided the appeal pursuant to Rule 11(d) of the court's General Rules." [*emphasis added*] *I.d.*, 822 F.2d 1172.

As stated above, Appellees' motion, being fatally flawed without presenting any element for a motion for summary affirmance presentation of any merits, nor identify the order, no argument if any "merits" were "so clear" that no reasonable judge can substitute such a motion for a brief for appeal pursuant to *Cascade Broadcasting Group, Ltd. v. FCC, supra.*

This motion is nothing but lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact that should be denied. *Wear v. United States,* 218 F.2d 24 (D.C. Cir.1954); *Lebron v. United States,* 229 F.2d 16 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

II. CIRCUIT RULE 27 AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF: reversal of Judge Contreras's order (ECF168 and 169) which is void that *no reasonable judge would legally affirm such order as he decided on his own case when he is a defendant* in willful violation 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and he failed to decide all issues raised in appellant's rule 60(b) motion which is centered on his violation 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i); new evidence of his spoliation of evidence by altering the dockets to remove the entries which may show his ex parte communications with other defendants, this court's 7 crimes, and US supreme court's 39 crimes.

A. Judge Contreras repeated violated 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i), and repeated violated the standard of Moran v. Clarke **in refusing to explain nor decide any and all irregularities raised by SHAO as grounds of change venue**

Judge Contreras knew that he should not have decided in this case as he cited 28 U.S.C.S.§455 (b)(5)(i) in his Memorandum of 1/17/2019 (ECF154). He wrote in Page 10 of 42 in ECF 154 that: "finally under §455(b)(5)(i), a judge can be disqualified for being a party to the proceeding. 28 U.S.C.§ 455(b)(5)(i)." Contreras created an accusation of "judge shopping" in the same page yet he did not provide any legal authority to counter the mandatory recusal in 28 U.S.C.§ 455(b)(5)(i), when he never explained to the actual prejudice of alterations of docket, deterrence of issuing Summons and faking court records stated in ¶83 of ECF16 . And this is a major ground for Appellant's 60(b) motion (ECF161).

In the Notice of Motion in ECF161, Appellant specifically wrote:

"Judge Contreras cannot legally decide this motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S.§455(b)(5)(i) as he has failed to provide Moran v. Clarke response thus far. He has failed to explain the felonies committed which were stated in Paragraph 83 of the FAC 16, FAC 32, 35, 40, 42, 142, 144, totally about 20 felonies. His argument of judge shopping is unsupported by the record because he has failed to explain to any of the felonies he committed and Plaintiff is the victim. Therefore, such direct conflicts of interest disallows him to continue sitting on this case."

Appellant used 11 pages in ECF161-1 to raise this issue from p.7 to p.10 and p.29 through P.36 of 44. On P.29 SHAO argued "B. Judge Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019 is a void judgment that should be vacated under Rule 60(b)(4)"; on p.31 of 44 SHAO argued:

"Judge Contreras should have recused himself as he does have actual knowledge of his violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and knew that his argument of judge shopping is not supported by the record when he never explained any of his accused ex parte communication, forging signature in ECF38 and ECF41 and alteration of the docket of this case."

From p.34 of 44 of ECF161-1, there are 3 pages specifically identifying the dockets and evidence on the court's records unambiguously proved that Contreras altered in concealing evidence of his ex parte communications.

SHAO's Rule 60(b) motion was properly made based on Lijeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp., 488 U.S. 847 (1988), Tumey v. Ohio, 273 US 510 (1927) and F.R.C.P.Rule 60(b)(3)(4)(5), William v. Pennsylvania, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 579 US__ (2016). In Contreras's Order of 8/31/2021 (ECF 168 and 169),

Contreras only made a general accusation that SHAO's motions are frivolous but failed to decide any issues raised against him; he did not dispute nor decide any of accusations of the 20 felonies committed by him, 7 felonies committed by this Court of Appeal, and 39 felonies committed by US Supreme Court.
For each accusation, SHAO carefully referenced the documentary evidence.
From pages 23 through 27, SHAO mentioned new evidence that justified reversal. None of the evidence of court crimes using at least 95% of the 44 pages of the Memorandum of Points of Authorities is mentioned in Contreras's Order in ECF168 and ECF169. SHAO's 60(b) motion made after mandate was properly based on LSLJ Partnership v. Frito-Lay, 920 F.2d 476 (7th Cir. 1990) and Standard Oil Co. v. California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976) on the ground that "the Supreme Court was unable to review the case or make a decision on the merits and reopening is necessary to cure the appearance of judicial bias the handling of the case has created at all levels.(Rule 60(b)(6)" (ECF161,p.2 of 3)

He did not deny any of the accused misconducts and did not rule on any of the issues either. None of the Appellees contested any of the accused crimes to be false, either. After SHAO filed a Notice of Non-Opposition (ECF162; the court removed the efiling stamp), Appellees American Inns of Court filed a belated Opposition without seeking relief from their violation of LCvR7. Such motion, nonetheless did not dispute any of the prima facie 20 felonies committed by Contreras, 7 felonies committed by this Court (a table of documentary evidence as well as where the document evidence are located are stated in details

on Page 14 and page 15 of 44 in ECF161-1). and 39 felonies committed by the US Supreme Court and its Justices (SHAO even included a screenshot as evidence of one the 39 crimes on P.38 of 44 in ECF 161-1).
SHAO's motion clearly identifies grounds of Rule 60(b) relief including Supreme Courts'12 new crimes in the proceeding of 20-524 (ECF 161-1, pages 23, 24 of 44) and undisputable felony in alteration of docket of 18-569 to remove the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children duly filed on 11/8/2018 from the court's docket which is to purge the evidence of their conspiracy in causing permanent parental deprival of SHAO (ECF 161-1, page 25 and 26 of 44); the docket of 18-569 before alteration was presented in Page 28 of 44. New evidence of Contreras's removing from the docket evidence of ex parte communications was fully discussed but Contreras ignored all[4]. Therefore, under this extraordinary circumstances, Contreras's orders of ECF168, ECF169, ECF153, ECF154 and ECF48 should all be automatically reversed under Rule 60(b) according to Liljeberg, Tumey and Wiliams, supra, and Clark v. District No. 89, 32 F.3d 851

---

[4] (Footnote #1 for 1920120) SHAO properly presented that: regarding the fraudulent entries of 6/5/2018 and 6/11/2018, Contreras altered the docket 5 times (see ECF161-1, page 35 of 44) and also completely removed them from the present docket. Regarding Supreme Court's 39 felonies, the evidence was also detained in ECF 161-1 and SHAO even included a screenshot on P.38 of 44 in ECF 161-1 showing how the 12/14/2020 order could be fraudulent. Judge Contreras averted discussion on any of these issues.

(2001)[5] , as Judge Contreras clearly abused his discretion and cannot rule on this case.

B.Decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 20-524 is not a decision on the merits that has no precedential effect such that Plaintiff's Rule 60(b) motion should be granted.

Appellees argued that all issues raised by Appellant in this proceeding were considered by the courts which appeared to copy Judge Contreras's decision which is not only improper but also not true.

Judge Contreras's decision about this is clearly an abuse of discretion as summary denial decisions have no precedential effects and are not binding. See, , United States v. Cote, 51 F.3d 178, 180-181 (9th Cir. 1995) (holding that a summary denial of hearing does not amount to a decision on the merits, and that the law of the case doctrine does not foreclose consideration of issues raised in the petition of rehearing)," which was quoted by Estate of Parsons v. Palestinian Auth., 952 F.Supp.2d 61 (D.D.C. 2013) at footnote 6.

The severe court crimes involved in this proceeding as fully presented by Appellant in ECF161 are NOT contested by any parties, which should be undisputed. All these courts' failure to decide according to Moran v. Clarke standard are nothing but admission by acquiesce. Judge Contreras's Order denying Rule 60(b) motion must

---

[5] [5] (Footnote #2 for 1920120) SHAO properly presented that: regarding In Clark v. District No. 89, Certiorari is granted and the trial court's judgment is reversed and the cause remanded for a new trial when the issue for certiorari is whether the plaintiff-teacher is constitutionally entitled to reversal of an adverse trial court judgment when she failed to secure a ruling on her quest for his disqualification.

be reversed for abuse of discretion--- not supported by record.

III.CIRCUIT RULE 27 AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF: All Orders Of 19- 5014 Be Vacated, 19-5014 Be Reactivated And Change Venue To New York

A. Appellees admitted to illegal ex parte communications with this Court of Appeal on July 31, 2019 and revealed that this Court of Appeal had "granted" their undocumented Motion for Summary Affirmance on July 31, 2019 which indicates this Court of Appeal had pre-determined dismissal on July 31, 2019 in issuing a fraudulent Order to Show Cause sua sponte to adopt the entire order of Judge Contreras which is illegal per se (for violating 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i)).

On page One in ¶2 of Appellees' short motion, Appellees wrote (ECF#1918497):

"On July 31, 2019, the Court of Appeals granted Appellees' Motion for Summary Affirmance; and dismissed the Appeal."

Yet, Appellees' motion for summary affirmance is not served nor filed nor shown on the docket of Case No. 19-5014. Appellees' counsel also failed to respond to Appellant's emails asking for a copy of his alleged motion for summary affirmance in Appeal No. 19-5014. They also refused to withdraw their motion. (Decl. Shao) This constitutes Appellees' admission through their counsel about Appellees' or their counsel's ex parte communication with this Court in prior related proceeding of 19-5014 via *an undocumented* motion for summary affirmance, which explains why there would be a ***"sua sponte"* order to show cause** on 7/31/2019 (#1799946) to adopt Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019 (ECF153, 154);

apparently, Judge Millett, Pillard and Wilkins "granted" Appellees' undocumented motion as early as 7/31/2019 to predetermine dismissal of the appeal. New facts just discovered that DC Circuit Court of Appeal committed **extrinsic frauds in having willfully concealed its direct conflicts of interest** and conspiring with Appellees secretly to block Appellant from having a normal appeal in 19-5014 to cause NO MERITS to be decided and to suppress the verified complaint stated in ECF16 and ECF 1-1 in 1:18-cv-01233.

B.There are 4 orders established the rule that Judges' regular social relationship with Appellees through the American Inns of Court is a ground of recusal, which was explicitly decided by two judges at Santa Clara County Superior Court in Linda Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel, and "implied conceded" by 7 Justices including California Chief Justice in S269711, as well as 6 Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court in 20-524.

1. **Two recusal orders at Santa Clara County Court**

At another related litigation at the State Court of California, 2012-1-cv- 220571, a breach of fiduciary duty/legal mal case SHAO sued McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel, there are two recusal orders of the judges including finding that there is a public view that Shao is unable to have an impartial proceeding in front of the judge who has relationship with McManis defendants through the American Inns of Court. See Request for Judicial Notice, **JN-1**, two orders.

The two judges who made findings of conflicts of

interest and recused themselves are Judge Socrates Manoukian on 12/2/2015 (Santa Clara County Court concealed this order from publication on its website in the case docket of 2012-1-cv-220571), which was based on his wife Justice Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian's regular social relationship with Appellee Michael Reedy for 10+ years through William A. Ingram American Inn of Court, and Judge Peter Kirwan on 12/15/2017 based on his relationship with "a defendant" through the American Inns of Court.

These recusals were made in response to Appellant's verified statements of disqualification. Appellant raised the conflicts of interest of these judges and Santa Clara County Court based on evidence: admission of Appellee James McManis on 7/20/2015, of Appellee Michael Reedy on 7/22/2015 during their depositions and William Faulkner's illegal impromptu oral testimony on 12/9/2015 that prove:

(1) Appellee James McManis is or was an attorney representing Santa Clara County Superior Court in an unidentified matter, and an attorney providing ***free legal services*** to about 25, not more than 50, judges, Clerk, courtroom clerks, deputies, and court reporters at Santa Clara County Court, to an unidentified Justice at the Sixth District Court of Appeal and to an unidentified Justice at California Supreme Court.

(2) Appellee Michael Reedy and Appellee James McManis have more than 10 years' close, regular, monthly social relationship with Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Theodore Zayner, Judge Carol Overton (who dismissed Shao's lawsuit sua sponte in February 2014), Judge Lucy Koh (who dismissed

Shao's lawsuit against Appellees at the USDC for the Northern California) and about 30 unidentified judges at Santa Clara County Court through the William A. Ingram American Inn of Court, as well as unknown numbers of judges through the Peninsula Intellectual Property American Inn of Court. The judges and attorneys have private interaction, including a mentorship that they may discuss clients' cases.

Appellee James McManis is a colleague to all judges at Santa Clara County Court and judges serving at Sixth District Court of Appeal who are from Santa Clara County Court as he had been appointed as a Special Master of that court for many years. Special Master is deemed "quasi- employee" of the appointing court as a matter of law.

The above facts were reaffirmed by Appellant's expert witness Meera Fox, Esq. in her declaration that has been presented many times to all courts involved. (RJN, ECF1-1, Exh. 2, Declaration of Meera Fox filed with California Sixth District Court of Appeal in H039823 on April 7, 2017, ¶11)

2. James McManis is a leading attorney of the American Inns of Court, that enabled him to be an attorney of Santa Clara County Court and Justices at all level in California and was able to manipulate all courts involved in this case and even California State Bar!

The fact that Appellee James McManis is a leading attorney at Appellee American Inns of Court is shown by McManis Faulkner's news release dated 8/13/2012 (RJN, #1787004, Exh. I "Chief Justice John G. Roberts' undisclosed relationship with James McManis"):

"The oldest institution of legal education in Ireland, the Honorable Society of King's Inns is comprised of benchers, barristers and students. The benchers include all the judges of lreland's Supreme Courts and High Courts as well as a number of elected barristers. Prior to the election of McManis and two other Fellows of the International Academy of Trial Lawyers (Tom Girardi and Pat McGroder), **the only Americans so honored were U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Antonin Scalia. Election as an honorary bencher is the highest accolade that the Inn can confer....**McManis was recently appointed to the newly established Task Force on Admissions Regulation Reform by California State Bar..."[*emphasis added*]

This news release has been removed from Appellee MF's website since 2018. It is well established that "a fact-finder may draw an inference adverse to a party who fails to preserve relevant evidence within his exclusive control." *Battocchi v, Washington Hosp. Center*, 581 A.2d 759, 766 (D.C. 1990); see also, *Hartman v.Lubar,* 49 A.2d 553, 556 (D.C. 1946); *Tendler v. Jaffe*, 203 F.2d 14, 19 (D.C. 1952). It is reasonable reference, as shown in the ECF16, that Appellees acknowledged their relationship with Justice John G. Roberts through the American Inns of Court and had conspired with the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court to deny all relief requested by SHAO (Petition No. 11119, 14-1172, 17-82, 17-569, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-639, and 20-524) All of US Supreme Court, California Supreme Court and California Sixth District Court removed his name from the case title purposely. Recently, even California State Bar

purged his records completely!

3.US Supreme Court Justices impliedly recused themselves based on grounds stated in the Request for Recusal filed in 20-524 which includes the ground of conflicts of interest arising from their relationship with Appellees through the American Inns of Court.

On 12/14/2020, US Supreme Court's 6 Justices who are Appellees in this case, "impliedly recused" themselves in No.20-524, in response to Appellant's Request for Recusal about their conflicts of interest that included their financial interests with Appellee American Inns of Court through the Temple Bar Scholarship and their relationship with Appellee McManis through the American Inns of Court. The 12/14/2020 and 1/15/2021 Mandate in Petition No. 20-524 reads: "The Chief Justice, Justice Thomas, Justice Breyer, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor, and Justice Kagan **took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition."**

Appellant raised the issue in her 60(b) motion (ECF161-1) that **this order/mandate appears to be fraudulent** as the Court took this order and judgment off three times. See **RJN, ECF 161-1, Page 36 through Page 39 of 44.** Evidence of one of the taking off was presented as screenshot on Page 38 of 44, ECF 161-1.

4.California Chief Justice "impliedly recused herself" in S2697001 on 8/25/2021

Case No. S2697001 pending at California Supreme Court, is a Petition for Review about California Sixth District Court of Appeal's Presiding Judge Appellee Mary J. Greenwood who concealed SHAO's Notice of Appeal by 111 days, and blocked SHAO's appeal from Santa Clara County Court's

denial of her motion to set aside the court's order granting Appellees' quiet speed motion to dismiss, with a false excuse created on 12/22/2020 through the docket in H048651 (created on 12/17/2020, after 111 days' delay) that SHAO needed to file a *second* vexatious litigant application with that Court of Appeal and deny that application 5 months later to **override** the approval of SHAO's first vexatious litigant application to file appeal issued by the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court on 7/27/2020.
Simultaneously with the denial, further altered the docket entry faking SHAO's second vexatious litigant application to be filed late on 5/26/2021, the same date of denial. In fact that second application was made on 12/22/2020. (Already corrected by Supervising clerk later.)

Just like in this case, all courts in California involved are conspiring to disallow a day of court by Appellant regarding this case of SHAO v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bethtel, with extrinsic fraud.

Santa Clara County Court had a Civil Local Rule 8(c) prevailing since 2014 which requires any motion to be reserved with the court before filing and such reservation requires clearance of hearing date with opposing party. On 9/18/2019, taking advantage of SHAO's overseas mission, Appellees filed a motion to dismiss quietly, that was impossible to be filed without assistance of Santa Clara County Court, McManis's client. They would like the motion to be heard in front of Judge Christopher Rudy, who concealed his relationship with Appellees through theWilliam A. Ingram American Inn of Court. Rudy did grant the motion to dismiss in Plaintiff's absence,

when no reasonable judge would have granted dismissal as Appellees requested stay the entire proceeding but had failed to file a notice to terminate the stay as required by California Rules of Court Rule 3.650 (b)and (d); pending stay, no motion to dismiss can be considered according to Rule 3.515(i). In addition to lack of notice to lift the stay, SHAO's interlocutory appeal from vexatious litigant orders issued by Judge Maureen Folan (recently discovered that she concealed from disclosure that she was the attorney of record of James McManis and McManis Faulkner for about 2.5 years in 2 legal malpractice case) stayed the 5 years' statute to terminate proceeding for failure to prosecute by 3 years and 9 months and 20 days from 6/25/2015 (H042531) through 4/15/2019 (end of Petition No. 18-800 at the US Supreme Court) such that the dismissal was absolutely premature.

Yet Rudy was not a regular Law and Motion judge and could only cut in on 10/8/2019 when the assigned judge at Department 8 would be absence. In apparent desire to get dismissal secretly from their buddies, Appellees conspired with Clerk at Santa Clara County Court (who may be the Clerk client of McManis according to his admission made on 7/20/2015) to alter the e-filing stamps of their motion to dismiss to antedate the efiling from 9/18/2019 to 9/12/2019. When SHAO discovered this fraud, the court denied SHAO's application to reopen discovery and disallowed SHAO to investigate how Appellees' motion to dismiss was able to be filed, and Appellees' counsel Janet Everson (Appellee) and Suzie Tagliere refused to state what made the antedation and alteration on the docket on filing date of their motion to dismiss. On 3/17/2020, an

unaltered Certificate of Service of their secret motion to dismiss showing filing stamp of 9/18/2019 showed up as Page 103 of Declaration of Suzie Tagliere.

Such document proved the perjury of Tagliere about filing date of the motion to dismiss being 9/12/2019 and proved that Appellee Everson and Tagliere must know what happened on the changes on the e-filing stamps of their motion to dismiss.

In addition to this appeal process, SHAO filed a complaint with the State Bar of California reporting this incident containing 6 felonies of violation of California Penal Code Sections 6200-01 pursuant to *People v. McKenna*, 116 Cal.App.2d 207 (1953). California State Bar promptly closed the case and erased from State Bar's record the complaint against James McManis (20-O-07258). Pending their secret motion to dismiss, within days without even making an inquiry about the crimes. (ECF161-10)

Moreover, regarding McManis's admission of bribing court/judges/justices with free legal services, the complaint at the Enforcement Unit of State Bar was suspended since June of 2016 with a false excuse that the issue is pending this case's resolution. When Appellees were conspiring with their client Santa Clara County Court to quietly dismiss the case, before dismissal order was issued by their buddy Rudy, State Bar closed the complaint on 9/25/2019, the 7th day after they filed the motion to dismiss (9/18/2019).(ECF161-8)

State Bar of California is under the control of Chief Justice Tani Cantil- Sakauye. Her active conspiracy with Appellees was exposed on 9/28/2020 when she created a case at the US Supreme Court with case number of S263527 by signing an order to

suspend the license of SHAO for failure to pay bar due, when was more than a month *before* the due date of payment of bar due (10/30/2020). She appeared to direct State Bar to issue a Board minutes to enable such order, and there was only one licensee on the list, who was SHAO. She further directed State Bar to send letters to California Franchise Tax Board to impute income of SHAO such as to harass and garnish money from SHAO's law firm.

The same evidence of collusion that resulted in California Chief Justice's recusal was provided in SHAO's 60(b) motion (ECF161-10), which, again, Judge Rudolph Contreras failed to decide, which is the subject of this appeal.

Copying the reaction of the Sixth Justices at the US Supreme Court in 20-524, California Chief Justice also impliedly recused herself in S269711.

C. IT SHOCKS THE CONSCIENCE OF ANY REASONABLE PERSON AT THIS COURT'S WILLFUL CONCEALMENT OF ITS DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST ABOUT THEIR CLOSE RELATIONSHIP WITH APPELLEES AND AMERICAN INNS OF COURT WHICH CONSTITUTE EXTRINSIC FRAUD IN THE PROCEEDING OF 19-5014

SHAO's Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court in Petition No. 20- 524 arises from this Court of Appeal's illegal sua sponte affirming Judge Contreras's illegal order of 1/17/2019 and willfully refused to decide all issues of crimes and irregularities raised in Appellant's 4 requests to change venue (#1791001 and 3 consecutive Petitions for Rehearing asking the court to decide issues raised for disqualification until May 1, 2020 (#1834621 and

1834622) when this Court persisted on summarily denied Petition for Rehearing for failure to decide 6 felonies of this Court raised in #1791001, when the court concealed their close relationship with Appellees American Inns of Court. Now, this motion revealed that such irregular *sua sponte* order to show cause of 7/31/2019 is caused by this Court's secret "granting" Appellees' *undocumented* "motion for summary affirmance".

Severe direct conflicts of interest that were involved in the proceeding of 19- 5014 shocks all reasonable persons' conscience that any reasonable judge could not bear to see that this proceeding may continue to be within the jurisdiction of this Court. Such new discovery could explain why this Court of Appeal would
commit the crime of silently removing SHAO from ECF user on the eve of Appellees American Inn of Court's filing of their motion for summary affirmance on 3/18/2019, and assigned the case to Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Nina Pillar to be in the appellate panel, would could cover up the 6 felonies with most of them related to American Inns of Court, 1 related to Appellees McManis, 2 related to Chief Justice, 1 related to Judge Contreras, and why the court would issue a fake en banc order within 7 minutes following the order from the panel on 5/1/2020 when no judge could reasonably read through about 1000 pages' document in the last Petition for Rehearing filed on 3/21/2020 (#1834621,#1834622). This Court of Appeal persisted on refusing to lay out all relevant facts for the 6 felonies stated in #1791001 in summarily denying Appellant's motion to change venue, a standard required by Moran v. Clarke, 309 F.3d 516, 517 (9th Cir. 2002) (the court is required to

set out all relevant facts), in an apparent purpose to cover up the frauds.

The 7 crimes committed by this Court of Appeal are articulated with evidence presented by 6 pages in Pages 11 through 16 of ECF 161-1. In her Rule 60(b) motion, SHAO stated below (See RJN, ECF 161-1, page 16 of 44):

"Regarding any of the facts, evidence and accusations presented in ECF 1791001, Judge Millett persisted on refusing to decide, for almost a year through 4 orders and three Petitions for Rehearing, except repeating its summary denial of recusal and a summary affirmation of Judge Contreras's illegal order of 1/17/2019, in disregard of three ensuing Petitions for Rehearing made by Plaintiff repeatedly requested the DC Circuit to respond to the evidence complained in ECF 1791001 (filed on 6/5/2019). The 3 Petitions for Rehearings are (1) ECF#1803537 filed on August 24, 2019 to petition rehearing of 7/31/2019's interim order (ECF 1834622, pages 34-35), (2) ECF 1820049 filed on 12/13/2019 to petition rehearing on 11/13/2019's Order (ECF 1834622, pages 31-33), and (3) ECF 1834621 (filed on 2/5/2020). Included in each of the Petitions, Plaintiff informed the DC Circuit of the laws: Such summary denial of recusal is improper and violated 28 U.S.C. §455 as the D.C. Circuit is required to "set out all the relevant facts" as required by Moran v. Clarke (8th cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517. See, e.g., ECF 1824621, P. 9." [emphasis added]

The newly discovered conflicts of interest are: (1) Appellee American Inns of Court has held meetings of William Coke Appellate Inn of Court at the Court's facilities for years. The Archive events of William Coke Appellate Inn of Court revealed that

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Samuel Alito, Judge Tatel, Chief Judge Merrick Garland were very active with this Inn, and could be a member of this Inn, or at least received gifts from this Inn (e.g., Justice Samuel Alito and his wife attended free dinner) See RJN, JN-4.

(2) When Judge Patricia Millett was assigned to the appeal case No. 19-5014, this Court and judges knew their direct conflicts of interest as Judge Millet was the President Elect of William Coke American Inn of Court in 2019-20 and in the same year, Appellee American Inns of Court gave her a big gift with a value of more than $7000 through Temple Bar Scholarship to let her clerk to tour in Europe in the same year of 2019. Judge Millett failed to disclose her close relationship with the American Inns of Court and failed to recuse herself.

(3) When Judge Nina Pillard was assigned for 19-5014, she knew or should have known her direct conflicts of interest in that Pillard was a President for William Coke American Inn of Court in 2019.

(4) When this Court received this case and saw 4 times of SHAO's requests to change venue, with each one raising new facts and asking for decision on 1791001, this Court knew the conflicts of interest was so severe that SHAO could not possibly have a fair proceeding on her appeal in 19-5014 based on the court's "SUA SPONTE" order to show cause on 7/31/2019 to adopt entirely the order of Judge Rudolph Contreras for "summary affirmance" to substitute appellate briefs. Such knowledge is imputed because thenPresiding Judge Merrick Garland has had very close relationship with Appellee American Inns of Court for about 20 years.

On June 20, 2019, when Appellant's motion to change venue (#1791001) and Appellant's Counter Motion to Summary Reversal (#1787225) were pending, Chief Judge Merrick B. Garland presented 2019 American Inns of Court Professionalism Award for the D.C. Circuit to Garland's nominated friend, A.J. Kramer, Esquire, on behalf of Appellee American Inns of court. That may explain why this Court of Appeal would assign this case to Judge Millett and Judge Pillard who are leaders at Appellee American Inn of Court who could cover up the crimes involved. Garlan[sic: Garland] apparently closed SHAO's complaint against Judge Patricia Millett later about Millett's refusing to explain the 6 crimes committed by this Court of Appeal. (Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, Complaint against Judge Millett)

(5) Present Chief Judge Sri Srinlvasan was the President of the same William Coke Inn in 2016-17.

(6) Chief Counsel of the Appellee U.S. House Representatives, Douglas Letter, was the President of the same Inn in 2017-2018 (7) In 2019, Appellee Michael Reedy is a President of William A. Ingram American Inn of Court.

D. Based on doctrine of spoliation of evidence, all orders in 19-5014 should be reversed

Concealment, misrepresentation or destruction of evidence falls within this rule of spoliation of evidence, which entitles inference reflecting defendant's recognition of the strength of the plaintiff's case generally and/or the weakness of its own case. Willful suppression of evidence goes to the entire case, not merely the evidence suppressed. It shows a consciousness of guilt or wrongdoing generally as to the entire case, and the jury may be

instructed that it can draw an inference to discredit the concealing party's entire case. See, Battocchi v Washington Hosp. Center, Tendier v. Jaffe, Hartman v. Lubar, supra. It has been a pattern of corruption at all courts involved as led by Appellee James McManis, a leading attorney of the American Inns of Court who had obtained the highest honor of the Inns, as Chief Justice John G. Roberts—let McManis's related courts through the American Inns of Court to seal all frauds conspired by him—to cause SHAO permanent parental deprival as the only defense for the case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al., 2012-1-cv-220571, and then used extrinsic frauds to cause Appellees's judicial friend through the American Inns of Court, Judge Christopher Rudy, to rush dismissal of the case quietly, and to quietly close his state bar case about judiciary corruption. Now, by way of Appellees' own motion for summary affirmance, Appellees admitted that this Circuit Court had pre-determined to dismiss the entire appeal on July 31, 2019 when Judge Millett irregularly issued the sua sponte Order to Show Cause to adopt the entire order of Judge Rudolph Contreras dated 1/17/2019! Such OSC is nothing but a fruit of extrinsic fraud, trying to disallow SHAO to have a day in the court on the merits. Therefore, this Circuit must be changed venue and all orders issued in 19-5014 must be reversed. The 19-5014 case should be reactivated in a neutral forum, when SHAO asked to transfer to U.S. Court of Appeal in New York.

IV. CIRCUIT RULE 27 AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF: APPELLEES AND/OR THEIR ATTORNEY OF RECORD MR. GARLAND SHOULD BE SANCTIONED UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1927 FOR FILING THE FRIVOLOUS MOTION AND LEADING THE CORRUPTIONS

28 U.S.C. §1927 is permissible to be used in the appellate proceeding. See, Alexander v. United States of America, 121 F.3d 312 (7th Cir. 1997). Appellees did not respond to multiple inquiries by Appellant on their motion for summary affirmance in the proceeding of 19-5014 and failed to respond their memberships with William Coke Inn. (Declaration of Yi Tai Shao) Appellees' illegal undocumented motion that influenced this Court to pre-determined dismissal and issued sua sponte an order to show cause on 7/31/2019 constitute "corruption" that should be entitled terminating sanction—summary reversal of Judge Rudolph Contreras's Order (ECF 170) and Memorandum (ECF169) which are subjects of this appeal, by analogy to the setting aside report in Williams v. Craig, 1 U.S. 313 (1788).

Dated: October 28, 2021 Respectfully submitted, /s/ Yi Tai Shao

VIII. "NOTICE OF APPEAL" FILED on 9/21/2021 but willfully blocked filing 8 days and further docketed as filing on 9/29/2021. (Likewise, U.S.D.C. for Eastern Cal. Also failed to docket 22-15857 appeal by 8 days; California sixth district court of appeal failed to docket the appeal H048651 from illegal dismissal of SHAO v. Mcmanis, et al (2012-1-cv-220571) for 4 months); Supreme Court delayed docketed 22-28 by 4 days and not posted Petition for Writ of Certiorari by a week; Petitioner was blocked from accessing her appeal case docket or 22-15857 recently where the entire appeal case disappeared from Pacer.gov).

A. **NOTICE OF APPEAL 1:18-CV-01233 FILED BY PETITIONER ON 9/21/2021(ECF 170)**
TO THE COURT AND ALL DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
Please take notice that Plaintiff Yi Tai Shao hereby appeals from Judge Rudolph Contreras's Order (ECF #168) and Memorandum (ECF #169). Note that Judge Rudolph Contreras is a defendant and has never ruled on the issues of ex parte communication, alterations of dockets but issued ECF 168 and ECF169 in blindly disregard of 28 USCA §455 and Constitutional due process repeatedly. Chief Judge Howard was given notice of the motion (ECF 163) but failed to take action to avoid the gross injustice and repeated violation of Judge Contreras who ruled on this motion with direct conflicts of interest.
Dated: **September 21, 2021** [SHAO signature]

B. DC CIRCUIT willfully refusing to docket the appeal until being inquired by Petitioner.

From: attorneyshao@aol.com,

To: Scott_Atchue@cadc.uscourts.gov,
Subject: Re: Appeal from 1:18-01233 RC
Date: Wed, Sep 29, 2021 12:58 pm

When, why you withheld from docketing for already 6 [sic: 8] days?

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

On Wednesday, September 29, 2021, 12:27:32 PM EDT, Scott Atchue <scott_atchue@cadc.uscourts.gov> wrote:

Ms. Shao,

We have received the appeal from this district court and it will be opened in due course.

Scott H. Atchue
Operations Manager
United States Court of Appealsfor the District of Columbia Circuit
Direct Dial: (202) 216-7288
scott_atchue@cadc.uscourts.gov

X. Dc Circuit Court Of Appeal Attempted To Alter The Docket And Court Record On 11/13/2021

(See documentary evidence of the change of docket 21-5210 in pages on Pages 27 through 44 of 148 of #1922459) (See, App.18-22 for all crimes.)

D.C. Circuit's Operation Manager Scott Atchue did not deny he was the person altering the docket of 21-5210 on 11/13/2021; who blocked Petitioner's email 3 minutes after receipt of Petitioner's original email of 9:07 am. He had the history of taking Petitioner's name off from the CM/ECF before American Inns of Court appellees' filing their motion for summary affirmance on 3/18/2019 in 19-5014.

From: **attorneyshao@aol.com**,
To: Scott_atchue@aol.com,
Subject: Re: report of felonious alterations of docket in 21-5210
Date: **Sat, Nov 13, 2021 9:10 am**
Attachments:
16368125599574593353382227128315.jpg (8192K)
Unable to see the docket
Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Attorney Shao, Yi-Tai
To: Scott_atchue@aol.com
Sent: Sat, Nov 13, 2021 9:07 am
Subject: **REPORT OF FELONIOUS ALTERATIONS OF DOCKET IN 21-5210**

I just found that someone is altering the docket of 21-5210. Is that you again? Now is Saturday morning, 11/13/2021.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC 4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588 Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com
1 Attached Image

XI. Evidence of DC Circuit's further conspiracy of blocking Petitioner's right to access the court in 21-5210, after the first conspiracy in 19-5014: Petitioner's 12/24/2021 email to DC Circuit's Chief Judge Sri Srinivasan asking to transfer court because the motion to transfer was unopposed — this explains why the "SRJ" would altered the docket entry for "Notice of Non-Opposition" (See App.VI, App.31),so as to conceal the fact that its 2/23/2022 order to dismiss appeal was contrary to the record that the motion to transfer all dispositive motions in 1922459 were actually unopposed. (See, App.18-21 for all crimes)

See in EXHIBIT VI above and the Notice of Non-opposition in App.31, the altered docket entry is below, which hided that the motion 1922459 was unopposed.
"NOTICE [1924935] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/01/2021] [21-5210]--[Edited 12/02/2021 by SRJ - MODIFIED EVENT--NOTICE FILED] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/01/2021 04:23 PM]"

From: attorneyshao@aol.com,
To: scott_atchue@cadc.uscourts.gov, sri@aol.com, sri_Srinivasan@cadc.uscourts.gov,
Subject: **Request to change venue and notice of TRO for 21-5210**
Date: **Fri, Dec 24, 2021** 9:45 am
Dear Mr. Atchue and Chief Judge Srinivasari:

The motion to transfer filed with 21-5210 is unopposed. My motion to transfer all dispositive motions to new court-- Second

Circuit was also unopposed. Please transfer all motions away to the Second Circuit.

In order to avoid irreparable harm, I will be forced to file a Temporary Restraining Order that this Court may comply with 28 U.S.C. section 455(a) and (b)(5)(i), and not to re-play the gross injustice that took place in Appeal Case 19-5014, if the case still were not transferred venue.

Please also **disclose** who was the person at this Court making alteration of the case docket of 21-5210 on November 13, 2021's morning. Within 15 minutes after I notified Mr. Atchue, the docket was reverting back half way. I could only presume that the docket alteration was done by Mr. Atchue who is the operation manager of this Court's CM/ECF system. yet, who is the person directing Mr. Atchue to make the alteration? Please advise. Thanks.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

XII. 8/30/2021 ORDER OF JUDGE RUDOLPH CONTRERAS AT U.S.D.C. FOR THE D.C. [ECF168]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Yi Tai Shao Plaintiff	Civil Action No.: 18-1233 (RC)
v.	
John G. Roberts, et al.	**Re Document Nos: 161, 165**
Defendants	

ORDER

Denying plaintiff's motion to vacate judgment and to change venue and denying plaintiff's motion to strike and for sanctions

For the reasons stated in this Court's Memorandum Opinion separately and contemporaneously issued, Plaintiff's motion to vacate judgment and change venue (ECF No. 161) is DENIED and Plaintiff's motion to strike and for sanctions (ECF No. 165) is DENIED. SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2021

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS United States District Judge

XIII. 8/30/2021 MEMORANDUM OPINION DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT AND TO CHANGE VENUE AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE AND FOR SANCTION [ECF169]

Yi Tai Shao, Plaintiff v. John G. Roberts, et al.
Civil Action No.: 18-1233 (RC)
Re Document Nos: 161, 165

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Yi Tai Shao brought this suit alleging a far-reaching conspiracy against her in connection with a California child custody case dating back to 2005. In previous opinions, this Court has denied Shao's motions to change venue and dismissed her complaint. See Shao v. Roberts, No. 18-cv-1233, 2019 WL 249855 (D.D.C. Jan. 17, 2019); Shao v. Roberts, No. 18-cv1233 (D.D.C. Aug. 8, 2018), ECF No. 48. The D.C. Circuit affirmed the dismissal. See Shao v. Roberts, No. 19-5014, 2019 WL 11340269, at *1–2 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 13, 2019) (per curiam). Neither did the Supreme Court disturb it. Shao v. Roberts, 141 S. Ct. 951 (2020) (mem.).6

Undaunted, Shao files two new motions to continue litigating her frivolous suit: a motion to vacate the dismissal and change venue and a motion to strike Defendants' opposition to her other motion and for Rule 11 sanctions. See Mem. P. & A. Supp. Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Mot. Change Venue ("Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue"), ECF No. 161-1; Pl.'s Objection andMot. Strike Defs.' Tardy Opp'n and Request for Sanctions ("Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions"), ECF No. 165. The Court denies her motions.

---

6 For a review of the facts of Shao's case, see Shao, 2019 WL 249855, at *1–2.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Motion to Strike and for Sanctions

The Court first turns to Shao's motion to strike and for sanctions. Shao asks the Court to strike Defendants' opposition to her motion to vacate and change venue because Defendants filed it late and failed to serve it on all parties. Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions at 1, 11–12. She also seeks financial sanctions against Defendants' attorneys because they filed the opposition late and made "frivolous" statements in it. Id. at 3–4, 13.

The Court disagrees that Shao's grievances warrant striking a filing and imposing sanctions. For one thing, there is no evidence that Defendants failed to serve their opposition on all parties. Shao provides no support for her assertion that the opposition "was not served upon" three defendants because they are "not on CM/ECF." See id. at 1. And Defendants say that they served those defendants via mail. Defs.' Opp'n Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions at 2, ECF No. 167. In addition, when "an action involves an unusually large number of defendants," a court can order that the "defendants' pleadings and replies to them need not be served on other defendants." Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(c)(1)(A). This case, in which Shao names over 100 defendants, certainly qualifies as an action involving "an unusually large number of defendants." So even if Defendants neglected to serve their opposition on the three defendants Shao names in her motion, the Court would excuse that error.

For another thing, Shao has not demonstrated that Defendants' attorneys made "frivolous" statements in the opposition. She alludes to Rule 11, which permits a court to sanction an attorney or party who (among other things) presents the court with frivolous legal

contentions or unsupported factual assertions. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(2)–(3), (c)(1); see also Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions at 1–2. The only supposedly frivolous statement Shao cites from Defendants' opposition is this one: "Plaintiff had her opportunity for her claims to be considered at every level of the federal court system and each court found her claims to lack merit." Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions at 3 (quoting Defs.' Opp'n Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue at 1, ECF No. 164). But that statement is true. As the Court related at the outset of this opinion, the D.C. Circuit affirmed this Court's dismissal of Shao's complaint and the Supreme Court also declined to disturb it. Shao's "conclusory and unsupported allegations of misconduct do not come close to supporting the award of sanctions." See Pilkin v. Hogan Lovells US LLP, No. 17- cv-2501, 2021 WL 950082, at *7 (D.D.C. Mar. 12, 2021). Moreover, Shao did not comply with the requirement that a motion for sanctions be filed on the opposing party at least 21 days before submitting it to the court to give the party a chance to correct the challenged filing. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(2). Compare Defs.' Opp'n Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue (filed June 4, 2021), with Pl.'s Mot. Strike and Sanctions (filed June 7, 2021).

Shao's last ground for striking the opposition and for sanctions at least has some basis in fact: Defendants' opposition was tardy. Under Local Civil Rule 7(b), an opposing party usually must file its opposition to a motion within 14 days of the motion's date of service. Defendants waited over a month to file their opposition to Plaintiff's motion. Compare Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue (filed April 29, 2021), with Defs.' Opp'n Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue

(filed June 4, 2021). But although Local Civil Rule 7(b) states that a court faced with an untimely opposition "may treat the motion as conceded," it does not require the court to do so. See Strickland v. Buttigieg, No. 20-cv-1890, 2021 WL 3207041, at *1 (D.D.C. July 29, 2021) (declining to treat unopposed motion as conceded under Rule 7(b)). Shao does not explain how Defendants' late filing prejudiced her or impacted judicial proceedings in this already-resolved case. Cf. Jones v. Quintana, No. 08-cv-00620, 2013 WL 12382261, at *1–2 (D.D.C. Feb. 4, 2013) (denying motion to strike opposition to summary judgment motion when the defendants failed to show that they would suffer prejudice from the tardy filing even though the plaintiff's reasons for filing late were weak). The Court does not believe that Defendants' tardiness warrants striking their opposition or sanctioning their attorneys, so it will excuse the missed deadline. Despite Defendants' low opinion of Shao's case, however, they should still respect this Court and submit any filings on time.

Shao's motion to strike and for sanctions is denied.

B. Motion to Vacate Judgment and Change Venue

Shao moves under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 to vacate this Court's orders refusing to transfer her case and dismissing her complaint. See Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue. She says that the Court should reopen her case on account of fraud, the fact that the Court's judgment is void, and extraordinary circumstances. See generally id.; see also Fed. R. Civ.

P. 60(b)(3)–(4), (6).7 To support her request, she reiterates her complaints about the undersigned judge and attacks various aspects of how the D.C. Circuit and Supreme Court handled her appeal. See generally Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue. First, Shao has not supported her claims of fraud with the "clear and convincing evidence" that Rule 60(b)(3) requires. See People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals v. U. Dep't of Health & Hum. Servs., 226 F. Supp. 3d 39, 55 (D.D.C. 2017) (quoting Shepard v. Am. Broad. Companies, Inc., 62 F.3d 1469, 1477 (D.C. Cir. 1995), aff'd, 901 F.3d 343 (D.C. Cir. 2018). All she does is ascribe malign motives to judges based on innocuous factual details and speculation. But "unsubstantiated, conclusory accusations that the defendants have lied throughout the various stages of this litigation" cannot substitute for the "actual evidence" needed to prove a "claim of fraud." See Green v. Am. Fed'n of Lab. & Cong. of Indus. Orgs., 811 F. Supp. 2d 250, 254 (D.D.C. 2011). The Court will not entertain her latest attempt to prolong this litigation and waste judicial resources with a deluge of baseless allegations. Second, Shao has not demonstrated that the judgment she wants vacated is void. She argues in large part that this Court's orders are void because they were—in her view—wrongly decided. See, e.g.,

---

7 2 Shao repeatedly refers to "new evidence" of fraud that supposedly justifies reopening her case. See, e.g., Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue at 5, 11. Although Rule 60(b)(2) permits setting aside a judgment for "newly discovered evidence," Shao never cites that specific provision. Instead, she points to "new evidence"—consisting largely of procedural details of her appeal—to support her allegations of fraud. Accordingly, the Court does not examine Rule 60(b)(2)'s application

Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue at 25–28. She also attacks the appellate affirmances of this Court's orders as void due to conflicts of interests. See, e.g., id. at 12, 14. But an order is not void merely because it was "erroneous." SEC v. Bolla, 550 F. Supp. 2d 54, 58 (D.D.C. 2008). An order is void "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 that deprives a party of notice or the opportunity to be heard." United States v. Phillip Morris USA Inc., 840 F3d 844, 850 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (quoting United Student Aid Funds, Inc. v. Espinosa, 559 U.S. 260, 271 (2010)). Shao alleges no jurisdictional error. See Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue at 11 ("[T]his court does have subject matter jurisdiction . . . ."). And although judicial bias is the kind of due process violation that could make an order void, Shao has not shown that a reasonable observer would question the impartiality of the undersigned judge or that of the appellate judges that have reviewed her case. See Shao, 2019 WL 249855, at *4–5 (denying Shao's motion to disqualify the undersigned judge). Her only evidence of bias are unsubstantiated claims of a judicial conspiracy and qualms with the judges' legal decisions, but neither of those kinds of evidence can impugn a judge's presumed impartiality. See Walsh v. Comey, 110 F. Supp. 3d 73, 77 (D.D.C. 2015) (explaining that a judge need not recuse himself when a party alleges a judicial conspiracy but offers "no facts that would fairly convince a sane and reasonable mind to question [the court's] impartiality"); Ramirez v. Dep't of Just., 680 F. Supp. 2d 208, 211 (D.D.C. 2010) ("[A] judge's legal decisions generally are not sufficient

grounds to substantiate a claim of bias or impartiality.").

Finally, no "other reason . . . justifies relief." See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). Shao says that the Court should vacate its judgment under Rule 60(b)(6) because the Supreme Court was unable to evaluate the substance of her appeal. Pl.'s Mot. Vacate and Change Venue at 12–14. The Supreme Court declined to disturb her complaint's dismissal after determining it lacked a quorum because many of the Justices recused themselves. See Shao, 141 S. Ct. 951. A court should vacate a judgment under Rule 60(b)(6)'s catch-all provision "only in 'extraordinary circumstances.'" Kramer v. Gates, 481 F.3d 788, 791 (D.C. Cir. 2007) (quoting Ackermann v. United States, 340 U.S. 193, 199 (1950)). Some circumstances that fit the bill include those that "essentially made the decision not to appeal an involuntary one," an attorney's gross negligence, and "[w]hen a party timely presents a previously undisclosed fact so central to the litigation that it shows the initial judgment to have been manifestly unjust." Salazar v. District of Columbia, 633 F.3d 1110, 1121 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (citations omitted). In addition, the party invoking Rule 60(b)(6) must make a "compelling showing of inequity or hardship." Id. at 1120 (quoting Twelve John Does v. District of Columbia, 841 F.2d 1133, 1140 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). Shao has neither explained how the circumstances of her case are extraordinary nor compellingly shown inequity or hardship. She received fair appellate review from the D.C. Circuit. And given that a small minority of those who seek Supreme Court review receive it, one can hardly say that the Supreme Court's nonengagement with the merits of Shao's appeal was "extraordinary." The

circumstances were a little unusual in that many of the Justices did not participate in the decision, but that was Shao's own doing—she was the one who named the Justices as defendants. In short, Shao has not cleared the "very high bar to obtain relief under Rule 60(b)(6)." See Kramer, 481 F.3d at 792.

The Court rejects Shao's latest attempt to relitigate her case. She has had her day in court and then some. If Shao files more baseless motions to revisit already-decided questions, she will face sanctions. See McLaughlin v. Bradlee, 602 F. Supp. 1412, 1417 (D.D.C. 1985) ("The imposition of sanctions is one of the few options available to a court to deter and punish people who relitigate cases hopelessly foreclosed."), aff'd, 803 F.2d 1197 (D.C. Cir. 1986).

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Shao's motion to vacate judgment and change venue (ECF No. 161) is DENIED and Shao's motion to strike and for sanctions (ECF No. 165) is DENIED. An order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is separately and contemporaneously issued.

Dated: August 30, 2021

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS

XIV. DOCUMENT LINKS FOR PETITIONER'S 60b motion and motion to change venue filed with the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (1:18-cv-01233)

ECF 161 Notice of Motion
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglVtIV_0DGkfd8OQ?e=3yl6Eb
ECF 161-1 Memorandum of Points and Authorities
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglCnNSoVDFqQai6m
ECF 161-2 proposed order
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglbJW8DkAVtA7wcj
ECF 161-3 Request for Judicial Notice
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgk_oNXsIGHNaOfo-
ECF 161-4 Declaration of Yi Tai Shao in support
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglH9jlh90_FqFnYg
ECF 161-5 Exh. 1 Returned Petition for Rehearing on by the Supreme Court on 1/29/2021
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgmEJ7pdM2SIi2MUK
ECF 161-6 Exhibit 2 Petitioner's Motion to File Petition for Rehearing as returned by Supreme Court which was directed by DC Circuit Court of Appeal
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglPQ086A-x4RRI7N
ECF 161-7 Exhibit 3 Petitioner's letter to the Congress dated 1/13/2021
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglsajq0xfUhSLj-n
ECF 161-8 Exhibit 4: emails showing secret dismissal of James Mcmanis's State Bar case at Enforcement Stage with case number of 15-O-15200

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglQnYuX5xD1qFz9P
ECF 161-9 Exhibit 5: Evidence of stalling appeal by Mary J. Greenwood, Judge Edward Davila's wife. https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgldGWkzwiWMnoq7h
ECF 161-10 Exhibit 6: conspiracies of silent suspending Petitioner's license on July 29=7, 2020, https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgl9EWLDTmmC1bQgW
ECF 162 Notice Of Non Opposition of Plaintiff's Motion To Vacate 1/17/2019 Order Under F.R.C.P. Rule 60 (B)(3),(4) &(6) And Motion To Change Venueand Request An Order Granting The Motion Pursuant To Local Rule 7 Filed On 05/30/21 https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgk0Jgol_l9yMgSvC
ECF 163 Letter to Chief Judge Howard regarding Judge Contreras's violation of 28 U.S.C. 455(b)(5)(i) and asked her to take action to ensure impartial hearing dated June 1, 2021.
ECF 164 American Inns of Court OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE 1/17/2019 ORDER AND MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE filed on 06/04/21
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphEhowCLyTINUywQ1
ECF 165 Plaintiff's Objection And Motion To Strike AIC Defendants'stardy Opposition, of Plaintiff's Motion To Vacate 1/17/2019 Order Under F.R.C.P. Rule 60 (B)(3),(4) &(6) And Motion To Change Venue; Request For Monetary Sanction for AIC defendants' Violation Of Local Rule 7 filed on 6/7/2021
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglLF3tq84FEcwAQH

ECF 169
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgliXrzrRItKv2LjO

ECF 161 FILED ON 04-29/21
NOTICE OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE 1/17/2019 ORDER UNDER F.R.C.P. RULE 60 (b)(3),(4) &(6) and MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE;
SHAO V. ROBERTS, ET AL.
CASE NO.: 1:18-cv-01233RC
TO THE COURT AND DEFENDANTS AND ATTORNEYS OF RECORD FOR THE DEFENDANTS: Please take notice that Plaintiff is moving to set aside the Order of January 17, 2019 of Judge Rudolph Contreras under Rule 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). 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), Plaintiff files this motion after the Mandate of the US Supreme Court was issued on January 15, 2021 when the U.S. Supreme Court irregularly returned unfiled Plaintiff's Petition for Rehearing and "Motion to File Petition for Rehearing [Rule 44(2)] that was mailed on January 8, 2021 but was unexpectedly delayed receipt by this Court until January 15, 2021 [Rule 29(2)], and to vacate January 15, 2021 Judgment; or alternatively deem the petition for rehearing be for the January 15, 2021 Judgment [Rule 44(1)]" (commonly referred to as "Motion to file Petition for Rehearing") and took off from the docket of Petition No. 20-524 twice the January 15, 2021 Mandate, on the ground that the Supreme Court was unable to review your case or make a decision on the merits and reopening is necessary to cure the appearance of judicial bias the handling of the case has created at all levels (Rule 60(b)(6)). As the Motion

to Change Venue and Disqualifying Judge Rudolph Contreras should have been granted, Plaintiff respectfully use the same facts under oath asking this Court to change venue to the U.S.D.C. in Central New York District based on the conflicts of interest and about 20 felonies committed by this Court through Judge Contreras, his clerk Jackie Francis and the fact that the normal function of the Clerk's Office has been severely interfered such that about 15 requests for entry of default were unwantedly pending for about 3 months before Judge Contreras's sua sponte dismissal made without any notice, hearing, and in direct violation of 28 U.S.C.S. §455(b)(5)(i). The request to change venue away from the D.C. Circuit is also based on the D.C. Circuit's 7 felonies committed in 19-5014. Both courts have failed to decide the issues of change of venue according to the standard in Moran v. Clarke (8th Cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517 that the Court must relay all facts. Both courts refused to decide issues in recusal which is a serious violation of judicial duty. Inquiry Concerning Freedman (Cal.Comm. Jud. Perf. 2007) 49 Cal.4th CJP Supp. 223. Judge Contreras cannot legally decide this motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S. §455(b)(5)(i) as he has failed to provide Moran v. Clarke response to Plaintiff's motions to disqualify him and change venue thus far. He has failed to explain the felonies committed which were stated in Paragraph 83 of the FAC 16, FAC 32, 35, 40, 42, 142, 144, totally about 20 felonies. His argument of judge shopping is unsupported by the record because he has failed to explain to any of the felonies he committed and Plaintiff is the victim. Therefore, such direct conflicts of interest disallows him to continue sitting on this case.

Objectively speaking, the case must be changed venue to be away from the D.C. Circuit as three

Justices/Defendants at the U.S. Supreme Court are alumni judges of the D.C. Circuit, and based on Chief Justice John G. Roberts' letter order of October 10, 2018, there is public view of conflicts of interest based on such relationship that Justice Kavanaugh's cases needed to move away.

Any reasonable person knowing all the facts will believe that Plaintiff cannot have a fair hearing in front of this Court that is within the D.C. Circuit's jurisdiction. Transfer to another district is necessary to avoid the appearance of impropriety created by all the errors and problems with the judicial handling of this case.

This motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Yi Tai Shao in support of the Motion, Request for Judicial Notice and proposed Order.

As part of the affidavit to change venue, the undersigned declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of her knowledge.

Dated: April 29, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yi Tai Shao

Yi Tai Shao

XX. ECF 161-1: FILED ON 4/29/2021: MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE 1/17/2019 ORDER UNDER F.R.C.P. RULE 60 (b)(3),(4) &(6) and MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE

Table of Contents

U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and knew that his argument of judge shopping is not supported by the record when he never explained any of his accused ex parte communication, forging signatures in ECF 38 and 41 and alteration of the docket of this case

2. Prima facie evidence of Judge Contreras's alteration of the court's records/docket

C. THE RISK OF INJUSTICE TO THE PARTIES IN PARTICULAR CASES, THE RISK OF INJUSTICE IN OTHER CASES AND UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

1. 7 crimes at the DC Circuit in 19-5014 and 39 crimes of US Supreme Court as mentioned above in 8 related Petitions filed by Plaintiff in 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613 and 20-524, including the US Supreme Court's failure to decide 15 matters properly presented in front of them

2. The legal presumption that the U.S. Supreme Court 8 Justices participated in the conspiracy to alter the docket of 18-569

3. The US Supreme Court in 20-524 violated the more than 100 years old's public policy on lack of quorum

4. In September 2019, Defendant James McManis's fraudulent dismissal of both the civil case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al (Santa Clara County Court, 2012-1-cv-220571) in conspiracy with Santa Clara County Court with alteration of the court's efiling record in order to take advantage of Plaintiff's unavailability to rush dismissal; and the State Bar of California refused to prosecute the forgery of the court's records, and even remove the case of 20-O-07258 as against McManis himself; the 2015 case against McManis for his bribery of the judiciary was also silently closed.

5. Defendants Santa Clara County Court and

Sixth District Court of Appeal conspired with their attorney Defendant James McManis to deter appeal of Plaintiff from the illegal dismissal in Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al, 2012-1-cv-220571

6. While State Bar silently dismissed the cases against James McManis, California State Bar conspired with Defendant California Chief Justice to issue a premature illegal order trying to suspend Plaintiff's bar license two months before due date for payment and trying to deter Plaintiff from payment by altering the State Bar Profile of Plaintiff

IV. CONCLUSION

With diligent appeal, the Supreme Court was unable to review this case or make a decision on the merits and reopening is necessary to cure the appearance of judicial bias the handling of the case has created at all levels.

The relief requested is to vacate January 17, 2019's Order of Judge Contreras and to transfer to another district is necessary to avoid the appearance of impropriety created by all the errors and problems with the judicial handling of this case when Plaintiff is a victim of about 20 felonies of this District Court, 7 felonies of the D.C. Circuit and 39 felonies of the U.S. Supreme Court defendants. The fact that three Justices defendants are alumni judges of the D.C. Circuit mandates change of venue, pursuant to Chief Justice John G. Roberts' own letter order of October 10 of 2018 regarding moving the complaints against Justice Kavanough away from the DC Circuit to the Tenth Circuit.

Plaintiff was illegally deprived of her day in court. All judgments are void. All courts failed to decide recusal in relaying all facts as required by Moran v. Clarke (8th Cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517. A refusal to decide is a serious violation of judicial duty. Inquiry

Concerning Freedman (Cal.Comm. Jud. Perf. 2007) 49 Cal.4th CJP Supp. 223. An unconstitutional failure to recuse constitutes structural error that is "not amenable" to harmless-error review, regardless of whether the judge's vote was dispositive, Puckett v. United States, 556 U.S. 129, 141, 129 S.Ct. 1423, 173 L.Ed.2d 266.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS FOR 60(b) MOTION & PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE

A. 1/17/2019's utterly vague "sua sponte dismissal" order is a void judgment which was made in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.S. §455(b)(5)(1) when Judge Contreras created a frivolous finding of "judge shopping" when he failed to explain any of the accused 29 irregularities including evidence of ex parte communications nor any of the evidence about 20 felonies of alterations of the docket.

Complaint was filed on May 18, 2018; Judge Contreras refused to docket the case until May 30, 2018 after Plaintiff's process server made inquiries. When the docket was created on May 30, 2018, the short case name became Shao v. Kennedy, et al and the first defendant's last name, Roberts for Chief Justice John G. Roberts, was concealed. After many inquiries, 4 Summons out of 65 were selectively issued by Judge Contreras's clerk Jackie Francis, bypassing the Clerk's Office, on June 5, 2018. On June 15, 2018, the Clerk's Office in charge of signing off Summons eventually was allowed by Judge Contreras to issue 61 Summons, but Judge Contreras ordered to back date the Summons to be June 11, 2018. Therefore, Plaintiff amended the complaint to add Judge Contreras and his clerk as new defendants on June 29, 2018 (ECF16). Both the docket entries for June 5

and June 11 2018 were altered 5 times after Judge Contreras was named as defendant. He persisted on denying motion to change court and to disqualify him, for twice, with the second time of denial was shown in the same order of "sua sponte dismissal" on January 17, 2019 (ECF154). On Lines 12-13 of Page 10 of ECF 154, he specifically cited 28 U.S.C.S. §455(b)(5)(i) but stated that he did not need to follow the statute as his being sued was a "judge shopping" and that all accused behaviors do not amount to bias or prejudice. There were altogether 29 irregularities including 20 felonies of alterations of docket and forging court's records in this case, but Judge Contreras failed to explain to any of the accused felonies, including any of the above felonious acts that were identified in the First Amended Complaint, ECF16.

In ¶83 of FAC16, Plaintiff wrote:

"Judge Rudolph Contreras is a Judge at U.S.D.C. in the District of Columbia who is the assigned judge for this complaint. Judge Contreras violated 18 U.S.C. §371, disrupting and obstructing the justice by interfering the function of the Clerk's Office to enter the process on the court's docket, maintain the docket and to file. Firstly, Judge Contreras directed the Clerk's Office not to docket the case which was put into the dropbox of the Court on May 18, 2019, in violation of F.R.C.P. Rule 79. Only until receiving numerous inquiries by One Source Process Server that is located at the District of Columbia, then Judge Contreras eventually allowed the case to be docketed on May 30, 2018. Secondly, in eventually not concealing existence of the complaint and docket the case, Judge Contreras directed the Clerk's Office to shape the short form of the case name to be Shao v. Kennedy, et al. instead of Shao v. Roberts, et al. Thirdly, Judge Contreras delayed the proceeding by

blocked the Clerk's Office from issuance of Summons for about 20+ days, until SHAO made inquiries to Michael Darby, the clerk in charge of initiation of a case asking if his delay of issuance Summons was directed by someone. Then, Mr. Darby was able to sign the Summons within a day after conversing with SHAO in her investigation on the reason for such lengthy delay. Fourthly, Judge Contreras further caused false entry on the docket to show a false date of issuance of Summons, in violation of Rule 29. Fifthly, Judge Contreras interfered the Clerk's Office's fundamental function of filing in controlling filing of Designation of Doe defendants No. 1, 2, and 3 from June 11, 2018 to June 18, 2018 , after SHAO made inquiries on whether such was regular or irregular. Sixth, Judge Contreras directed a false entry on the docket to be made regarding the delayed filing of Designation of Doe Defendants by back dating the filing date to be June 14, 2018. In deterring docketing, and falsifying entries of docket, Judge Contreras aided and abated Jackie Francis and Michael Darby to violate F.R.C.P. Rule 79, 18 U.S.C. §1512(c) and 18 U.SC§371. Judge Contreras's deterring the normal function of the Clerk's Office constitutes violation of 18 USC §371, impairing, obstructing the lawful functions of any department of government. Seventhly, Judge Contreras did not disclose his conflicts of interest with Chief Justice John G. Roberts. These irregularities appeared to be derived from his undisclosed conflicts of interest with the first named defendant, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, who appointed him to have a second judge position at U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court in May of 2016. As Designation of Doe No. 1 through 3 defendants were withheld from filing for a few days and with substantial delay in issuing

Summons, and the Doe No. 1 Defendant is Justice Adrienne M. Grove who did a big favor for James McManis, it is likely that Judge Contreras has undisclosed relationship or contacts with James McManis or other judicial defendants in this case." None of these acts stated in ¶83 of FAC16 that were recited in a formal motion to change venue and disqualify Judge Contreras, were ever explained by Judge Contreras. These docket entries of June 5, 2018 and June 11, 2018 and the later accused minutes order of July 24, 2018 which is evidence of ex parte communications with California judicial defendants had been purged from the present docket.

In denying recusal twice, and each time more than a month after filing of the motion to change venue and disqualification of Judge Contreras when no oppositions were filed, Judge Contreras failed to explained to any of the 20 incidents of felonious alterations of the court's records/docket as well as evidence of ex parte communications contained in ECF 32, 25, 40, 42, 142, 144, with actual knowledge that he must be disqualified under 28 U.S.C.S. §455(b)(5)(1). See the list of 29 irregularities including 20 felonies in Appendix pages 144-154 attached to "Petition for Writ of Certiorari" filed on July 2, 2020 with the US Supreme Court in the case of 20-524.

The Clerk's Office entered default against two defendants, Tsan-Kuen Wang (ECF 76) and David Sussman (ECF77) on July 28, 2018. Judge Contreras then directed Clerk's Office to stall all other Plaintiff's default requests, including against Judge Contreras himself and the 11 U.S. Supreme Court defendants (including 8[5] Justices). On November 19, 2018,

---

[5] 1 The 8 Justices contained in ECF16 are Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Anthony Kennedy,

without a motion, Judge Contreras allowed the U.S. Attorney to file as an interpleader to respond to default (ECF 140) when the U.S. Attorney Karen W. Liu has direct conflicts of interest for being a member of Defendant American Inns of Court.

Within 24 hours following Plaintiff's filing of service of Summons on the hacker Kevin L. Warnock (ECF152) and Judge Craig Wallace (ECF151), founder of the American Inns of Court, Judge Contreras suddenly issued a sua sponte dismissal order on January 17, 2019 (ECF 153) without giving any notice of his intention to dismiss the case, when there were about 22 defendants who were just served with Summons, or had not filed a motion to dismiss, and further acted as an attorney, in violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(ii) to argue sua sponte for these defendants that had not appeared. In 1/17/2019 Order, Judge Contreras failed to decide Plaintiff's motion to strike ECF140 and disqualify Karen Liu and US Attorney's Office (contained in ECF142).

His 1/17/2019 order contained a vague dismissal of "All remaining claims against all other defendants are DENIED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction" (ECF153) which is void as being too vague.

The felonies of alterations of docket are prima facie and can be easily seen by any reasonable person from the face of the present altered docket: entries are out of chronological order of docket for ECF 38 and ECF 41, disappearance of docket entry of June 5, 2018 (Francis issued 4 Summons), June 11, 2018 (backdated issuance of 61 Summons) and July 24,

---

Justice Stephen Brayer, Justice Ruh Bader Ginsberg, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Sonia Sotomayer. Justice Kennedy announced retirement two weeks after being served with ECF 16. Justice Ginsberg died in September 2020

2018's minutes orders (Contreras's ex parte communication with California judicial defendants). The default entries against the US Supreme Court defendants as well as against himself were left undecided for a good 3 months before his dismissal when he himself is in default as a defendant!

B.NEW EVIDENCE OF DC CIRCUIT'S CONSPIRACY OF THE HACKER KEVIN L. WARNOCK, AMERICAN INNS OF COURT, US SUPREME COURT JUSTICES/DEFENDANTS, AND MCMANIS DEFENDANTS AND DEFENDANT JUDGE CONTRERAS IN ALTERING THE COURT RECORDS REGARDING THE 8 JUSTICES OF THE US SUPREME COURT, DEFENDANTS JAMES MCMANIS, MICHAEL REEDY AND MCMANIS FAULKNER, LLP, AS WELL AS JUDGE CONTRERAS

Plaintiff timely filed appeal with the DC Circuit on January 30, 2019 with the case number of 19-5014 (#177156). Judge Patricia Millett was leading the panel.

Similar crimes played by California judicial defendants and McManis Defendants in dismissing appeal behind the back of Plaintiff without notice was replayed at the D.C. Circuit. Obvious conspiracies with American Inns of Court appellees, McManis appellees and US Supreme Court Justices and the hacker (hired by McManis appellees and Tsan-Kuen Wang (default entered shown in ECF 76 in 1:18-cv-01123 RC)) caused Plaintiff to file a motion to change venue. The evidence and facts for the felonies conspired are stated in full in ECF 1791001 as well as the Motion for Judicial Notice in ECF 1787004.

DC Circuit committed the following 7 crimes: (1) silently took off Plaintiff's CM/ECF user account

on the eve of American Inns of Court Appellees's filing of their dispositive motion on March 18, 2019. (2) Silently put back Plaintiff's CM/ECF user account on April 9, 2019. With knowledge that Plaintiff was unable to receive notice of American Inns of Court's Motion, Judge Millett fraudulently issued the Order to Show Cause of granting American Inns of Court Appellees' dispositive motion on April 9, 2019 because Plaintiff did not file an opposition.
(3) In conspiracy with the American Inns of Court Appellees, US Supreme Court Justices Appellees, Kevin L. Warnock Appellee, and Judge Contreras Appellee, the DC Circuit purged and altered the following 4 court records on May 9 and May 10 of 2019 (ECF 1820049, p. 21), which constitutes 4 counts of felonies as pursuant to People v. McKenna, 116 Cal.App.2d 207 (1953), one alteration is one count of felony, and no direct evidence of actual act of purging is required; the court may create an implied presumption of facts of alteration acts based on the undisputable facts that the records were altered and who is benefitted by such alterations:
a. **Deletion of the 2nd and 3rd pages of Temple Bar Scholars and Reports** in Doc. #26 of 1787004. Eight Justices/appellees at the US Supreme Court are benefited.
b. **Deletion of the docket sheet** of Petition for Writ of certiorari 18-800 from Doc. #21 of #1787004 where McManis appellees are the appellees.
c. Alteration of the cover page of ECF 41 that bears Judge Rudolph Contreras's date of signature, that is on Page 63 of the 4th Document of #1787004 (i.e., ECF42, P.63). Judge Contreras is benefited. He signed off allowing identical pleadings in ECF 41 and 38 be filed twice.

On July 31, 2018 at 3:26 p.m., Plaintiff filed request for entry of default against BJ Fadem.

In case of 1:18-01233	Receipt by USDC clerk's office Date	Date Judge Contreras forged as his approval of filing	ECF notice of Date of entry into the docket
ECF 38 that has no proof of service	None; the clerk's office stated at 12:25 p.m. of August 2, 2018 that there was no filing stamp for ECF #38 and that ECF#38 bypassed the Clerk's office and went directly to the chamber of Judge Contreras. At 12:45 p.m. of 8/2/2018, Plaintiff sent an email to Jackie Francis asking result of entry of default against Fadem. (ECF 40, p.8, p.13)	July 31, 2018 (ECF 40, p.16); Jackie Francis refused to respond when Judge Contreras received ECF38 (ECF40, p.52)	8/2/2018 4:43 p.m. (ECF40, p.15) docketed as "civil statement from Defendant BJ Fadem" it was entered by ztd.
ECF 41	A forged date of receipt by the Court as of "Jul.30, 2018"	Aug. 2, 2018	8/3/2018 at 2:50 p.m. docketed "motion to dismiss" It

			was entered by zrdj.

Ironically, in ECF 49, Judge Contreras wrote on the first sentence of his order denying recusal that "On July 31, 2018, BJ Fadem filed a motion to dismiss, see ECF No. 38". Such filing date is different from the forged fake receipt stamp shown on the cover of ECF41. Such forged docketing entries with back dates caused the docket to be out of chronological order in that the sequence shown on the altered docket became ECF 34, 38, 35, 36, 37, 41, 39, 40.

d. **ECF 1787225, pages 42 and 43, removed the sponsors of Temple Bar Scholars before year 2007**

(4) forging the En Banc Order of May 1, 2020, which was issued 7 minutes following issuance of Per Curiam order from Judge Millett. Evidence presented in ECF1791001 regarding the above 6 of 7 felonies (the 7th felony happened on 5/1/2020 as end of the proceeding) includes

Page	Evidence presented to account for the court's frauds/crimes of DC Circuit
31-38	the involvement of the hacker, i.e., Defendant Kevin L. Warnock, on the alterations of court records
40-48	Altered records
66-69	Second time of alteration of Temple Bar Scholars and Reports, shown as pages 42- 43 of ECF 1787225
71- 74	Evidence showing that when the court's records in 19-5014 were altered, the American Inns of Court also posted the identical change on its Temple Bar Scholars and Reports' webpage. This proves that the American Inns of Court conspired with the DC Circuit in

	purging evidence regarding the 8 Justices of the United States.
75-85 87-91	evidence that when DC Circuit's Operation Manager Scott Atsue promised Plaintiff that the DC Circuit did not change the records on May 13, 2019, the website of the American Inns of Court was also doing amendment trying to revert back to its original complete list of Temple Bar Scholars and Reports. The complete reversion took place on May 14, 2019 as shown in Pages 87 through 91.
113- 119	The orders of Chief Justice John G. Roberts which establishes the conflicts of interest of the DC Circuit in deciding the appeal and is the legal basis of changing venue of the entire DC Circuit. **Judge Millett failed to decide.**
93- 111	evidence of how Chief Justice Roberts interacted with the other Judges at the DC Circuit extensively that the DC Circuit must be changed venue.
123	Emails showing contacts with DC Circuit staff when Plaintiff was CM/ECF user of DC Circuit
125- 128	Evidence that up to March 17, 2019 (one day before American Inns of Court's filing of motion for summary affirmation of Judge Contreras's Order), Plaintiff was on ECF list and had communications with DC Circuit. This proves that the DC Circuit took Plaintiff off from CM/ECF silently was to participate the common scheme of dismissal of appeal against American Inns of Court by forbearing Plaintiff from getting notice; same scheme was applied by McManis defendants and California Sixth District Court of Appeal in dismissing the child custody appeal (Petition

	18- 569), dismissing vexatious litigant order appeal (Petition 18-800).
133	the DC Circuit silently put Plaintiff back on the ECF list on April 9, 2019 to allow Plaintiff to receive an order to show cause why not grant AIC's motion because of no objections were filed by Plaintiff.
138	Mr. Atchue admitted to removal of Plaintiff from the CM/ECF and tried to find an excuse of "automatic removal." However, any reasonable person cannot believe that Mr. Atchue was impossible to be unaware of the fact that Plaintiff was removed from ECF user and that Plaintiff was impossible to be automatically put back to ECF user on April 9, 2019.
141	Evidence that Mr. Atchue's excuse was false as the same story was already mentioned in February 2019.
143- 145	Scott Atchue refused to respond the exact time he took off Plaintiff's name from the ECF user
149	AIC admitted in ¶2 that "It is clear that Appellant had good cause for not timely responding as she had not received the Motion for Summary Affirmance." (Page 149, ¶2). By law, the DC Circuit should have denied the AIC's motion for summary affirmance because of lack of notice, yet Judge Millett still granted the motion anyhow. AIC falsely pretended that AIC attempted to serve by mail, which proved that Mr. Atchue had communicated with AIC about evidence shown in p.138.
152-	Evidence that the burglaries were to stalk Plaintiff by hacking into electronic data and

53	destroying database, as testified by a Senior Engineer Jonathan Lo as shown in Pages 50-56.

Regarding **any** of the facts, evidence and accusations presented in ECF 1791001, Judge Millett persisted on **refusing to decide,** for almost a year through 4 orders and three Petitions for Rehearing, except repeating its summary denial of recusal and a summary affirmation of Judge Contreras's illegal order of 1/17/2019, in disregard of three ensuing Petitions for Rehearing made by Plaintiff repeatedly requested the DC Circuit to respond to the evidence complained in ECF 1791001 (filed on 6/5/2019). The 3 Petitions for Rehearings are (1) ECF#1803537 filed on August 24, 2019 to petition rehearing of 7/31/2019's interim order (ECF 1834622, pages 34-35), (2) ECF 1820049 filed on 12/13/2019 to petition rehearing on 11/13/2019's Order (ECF 1834622, pages 31-33), and (3) ECF 1834621 (filed on 2/5/2020). Included in each of the Petitions, Plaintiff informed the DC Circuit of the laws: Such summary denial of recusal is improper and violated 28 U.S.C. §455 as the D.C. Circuit is required to "set out all the relevant facts" as required by Moran v. Clarke (8th cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517. See, e.g., ECF 1824621, P. 9.

In ECF 1834261, pages 35 through 134, Plaintiff informed the DC Circuit of the new felonies and new First Amendment violations of US Supreme Court Appellees in Petition 19- 639 that supported the First Amended Complaint (ECF 16) of this case (i.e., docket alterations in 19-639 and concealed or delaying filing of the Request for Recusal by 23 days (ECF 1834261, pp. 35, 36) and alteration of docket of 19-639 (ECF 1834621, pp. 33, 37) and concealed the appendix attached to the Request for Recusal (ECF 1834621, p.45). Plaintiff also inform new judicial conspiracies

directed by McManis defendants at Santa Clara County Court where appellee Kevin L. Warnock was uncovered by the forged e-filing stamps of McManis's secret motion to dismiss where the court's records were forged in backdating the filing date of the illegally made motion to dismiss from 9/18/2019 to be 9/12/2019) with evidence of the hacker Kevin L. Warnock's unambiguous interference with Plaintiff's motion to set aside dismissal. These new facts supported reversal of Judge Contreras's Order of 1/17/2019. Yet, DC Circuit just wanted to dismiss the case, and failed to decide on any of these issues.

Judge Millett's willful refusing to decide all new facts raised in ECF 1834621 and any issues raised in Petition for Rehearing 11/13/2019's Order (ECF1820049), Response to Order to Show Casue (ECF 1799946) and Motion for Summary reversal (ECF 1787225) indeed violated Southhard et al. v. Russel (1853) 57 U.S. 547. Moreover, she used extremely vague and ambiguous terms to dismiss the entire appeal, bypassing the normal appeal procedure, violated the standard stated in Southwestern Elec. Power Co. v. FERC, 801 E. 2d 289, 294 (D.C. Cir. 1987) An example of such illegal vagueness is in 11/13/2019's Order where she wrote "The district court also correctly concluded that, because it lacked authority to grant the relief sought by appellant in several of her claims, appellant lacked standing for those claims." (ECF 1834621, P.11)

In conclusion, the appearance of conspiracy among American Inns of Court, DC Circuit, James McManis, Judge Contreras, the hacker and US Supreme Court Justices are shown on the records which constitute "new evidence" justifying reopening of the complaint as this court does have subject matter jurisdiction and **[deleted by the hacker]**

Therefore, new evidence of conspiracy among the defendants justify reopen of this case.

C. **JUDGMENT OF THE DC CIRCUIT AFFIRMING JUDGE CONTRERAS'S ORDER OF JANUARY 17, 2019 SHOULD BE VOID AS JUDGE MILLETT, THE LEADING JUDGE FOR THE APPELLATE PANEL, FAILED TO DISCLOSE HER FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH AMERICAN INNS OF COURT APPELLEES.**

Judge Millett failed to disclose her direct financial conflicts of interest in that she actually solicited the Temple Bar Scholarship from American Inns of Court Appellee in 2019, when she was in charge of the appeal of 19-5014 such that the 4 orders from her must be void:

(1) 7/31/2019 Order summarily affirmed Judge Contreras's 1/17/2019 order to dismiss American Inns of Court Appellees despite lack of notice to Plaintiff; the order further summarily denied Petitioner's countermotion to summary reversal, and summarily denied motion to change venue without stating all facts on accused matters, including how and why the DC Circuit would silently remove Plaintiff from being CM/ECF user on the eve of American Inns of Court's filing of the dispositive motion, and why there would not be conflicts of interest when 3 of the 8 Justices are alumni judges of the DC Circuit.

(2) 11/13/2019 Order to sua sponte dismiss the entire appeal and affirm Judge Contreras's sua sponte dismissal, and again summarily denied change of venue without explaining to the conflicts of interest because three Justices/alumni judges and any felonious alterations of records by the DC Circuit;

(3) 2/5/2020 Order summarily denying rehearing of 11/13/2019 Order and refusing to state any facts in

denying change of venue and recusal.
(4) 5/1/2020 orders summarily denying rehearing of 2/5/2020 order and failed to consider nor dismiss any new facts that would have justify reversal of dismissal.

Therefore, all these orders of Judge Millett should be void for concealing such financial conflicts of interest.

D. SUPREME COURT WAS UNABLE TO REVIEW THE MERITS ON APPEAL OR MAKE A DECISION ON THE MERITS WHICH CAUSED REOPENING TO BE NECESSARY TO CURE THE APPEARANCE OF JUDICIAL BIAS THE HANDLING OF THIS CASE HAS CREATED AT ALL LEVELS PURSUANT TO RULE 60(b)(6).

This case must be reopened as the U.S. Supreme Court was unable to review the merits on appeal or make a decision on the merits and reopening is necessary to cure the appearance of judicial bias the handling of the case has created at all levels, while there are significant issues of conflicts of interest for all courts involved throughout this proceeding that have impaired Plaintiff's fundamental right to have her cases decided by an impartial tribunal. All that was contained in 1/15/2021's Mandate was refusing to decide, despite Plaintiff had diligently pursued appeal.

Not only the 1/15/2021's Judgment erroneously cited 28 U.S.C.S. 2109 which in fact is inapplicable as the merits on appeal were never decided by the DC Circuit, their refusing to decide violates the long lasting public policy rules on lack of quorum stated in Pollock v. Farmers' Loan Trust Co, 158 U.S. 601, 603-04 (1895) that was discussed in Pages 9 and 10 of Petition for Rehearing which was served upon the US Supreme Court defendants on January 8, 2021. (See

Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, Exhibit 1) The second Request for Recusal was also served on January 8, 2021 that Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh must be recused and failed to disclose their financial conflicts of interest with Appellee American Inns of Court.

January 11, 2021 was the expected delivery date that the Petition for Rehearing would arrive at the US Supreme Court. Defendant Jeff Atkins was further informed twice on January 12, 2021 about the Petition for Rehearing in Case No. 20-524.

The US Supreme Court defendants appeared to participate in mail hijacking to cause the insured U.S.P.S. priority mail containing the Petition for Rehearing be *disappearing for 8 days* then, the US Supreme Court rushed the 1/15/2021 Judgment/Mandate.

The mail for Petition for Rehearing reappeared only on 1/16/2021 after the 1/15/2021's Mandate was issued. After considering 10+ days, the US Supreme Court silently returned and de-filed the Petition for Rehearing and the second Request for Recusal without docketing the receipt.

The Petition for Rehearing discussed the public policy on lack of quorum, that the court's December 14, 2020's Order relying on 28 USC 2109 was misleading, that the case should be transferred to an unbiased Court of Appeal to review, and the new evidence that the US Supreme Court altered the docket of 18-569 by removing the court's record and the filing of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children that the US Supreme Court 7 Justices conspired not to decide.

According to the doctrine of spoliation of evidence, the US Supreme Court Justices are legally presumed to be the perpetrators of such felony.

Such return was dated January 29, 2021, which is likely happened after Plaintiff served them with a motion to file Petition for Rehearing. Regarding this Motion to file Petition for Rehearing, waited for 33 days, the Supreme Court returned it in a very irregular way--- it returned D.C. Circuit's mail envelop to the US Supreme Court and stamped receipt date of March 2, 2021 and return to Plaintiff regarding her motion to file Petition for Rehearing, to vacate 1/15/2021's Judgment and alternative motion on March 2, 2021 via Defendant US Supreme court's priority mail dated March 2. (See Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, Exhibit 2)

This Mandate did not resolve any issues on the merits nor any issues on appeal that constitutes ground of vacating judgment based on Rule 60(b)(6).

E. THE PURPORTED MANDATE OF DEFENDANT US SUPREME COURT IS VOID AND LIKELY A PRODUCT OF US SUPREME COURT'S FRAUD AND THAT JUSTIFIES CASE REOPENING UNDER RULE 60(b)(4).

The 1/15/2021 Mandate should be void as the Mandate alone is involved with about 6 incidents of alterations of dockets in violation of 18 U.S.C.S. §§1001, 2071, 1512(c) & 1519.

On January 13, 2021 when the hacker was aware that Plaintiff was writing a letter to the House Representatives, December 14, 2020's Order was removed from the docket. (See below)

How the purported mandate was issued was very irregular (please see evidence attached to Motion to File Petition for Rehearing as shown in Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, Exh. 2):

(1) Defendant U.S. Supreme Court has never served its January 15, 2021's Mandate [hereinafter, "Mandate"] upon Plaintiff.

(2) Within 48 hours of the purported Mandate, Defendant Supreme Court made 4 times of change on the docket of Petition No. 20-524 in that for twice, it took this Mandate off from the docket of 20-524, and then put it back, which suggested that the Mandate may be a fraud, and may not have been issued by the 3 non-defendant Justices who were allegedly impartial, i.e., Justice Gorsuch, Justice Kavanaugh and Justice Barrett.

(3) Defendant U.S. Supreme Court willfully and knowingly rushed for issuance of the Mandate, after a felonious interception of the U.S.P.S. priority mail of the Petition for Rehearing by 8 days to block its arrival with Defendant US Supreme Court. (See, Declaration of Shao for Motion to file Petition for Rehearing, Exh. B) Such willfulness is proven by notice given by Plaintiff to Defendant Jeff Atkins about the forthcoming Petition for Rehearing on January 12 and 13, 2021. (See, Declaration of Shao for Motion to file Petition for Rehearing, Exh. D) In fact, as early as on January 8, 2021, all Supreme Court defendants including Jeff Atkins were already served with the Petition for Rehearing, and Second Request for Recusal to disqualify Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh (See, Declaration of Shao for Motion to file Petition for Rehearing, Exh. C) Knowing the mail would be coming, Defendant Jeff Atkins allowed the 1/15/2021 Judgment to be docketed.

The mail interception is reasonably viewed as a plot as only after issuing the Mandate was issued, then the suspension of mail for Petition for Rehearing was released on January 16, 2021 according to the U.S.P.S's tracking record. Therefore, the US Supreme Court defendants are suspected to be involved with the crime of interception of interstate mail.

(4) Defendant Supreme Court willfully refused to file

or enter into the docket of the Petition for Rehearing that was mailed on January 8, 2021 that supposedly should have a filing date of January 8, 2021, but returned the Petition for Rehearing with a letter from the Deputy Clerk Michael Duggan dated January 29, 2021, when was 10 days after Defendant U.S. Supreme Court actually received the same Petition for Rehearing.

In another words, since January 19, 2021's receipt of the Petition for Rehearing, the US Supreme Court refused to enter into the docket of filing Petition for Rehearing as on January 8, 2021 as required by Supreme Court Rule 29(2) but conspired to de-file the Petition for Rehearing 10 days later, which could be in response to the Motion to file Petition for Rehearing that was served on January 29, 2021.

(5) While Plaintiff was not informed of the whereabouts of the Petition for Rehearing, on January 29, 2021, Plaintiff filed and served her "Motion to File Petition for Rehearing [Rule 44(2)] that was mailed on January 8, 2021 but was unexpectedly delayed receipt by this Court until January 15, 2021 [Rule 29(2)], and to vacate January 15, 2021 Judgment; or alternatively deem the petition for rehearing be for the January 15, 2021 Judgment [Rule 44(1)]" (commonly referred to as "Motion to file Petition for Rehearing").

This is the same date when Deputy Clerk Mike Duggan issued the letter returning Petition for Rehearing. Whether the US Supreme Court decided to de-file the Petition for Rehearing after it was served with the Motion to file Petition for Rehearing is unclear.

Yet, very odd is: on March 2, 2021, Defendant US Supreme Court waited for 33 days to return the Motion to file Petition for Rehearing. Even more odd

is, what Defendant US Supreme Court returned was the motion forwarded by the DC Circuit with DC Circuit's envelop mailing to the US Supreme Court and enclosed with Mr. Duggan's January 29, 2021's letter. See Declaration of Shao, Exhibit 2.

(6) Simultaneously with the filing of the Petition for Rehearing, Plaintiff also submitted her second Request for Recusal of Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh, the two Justices not sued in the Complaint for their undisclosed conflicts of interest, including their financial interest with Appellee/Defendant American Inns of Court. (See, Decl. Shao, Exhibit 2, Motion to file Petition for Rehearing, Exhibit C)

(7) All three documents filed on January 8 2021 and January 29, 2021were not entered into the docket of Petition No. 20-524.

(8) The US Supreme Court failed to decide 7 matters in 20-524: Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Motion for judicial Notice of the Amicus Curiae Motion filed in 18-569, Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children, Petition for Rehearing, First and Second Request for Recusal, Motion to file Petition for Rehearing.

F. NEW EVIDENCE OF CONSPIRACY AND COURT CRIMES THAT JUSTIFIES REOPENING THE CASE UNDER RULE 60(b)(3)

While the issues on the Mandate alone should constitute a ground for Rule 60 motion based on subdivision (b)(6) and (b)(4), there are indeed new evidence of court crimes and conspiracy that justify reopening as well under (b)(3)

1. **At least 12 new incidents of court crimes committed by the US Supreme Court defendants in the proceeding of Petition 20-524 alone.**

In Petition No. 20-524 that deals with this case's

appeal alone, the US Supreme Court defendants committed 12 incidents of felonious alterations of docket (removal of all appendix of the first Request for Recusal, concealed filing of Motion for Judicial Notice, concealed filing record or illegally reject filing of Petition for Rehearing, second Request for Recusal, and Motion to file Petition for Rehearing and 6 times of removal/putting back December 14, 2020 Order and January 15, 2021's Mandate). During this proceeding, Plaintiff discovered their failure to file the Motion for Judicial Notice of the Amicus Curiae Motion filed in 18-569 was because they had silently altered the docket of 18-569 at some unknown time to remove the court records and filing of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children.

2. **Severe injustice and court crimes**
The remaining 6 Justices/defendants knowingly failed to decide 7 matters in 20-524 that were properly presented in front of them as mentioned in the previous section. Therefore, for the case of 20-524 alone, which is the appeal from Judge Contreras's 1/17/2019 Order, the US Supreme Court defendants are involved with totally 19 irregularities in conspiring to disrupt the normal function of the Supreme Court by refusing to decide matters presented in front of them 7 times plus 12 crimes of alterations of docket. Therefore, this unexpected new circumstances requires this District Court to reopen the case pursuant to Standard Oil case under Rule 60(b).

Notably, in this proceeding for this Complaint and ensuing appeals, there were 29 irregularities including 19 crimes committed by Judge Rudolph Contreras, 7 crimes committed by the DC Circuit under the leadership of Judge Patricia Millett, and 19 irregularities including 12 felonies of alteration of

dockets committed by the US Supreme Court.

In the past three years for related Petitions for Writ of Certiorari in 17-82, 17-256, 17- 613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-639 and 20-524, the US Supreme Court committed at least totally 39 felonies. The 8 Justices (now is 6) failed to perform their Constitutionally mandated duty to decide by at least 17 times:10 Requests for Recusal in 17-256, 17-613 (two), 18-344 (two; one returned, and another, filed), 18-569, 18-800, 19-639, 20-524 (two, the second one to disqualify Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh was returned unfiled); 3 amicus curiae motions of Mothers of Lost Children filed in 17-82 that was concealed from showing on the docket of 17-82 and was not returned to the Amicus Curiae attorney; in 18-569 and further later altered the court's docket to remove records of filing of the motion in 18-569; and in 20-524; and further concealed from filing of the motion for judicial notice for the undisputed fact that Defendant US Supreme Court failed to decide the Amicus Curiae Motion filed in 18-569, and failed to decide Petition for Rehearing and Motion to file Petition for Rehearing in 20-524.

Additionally, there is undisputed alteration of docket of Petition No. 18-569 that was recently discovered. The court record of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children and the docket were both purged from the docket, yet, in doing so, they forgot to delete the appearance of Amicus Curiae attorney from the docket. Under the doctrine of spoliation of evidence, the 7 Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court who are defendants in this case are legally presumed to participate in the obvious crime of 18 U.S.C. §§1001, 2071, 1512(c) & 1519 in altering the docket of Petition No. 18-569. Moreover, their attorney, Jeffrey Wall and deputy clerk Michael Duggan, and

Defendant Jeff Atkins (Supervising Clerk) all were informed of the alterations of the docket for Petition No. 18-569 on October 28, 2020 but refused to take action to correct the docket despite repeated requests on November 4, 2020 and November 5, 2020. This justifies reopening the first Count of the First Amended Complaint (ECF#16).

3. **Undisputable and legal presumption of US Supreme Court Justices' crimes of alteration of the docket of 18-569**

Notorious alterations of docket was the recent discovery in January 2021 that US Supreme Court defendants removed from the docket of Petition No. 18-569 the filing and record of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children. The original docket before removal was filed with the DC Circuit in the appeal case of 19-5014 in ECF #1787004 as shown below:

USCA Case #19-5014 Document#1787004 Filed 05/09/2019

No.18-569

Title: Linda Shao, Petitioner v. Tsan-Kuen Wang
Docketed October 31, 2018
Lower Ct: Court of Appeal of California, Sixth Appellate District
Case Numbers (H040395)
Decision Date May 10, 2018
Discretionary Court Decision Date: July 25, 2018

Date	Proceedings and orders
Oct 23 2018	Petition for a writ of certiorari filed (Response due November 30 2018)
Nov 08 2018	**Mother of Mothers of Lost Children for leave to file amicus brief submitted**
Nov 20	Request for Recusal received from

2018	Petitioner
Dec 19 2018	DISTRIBUTED for conference of 1/4/2019
Jan 7 2019	Petition DENIED
Jan 21 2019	Petition for Rehearing filed

ECF#16 is not asking the District Court to decide matters beyond its jurisdiction as twisted by Judge Contreras in his order of 1/17/2019 but it was asking declarative relief, not asking the court to impeach the Supreme Court Justices. The above constitutes new ground why the First Count of the FAC (ECF 16) should be granted. The case should not be dismissed!

Under the doctrine of spoliation of evidence, the suspect for such felonies should include all Justices defendants who would be benefited from such removal, i.e., Defendant Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Stephen Breyer, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Sonia Sotomayer, and/or the deceased Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg.

II. SPECIFIC DISCUSSION

Rule 60 states in relevant part, that:

"(a) Corrections Based on Clerical Mistakes; Oversights and Omission... But after an appeal has been docketed in the appellate court and while it is pending, such a mistake may be corrected only with the appellate court's leave.

(b) Grounds for Relief from a Final Judgment, Order, or Proceeding. On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representatative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;

(2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence

could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(b);
(3) fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party;
(4) the judgment is void.
(5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacatd, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application, or
(6) any other reason that justifies relief.
(c) Timing and effect of the Motion
(1) Timing. A motion under Rule 60(b) must be made within a reasonable time – and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) no more than a year after the entry of the judgment or order or the date of the proceeding
(2) Effect on Finality. The motion does not affect the judgment's finality or suspend its operation.
(d) Other Powers to Grant Relief. This rule does not limit a court's power to:
(1) entertain an independent action to relieve a party from a judgment, order, or proceeding;
(2) grant relief under 28 U.S.C. §1655 to a defendant who was not personally notified of the action or
(3) set aside a judgment for fraud on the court." .

An unconstitutional failure to recuse constitutes structural error that is "not amenable" to harmless-error review, regardless of whether the judge's vote was dispositive. Williams v. Pennsylvania, 136 S. Ct. 1899, 579 US __, 195 L. Ed. 2d 132 (2016).

A. THE CASE LAWS HAVE MODIFIED RULE 60(c) SUCH THAT THE TRIAL CASE MAY BE RE-OPENED AFTER ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE BY DEFENDANT U.S. SUPREME

COURT ON JANUARY 15, 2021 ESPECIALLY WHEN THE MANDATE WAS SURREPTIOUSLY ISSUED, NEVER SERVED UPON PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT AND HAS LEFT ALL ISSUES OF THE MERITS OF THIS CASE UNRESOLVED.

In LSLJ Partnership v. Frito-Lay, 920 F.2d 476 (7th Cir. 1990), the trial case was closed with a judgment on Aug. 1, 1985. The appeal court affirmed the trial court in an unpublished order on Sep. 8, 1988. One year later, LSLJ filed a 60b motion to set aside the trial court's judgment. The trial court denied the motion based on lack of jurisdiction. The 7th Circuit reversed the trial court decision based on a ruling that as a matter of law, the district court had jurisdiction to entertain plaintiff's 60(b) motion despite it was one year after issuance of mandate. Such decision was based on the U.S. Supreme Court's 1976's decision of Standard Oil Co. of California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976) even though the facts of LSLJ to justify Rule 60(b) motion are different from that for Standard Oil. Such decision has changed the statute of Rule 60: "in 1976, the Supreme Court held that a district court may reopen a case which had been reviewed on appeal without leave from the court of appeals. Standard Oil Co. of California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17, 97 S.Ct.31, 50 L.Ed.2d 21 (1976) In Standard Oil, the appellant sought leave to have the Supreme Court recall its mandate in order to reopen a judgment on the basis of alleged misconduct by both government counsel and a material witness. The Supreme Court denied the motion to recall the mandate, holding that a district court could entertain a Rule 60(b) motion without leave from the Supreme Court. Id. at 17. While citing arguments that the appellate leave requirement protected the finality of the judgment as

well as allowing the appellate court to screen out frivolous Rule 60(b) motions, the Supreme Court nonetheless found the arguments in favor of requiring appellate leave unpersuasive.

.....

The Court further noted that the appellate leave requirement "burdened the increasingly scarce time of the federal appellate courts [and saw] no reason to continue the 'unnecessary and undesirable clog on the proceedings." Id. at 19 (citations omitted)."

The D.C. Circuit also has adopted the holding of the Standard Oil. It cited to Standard Oil in footnote 5 in Nat'l Anti-Hunger Coal v. Exec. Comm. Of President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, 229 U.S. App. D.C. 143 n.5, 711 F.2d 1071, 1076 (1983):

The Supreme Court has held that the filing of an appeal does not affect the right to seek or obtain relief from a judgment under rule 60(b). Standard Oil Co. v. United States, 429 U.S. 17, 50 L.Ed.2d 21, 97 S.Ct. 31 (1976)(per curiam). On the basis of the decision in Standard Oil, it is clear that a timely request under rule 60(b), based upon "newly discovered evidence," may be granted even after an appeal has been decided. As the Court noted, "like the original district court judgment, the appellate mandate relates to the record and issues then before the court, and does not purport to deal with possible later events. Hence, the district judge is not flouting the mandate by acting on the motion." Id. at 18.

B. JUDGE CONTRERAS'S ORDER OF 1/17/2019 IS A VOID JUDGMENT THAT SHOULD BE VACATED UNDER RULE 60(b)(4)

The Supreme Court has held that disregard of strength of evidence, a judgment issued by a judge who lack of impartiality is void and mandates reversal. Tumey v. Ohio (1927) 273 U.S. 510. There is

important public policy to ensure public confidence in the judiciary. Curle v. Superior Court (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1057, 1070.

In Liljeberg v. Health Serv. Acquisition Corp. (1988) 486 U.S. 847, 10 months following the judgment, respondent discovered that Liljeberg was negotiating with Loyola University to purchase a parcel of land on which to construct a hospital and the success and benefit to Loyola of these negotiations, turned in large part, on Liljeberg prevailing in the litigation before Judge Collins. Respondent filed a Rule 60(b)(6) motion to vacate the judgment, but Judge Collins denied the motion. On appeal, the panel reversed the judgment and remanded the matter to a different judge for such findings. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that vacatur based on Rule 60(b)(6) is a proper remedy for the §455 violation, that vacatur will not produce injustice in other such cases and may in fact prompt other judges to more carefully search for an disclose disqualification grounds and stated that "Furthermore, a careful study of the merits of the underlying litigation suggests that there is a greater risk of unfairness in upholding the judgment for petitioner than in allowing a new trial (see i.d., 486 U.S. 847, 849).

The Supreme Court confirmed the Fifth Circuit's judgment to vacate the decision of the trial court and remanded to a different judge for the reason that the motion to disqualify the district judge should have been granted under 28 U.S.C. §455(a) because even if the judge was not conscious of the circumstances creating the appearance of impropriety, a reasonable person knowing the relevant facts, would have expected that judge to have been aware of the circumstances and concluded that federal judge should have known disqualifying facts held sufficient

to disqualify judge, under 28 U.S.C.S. §455, on ground that judge's impartiality might reasonably have been questioned.

The Supreme Court set the rule that recusal is required even when a judge lacks actual knowledge of the facts indicating his interest or bias in the case if a reasonable person, knowing all the circumstances, would expect that the judge would have actual knowledge and stated that "Judges are under a duty to stay informed of any personal or fiduciary financial interest they may have in cases over which they preside pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S. 455(c), that the judge is disqualified from acting in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality "might reasonably be questioned" and that such judiciary conflicts of interest is a ground for Fed.R.Evid.60(b)(6) extraordinary circumstance analysis.

The Supreme Court stated further that

"Fed.R.Civ. P. 60(b)(6) relief is neither categorically available nor categorically unavailable for all violations of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C.S. §455(a). In determining whether a judgment should be vacated for a violation of §455(a), it is appropriate to consider the risk of injustice to the parties in the particular case, the risk that the denial of relief will produce injustice in other cases, and the risk of determining the public's confidence in the judicial process." See, i.d.,486 U.S. 847, 875.

In Liljeberg, Chief Justice Rehnquist the Supreme Court, in dissenting to the constructive knowledge holding of the majority, still held that:

"The purpose of §455 is obviously to inform judges of what matters they must consider in deciding whether to recuse themselves in a given case. The court here holds, as did the Court of Appeal below, that a judge must recuse himself under §455(a) if he should have

known of the circumstances requiring disqualification, even though in fact he did not know of them."

1. **Judge Contreras should have recused himself as he does have actual knowledge of his violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and knew that his argument of judge shopping is not supported by the record when he never explained any of his accused ex parte communication, forging signatures in ECF 38 and 41 and alteration of the docket of this case**

As mentioned above, Judge Contreras's 1/17/2019 order of "sua sponte dismissal" is void and should be vacated under Rule 60(b)(4) pursuant to Liljeberg on the following grounds:

(1) Judge Contreras willfully violated 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) with his actual knowledge proven by page 10, Lines 12-13 in ECF154, the Memorandum for 1/17/2019 Order.All cases cited by him in ECF154 regarding judge shopping do not apply as none of these cases have a situation like him that had committed any felony to cause a party to be the victim of the same judge's crimes.

(2) Judge Contreras should have recused himself pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S. §455(a) as he failed to set out all relevant facts as required by Moran v. Clarke (8th Cir. 2002) 309 F.3d 516, 517 regarding any of the accused ex parte communications and felonies of alterations of dockets and court records, but further commented in his order that the accused felonies are immaterial. Failure to properly handle a request for recusal is an independent ground for reversal. Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Loviae (1986) 475 U.S. 813.

(3) His finding of "judge shopping" is unsupported by the record, as Paragraph 83 of ECF 16 clearly identified the felonious misconducts that caused the conflicts of interest but Judge Contreras never explained to any

of the accused misconducts. Judge Contreras also failed to explain to any of the ex parte communications and felonies stated in ECF 32, 25, 40, 42, 142, 144. These accusations are again presented as Appendix pages 144-154 attached to "Petition for Writ of Certiorari" filed on July 2, 2020 with the US Supreme Court in the case of 20-524. Judge Contreras should not be allowed to use the frivolous finding of "judge shopping" to cover up his at least 20 incidents of felonies and ex parte communications as accused by Plaintiff which he never explained throughout the entire proceeding.

The conflicts of interest involved with this 1/17/2019 Order is so extreme and egregious as when he dismissed the case, Plaintiff's request for entry default against him had been pending for almost 3 months and Judge Contreras instructed the Clerk's Office not to enter default for all requests for entry of default including against himself, following the Clerk's Office entered default against two defendants, Tsan-Kuen Wang (ECF 76) and David Sussman (ECF77) on July 28, 2018. Plaintiff's default requests were pending against Judge Contreras himself and the 11 U.S. Supreme Court defendants including 8 Justices[6] were pending by about 3 months before his eventual dismissal on his own.

On November 19, 2018, without a motion, Judge Contreras allowed the U.S. Attorney to file as an interpleader to respond to default (ECF 140) when the U.S. Attorney Karen W. Liu has direct conflicts of

---

[6]2 The 8 Justices contained in ECF16 are Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Anthony Kennedy, Justice Stephen Brayer, Justice Ruh Bader Ginsberg, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Sonia Sotomayer. Justice Kennedy announced retirement two weeks after being served with ECF 16. Justice Ginsberg died in September 2020.

interest for being a member of Defendant American Inns of Court.

Within 24 hours following Plaintiff's filing of service of Summons on the hacker Kevin L. Warnock (ECF152) and Judge Craig Wallace (ECF151), founder of the American Inns of Court, Judge Contreras suddenly issued a sua sponte dismissal order on January 17, 2019 (ECF 153) without giving any notice of his intention to dismiss the case, when there were about 22 defendants who were just served with Summons, or had not filed a motion to dismiss, and further acted as an attorney, in violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(ii) to argue sua sponte for these defendants that had not appeared.

(4) His 1/17/2019 order contained a vague dismissal of "All remaining claims against all other defendants are DENIED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction" (ECF153) which is void as being too vague.

The dismissal of are vague and confusing as he acted as an attorney arguing in the order for 22 defendants that did not file a motion, including 2 defendants already entered as in default (ECF76&77), 15 federal defendants pending entry of default including 14 defendants located in the D.C., and 5 defendants who had not appeared.

In his Order/Memorandum (ECF 153&154), Judge Contreras further failed to decide SHAO's motion to strike the Interpleader and motion to disqualify Jackie Liu. Judge Contreras falsely stated in the 1/17/2019 Order that the second motion to change venue and disqualify "reasserts much of the same arguments brought in her first motion" (ECF 154, p.7, last sentence) which are false and unsupported by record and evidence. The second motion to change venue and disqualify Judge Contreras arose from ECF140 where the Interpleader was filing paper to

include the direct conflicts of interest of Judge Contreras as he was requested to be entered default. The second judicial disqualification also includes about 20 felonies of alterations of dockets and records that Judge Contreras silently made as well as unexplained evidence of ex parte communications with Defendant BJ Fadem and California judicial defendants.

Judge Contreras further failed to recuse himself as required by Local Civil Rule 7(b) which stated that unopposed motions are conceded. Judge Contreras did not file any opposition to the motions to change venue and disqualify himself. Instead, he held that these accused ex parte communications and alterations of records, which he silently conceded, do not warrant recusal. (ECF 154, p.9)

2. Prima facie evidence of Judge Contreras's alteration of the court's records/docket

The felonies of alterations of docket directed by Judge Contreras are prima facie and can be easily seen by any reasonable person from the face of the present docket:

(1) out of chronological order of docket entries for ECF 38 and ECF 41,

(2) disappearance of docket entry of June 5, 2018 (Francis issued 4 Summons) and July 24, 2018's minutes orders (Contreras's ex parte communication with California judicial defendants).

(3) In addition, from the face of the docket, it is obvious that the US Attorney failed to file a motion for interpleader as required by law but was able to appear (ECF140), and that the default entries against the US Supreme Court defendants as well as against himself were left undecided for a good 3 months before his dismissal when he himself is in default as a defendant!

Notably, the docket entries of 6/5/2018 (evidence of ex parte communication in which Contreras's clerk took over the authority of the Clerk's office and selectively issued only 4 Summons and withheld other 61 Summons from issuance by 23 days until 6/13/2018) and 6/11/2018 (Judge Contreras directed the clerk's office to antedate the issuance of about 61 Summons that were in fact signed off on 6/15/2018) were **altered 5 times and Judge Contreras never explained:**

(1) the entries were removed after 6/29/2018 when Contreras and his clerk were added as new defendants in the First Amended Complaint (ECF 16); please see ECF 19, pp. 38- 39 for the unaltered entries;

(2) The Entries were put back to the docket after Plaintiff's criticism on August 2, 2018; See ECF 40, p.39.

(3) The entries were removed again as shown in 11/2/2018's docket; see ECF 144, p.59.

(4) Put back on 12/4/2018. See ECF 144, p.62.

(5) The entries were removed again and are not in the present docket. The original 6/5/2018's docket entry is in ECF19, p.50.

The night-time minutes order of 7/24/2018 which indicated ex parte communications between Judge Contreras and California judicial defendants and violated Local Rule 83.20 (ECF32, p.29) were altered 3 times:

(1) Silently removed at sometime between 8/8/2018 and 11/10/2018; see ECF 144, p.34. All of the 4 entries of 6/5/2018, 6/11/2018 and two minutes order on 7/24/2018 were removed as shown in 11/10/2018's docket.

(2) Two minutes orders were put back to the docket later as shown in 12/4/2018's docket in ECF 144, p.62. All 4 entries were put back
(3) All 4 entries were removed from the present docket.

The other conspicuous evidence of ex parte communication was ECF 38 and ECF 41. As discussed above, the forgery is shown on the face of the covers for the two pleadings and the first sentence of Judge Contreras's order of 8/8/2018 (ECF 49) where Judge Contreras stated the filing date of BJ Motion to be July 31, 2018, which is inconsistent with both forged dates written by himself on the covers of ECF 38 and 41. Despite of these forgeries, Fadem's motion was nonetheless too late as the due date of filing the motion to dismiss was July 24, not close to July 30, 31, or August 2. Judge Contreras failed to rule on Fadem's motion nor on Plaintiff's motion to strike Fadem's motions. Judge Contreras never explained the ex parte communication and the Fadem's two identical motions in ECF 38 and ECF 41.

While according to Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Loviae the order of Judge Contreras must be reversed as he failed to properly handle disqualification, all severe felonious accusations against Judge Contreras should constitute adoptive admission according to F.R.E. Rule 801(d)(2)(B) as Judge Contreras has willfully refused to explain or avoided explanation. He simply concluded that all these matters about conflicts of interest do not warrant recusal.

C. THE RISK OF INJUSTICE TO THE PARTIES IN PARTICULAR CASES, THE RISK OF INJUSTICE IN OTHER CASES AND UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

1. **7 crimes at the DC Circuit in 19-5014 and 39 crimes of US Supreme Court as mentioned**

above in 8 related Petitions filed by Plaintiff in 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613 and 20-524, including the US Supreme Court's failure to decide 15 matters properly presented in front of them

Especially highlighted here is the severity in 20-524 in that the 12/14/2020 order is presumed to be a fake order. The Supreme Court once altered the docket to remove 12/14/2020 when they discovered a letter from Plaintiff was to be sent to the House Representative (Declaration Shao, Exhibit 3).

Therefore, according to the doctrine of spoliation of evidence, it is legally presumed that the order of December 14, 2020 may not have been issued by the 3 Justices but that the December 14, 2020 Order apparently was a fraud of Defendant Supreme Court under the supervision of Defendant Chief Justice John G. Roberts in view of their unambiguous attempt to hide the Order of December 14, 2020 on January 13, 2021.

When the hacker discovered that Plaintiff had found the attempted alteration of docket, the docket was altered back to include December 14, 2020's Order. This indicates that the hacker is connected with the US Supreme Court.

The screenshot mentioned above is attached below:
[NOTE: see diagram in ECF 161-1, p.38 of 44; document link https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglCnNSoVDFqQai6m]

No. 20-524

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

Case Number (19-5014)
Decision Date November 14, 2019
Rehearing denied Feb. 5, 2020

Date	Proceedings and orders
Jul 2 2020	Petition for a writ of certiorari filed (Response due November 19, 2020)
Oct 22 2020	Waiver of right of respondents Roberts, John G, et al.
Nov 4 2020	Request for Recusal from petitioner received
Nov 09 2020	Amicus Brief of Mothers of Lost Children
Nov 24 2020	DISTRIBUTION for Conference of 12/11/2020

Name	Address	Phone
Attorney for Petitioner Linda Shao Party name: Yi Tai Shao	4900 Hopyard Road, Suite 100 Pleasanton, CA 94588	(408) 873-3888
Attorney for Respondents Jeffrey B. Wall Counsel of record	Acting Solicitor General United States Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DA 20530-0001 SupremeCtBrief@USDOJ.gov	(202) 514-2217
Other Christopher Wolcoff Katzenbach Counsel of record	Katzenbach 912 Lootens Place, 2nd Floor	(415) 834-1778

Details
January 13, 2021 7:16 PM

Screenshot_20210113-191625_Samsung Internet.jpg

The same happened to the 1/15/2021 Judgment/Mandate, which appeared to be the peak of the crimes of the US Supreme Court. The Court appeared to have a civil war such that the 1/15/2021 Judgment/Mandate was removed twice (See Decl. Shao, Exhibit 2) and put back eventually on the docket of 20-524. Also, the bizarre mail hijacking ended after the 1/15/2021 Judgment was issued will entail a public view that the US Supreme Court had participated in the mail hijacking in order to rush issuing a Mandate. The Supreme Court defendants were served with the Petition for Rehearing and Second Request for Recusal on January 8, 2021, with 21 days' meditation, the Supreme Court illegally returned the Petition for Rehearing; with 33 days' meditation, the Supreme Court illegally returned the Motion to file Petition for Rehearing that was served on 1/29/2021, and such return involves contacts with the DC Circuit. (See Decl. Shao, Exh. 2) Thus, Judge Millett's willful persistent on refusing to decide the merits of the Motion to change venue is likely connected with the Chief Justice John G. Roberts. The US Supreme Court also never served Plaintiff with the 1/15/2021's Judgment/Mandate. Based on twice removal from the docket itself, it is presumed that 1/15/2021's Judgment/Mandate is also a fraud.

2. The legal presumption that the U.S. Supreme Court 8 Justices participated in the conspiracy to alter the docket of 18-569

On November 4, 2020, under supervision of Defendant Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., in the case of Petition No. 20-524, Defendant Supreme Court concealed from filing Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Notice of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost

Children filed in Petition No. 18-569 wherein Plaintiff requests Defendant Supreme Court to take judicial notice of the fact that the 6 defendant-Justices at the Supreme Court failed to decide Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in 18-569.

Thereby, Plaintiff discovered the alteration of the docket of 18-569 in removing the court record of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children, with the clear attempt to purge any evidence of the Supreme Court Justices' conspiracy in failure to decide the motion, which was the only motion that was not a Request for Recusal.

In addition, the entire appendix for the Request for Recusal in 20-524 was removed to appear like there was no appendix at all, in violation of the Court's own local rule of electronic filing. In comparison with the prior alterations, this time occurred on or about November 4, 2020 is even worse in that for prior removals, Defendant Supreme Court would marked as the last page that "Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office" but there is not even such page for this November 4, 2020's alteration.

3. <u>The US Supreme Court in 20-524 violated the more than 100 years old's public policy on lack of quorum</u>

On December 14, 2020, Defendant Supreme Court entered into an order with a false citation of 28 U.S.C.S.§2109 when they actually cited Paragraph 2 of 2109, concealing Paragraph 1, without any reasoning why that the case is impossible to be heard or decided in the Next Term, which is a clause which should be void for unconstitutionally vague, when Paragraph 2 of §2109 is actually not applicable under any circumstances because Paragraph 2 of §2109 applies only when the merits of the appeal were reviewed by a court of appeal, yet the DC Circuit

failed to review the appeal. See, Decl. Shao, Exhibit 1. The Petition for Rehearing, which appeared to be intercepted mailing by 8 days, was received by the US Supreme Court on January 19, 2021 was returned to Plaintiff unfiled 10 days later on January 29, 2021. Both the Petition for Rehearing and the Second Request for Recusal were put into mail by the US Supreme Court to return to Plaintiff on January 29, 2021 with a statement in a letter by the Deputy Clerk Michael Duggan that

"Because the Court lacks a quorum in this case, 28 USC Section 1, the Court cannot take action on the petition for rehearing."

4. **In September 2019, Defendant James McManis's fraudulent dismissal of both the civil case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al (Santa Clara County Court, 2012-1-cv-220571) in conspiracy with Santa Clara County Court with alteration of the court's efiling record in order to take advantage of Plaintiff's unavailability to rush dismissal; and the State Bar of California refused to prosecute the forgery of the court's records, and even remove the case of 20-O-07258 as against McManis himself; the 2015 case against McManis for his bribery of the judiciary was also silently closed.**

As shown from Pages 16 through 30 of Exhibit 4 attached to Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, James McManis silently filed a motion to dismiss without notifying Plaintiff of the schedule of such motion. The local Rule 8 of Santa Clara County required reservation of hearing date before filing and at the reservation, the moving party must report whether they had notified the other parties. The filing did not take place on September 12, 2019 but on September 18. The hearing was made in front of a judicial

member of William A. Ingram American Inn of Court and they dismissed the case. The court helped in allowing filing of the motion to dismiss without notice to Plaintiff and without reservation, and further helped in altering the docket to move up the filing day to be September 12, 2019 in order to satisfy the minimum 16 working days' notice requirement for a motion.

McManis defendants' attorney Suzie M. Tagliere knew this but filed an affidavit in opposition to Plaintiff's motion to set aside dismissal where she lied under oath that the motion was filed on September 12, 2019. In her declaration, Page 103 slipped into the original efiling stamp of September 18, 2019 and someone altered the stamp to be September 12, 2019. The case was complained to the State Bar, the State Bar closed the case and even removed the complaint against James McManis.

The State Bar is led by Defendant California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Saukauye, who was a President to Justice Anthony Kennedy American Inn of Court.

5.**Defendants Santa Clara County Court and Sixth District Court of Appeal conspired with their attorney Defendant James McManis to deter appeal of Plaintiff from the illegal dismissal in Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al, 2012-1- cv-220571**

As shown in Exhibit 5 attached to Declaration of Yi Tai Shao, based on the vexatious litigant orders procured by Defendant James McManis from his client Santa Clara County Court, Plaintiff had to apply for approval in order to file the appeal. Plaintiff properly obtainedapproval from the then Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court who is not a defendant in this case on July 27, 2020. Yet, its Clerk's Office returned the check payment of $775.

And, California Court of Appeal, as directed by its attorney James McManis, when the Presiding Judge is the wife of Defendant Edward Davila, the Notice of Appeal disappeared in the chamber of the Presiding Judge and eventually docketed in December 2020. Yet, Defendant California Sixth District Court of Appeal willfully stayed the proceeding, after trying all means to silently dismiss the appeal to no avail. Up to present, it still refused to proceed the appeal after 9 months of filing of the Notice of Appeal.

6. While State Bar silently dismissed the cases against James McManis, California State Bar conspired with Defendant California Chief Justice to issue a premature illegal order trying to suspend Plaintiff's bar license two months before due date for payment and trying to deter Plaintiff from payment by altering the State Bar Profile of Plaintiff.

As shown in Exhibit 6 attached to Declaration of Shao, on July 29, 2020, California Chief Justice Defendant Tani Cantil-Sakayue signed an order without any prior notice to Plaintiff with a new case of S263527 two months before the bar due to suspend the bar license of Plaintiff. Plaintiff was the only target for this case of S263527. The notice was mailed, after ordered , by the State Bar of California on August 14, 2020. As shown in the docket of the case, Chief Justice's order was based on a recommendation by the State Bar of California on July 27, 2020. Such premature order misusing the State power aiming at Plaintiff alone is nothing but another violation of § [Note: **purged by the hacker]**. The case was dismissed on the same date payment was made. Based on the relationship of James McManis and State Bar, such action is likely caused by McManis who had two cases dismissed by the State Bar.

The State Bar also had sent letters to California Franchise Tax Board to purposely allocated tax over Plaintiff's business account and to impute the income since 2017 illegally There are more impacts of this huge judiciary corruption case stemming from Judge Contreras's void order of January 17, 2019.

The risk of injustice of this particular case and for related cases among the parties has been clearly so high that substantially outweighed the other side of risk to maintain the illegal orders of Judge Contreras. The balance test under Liljerberg requires this Rule 60 (b) motion to be granted.

III. CONCLUSION

All the issues have never been directly decided. Judge Contreras's January 17, 2019 Order is void not only because of lack of notice, and failure to give Plaintiff a chance to rebut, but is an act outright banned by 28 U.S.C.S.§455(b)(5)(i); while he never explained to any of the complained felonies and ex parte communications stated in the two motions to change venue and disqualification and in ECF16, ¶83, in compliance with Moran v. Clarke standard, Judge Contreras has no ground to argue "judge shopping" while none of the cases cited by him to support judge shopping have any similar facts like this case where the judge committed felonies where the plaintiff was the victim. The Supreme Court's failure to decide meant that Plaintiff has received no review on the merits. Therefore, Rule 60(b) motion is well based on new facts (subdivision (3)), judgment is void (subdivision (4)), and other circumstances (subdivision (6)). Judge Contreras's sua sponte dismissal order in ECF153 and ECF154 therefore should be void and vacated.

Transfer to another district is necessary to avoid the appearance of impropriety created by all the errors

and problems with the judicial handling of this case where the Clerk's Office for three courts were all involved. Transfer away from the D.C. Circuit jurisdiction is necessary based on Chief Justice Roberts' own letter order of October 10, 2018 in moving the complaints against Justice Kavanaugh away from the D.C. Circuit area because he was an alumni judge of the D.C. Circuit which Chief Justice found there was a public view of bias and prejudice..

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH AND VERIFICATION The undersigned swears under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing statements are all true to the best of her knowledge, that both motions are filed in good faith under Rule 60(b)(3), (4) and (6), and that all exhibits (1-6) attached hereto are true and genuine.

Dated: April 29, 2021 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yi Tai Shao Yi Tai Shao

XVII. 12/14/2020 ORDER (1/15/2021 JUDGMENT) FOR PETITION NO. 20-524, that was taken off three times from the docket:

"Because the Court lacks a quorum, 28 U.S.C. §1, and since the qualified Justices are of the opinion that the case cannot be heard and determined at the next Term of the Court, the judgment is affirmed under 28 U.S.C.§2109, which provides that under these 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 affirmance by an equally divided court." The Chief Justice, Justice Thomas, Justice Breyer, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor, and Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition."
[See I. Statutes Involved, "O" regarding the truth that 28 U.S.C.§2109, ¶2 is inapplicable to confirm D.C. Circuit's dismissal appeal judgment as the statutory premises to have appellate review did not take place in Appeal No. 19-5014]

It has been undisputed by all defendants/respondents/appellees in Shao v. Roberts, et al. that **the 12/14/2020 Order and 1/15/2021 Judgment/Mandate were taken off from the docket Petition No.20-524 three times** and that Chief Judge had forged the order and judgment that they were not indeed issued by the three unrecused Justices.. See the screenshots of such taking off and on in App.85; 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 https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglPQ086A-x4RRI7N

XVIII. Appendix to Petition No.20-524—see US Supreme Court website, docket search No.20-524, click on Appendix—its App.074-083 present evidence that Judge Contreras was added as a defendant in Shao v. Roberts, et al. (ECF 16) is not what Contreras's unfounded accusation of "judge shopping." Undisputed crimes of removal of docket entries to spoliate evidence of ex parte communications with California judicial defendants (Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye had *irrevocably admitted* to her conspiracy with McManis and Judge Contreras in dismissing this case)

A. See App.074-76 regarding "A, THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT REGARDING JUDGE RUDOLPH CONTRERAS" where pages 8l 24, 69-70, and 172, regarding Paragraphs 4, 27,83 and 320 of the First Amended Complaint (ECF 16) were quoted to show that Judge Contreras failed to explain to any of the accused facts in the First Amended Complaint where he was added to as a defendant of Shao v. Roberts, et al.

B. See App.076-83 for a Table containing **accusations and evidence** against Judge Contreras, contained in ECF 19, 25, 32, 35, 40 and 42 that he never decided but refused to recuse himself and dismissed the case in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) [Judge Contreras knew his violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) by mentioning this statute, without conclusion in his 1/17/2019 Order (See Section XXIX below) App083-84 filed in Petition 20-524 is reprinted below, which are the **undisputed felonies of removal of docket entries done by Judge**

Contreras, which he has refused to decide in his 8/30/2021 Order when the same accusations were mentioned in Rule 60(b) motion (ECF 161, supra; also, this link https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpglCnNSoVDFqQai6m])

"After 8/8/2018's Order, the 4 entries were altered 3 times totally should be counted as 12 counts, Pursuant to People v. McKenna (1953) 116 Cal.App.2d 207, each altering the filing stamp for each piece of paper in the court's file constituted one count of felony. .....

there were 3 times of alterations and each time involves 4 docket entries.

Notably, the docket entries of **6/5/2018 (evidence of ex parte communications in which Contreras's clerk took over the authority of the Clerk's Office and selectively issued 4 Summons and withheld other 61 Summons until 6/13/2018**) and **6/11/2018 (antedating the issuance of about 61 Summons which were withheld from issuance by 23 days)** were altered **5 times**:

(1) the entries were removed immediately after Judge Contreras and his clerk were added as defendants to the First Amended Complaint on 6/29/2018(see 7/5/2018's printed docket in ECF19, pp.38-39)

[2) the entries were put back after criticism by SHAO (See 8/2/2018's docket in ECF40, P-39);

(3) the entries were removed again as shown in 11/2/2018's docket (See ECF144,p.34);

(4) the entries were put back again as shown in 12/4/2018's docket (See ECF144,p.59);

(5) the entries were removed again and are not in the present docket.

The original 6/5/2018's docket entry is shown in ECF19, p.50.

The night-time minutes orders of 7/24/2018, indicating ex parte communications between Judge Contreras and California judicial defendants where Judge Contreras acted within 2 hours of filing of California Judicial Defendants after the court house was closed to cure their violation of Local Rule 83.20(ECF32,p.29), **were altered 3 times**:

(1) Removed sometime between 8/8/2018's Order and 11/10/2018. See 11/10/2018's docket in ECF144, p.34. All 4 dockets of 6/5/2018, 6/11/2018, two 7/24/2018 minutes were removed.

(2) Put back by 12/4/2018 as shown in the 12/4/2018's docket in ECF144,p.62. All 4 dockets were put back.

(3) Removed from present docket. All 4 docket entries were removed

C. SHAO posted on Facebook 5 days before filing the First Amended Complaint complaining about so many irregularities took place within a month of the case. (ECF19, P.70)

XIX. MAY 1, 2020 ORDER IN 19-5014
United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit September Term 2019

NO. 19-5014
Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees.
BEFORE Srinivasan, Chief Judge, and Henderson, Rogers, Tatel, Garland, Griffith, Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Katsas, and Rao, Circuit Judges
ORDER
Upon consideration of the motion for en banc reconsideration of the February 5 2020 order denying appellant's petition for rehearing, which the court construes as containing a request to recall the mandate, it is ORDERED that the motion be denied.
Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk
BY: Is/ Daniel J. Reidy Deputy Clerk

XX. MAY 1, 2020 ORDER IN 19-5014

United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit September Term 2019

NO. 19-5014

Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees.

BEFORE Millett, Pillard, and Wilkins, Circuit Judges, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for reconsideration of the February 5, 2020 order denying appellant's petition for rehearing, the motion to exceed the word limit for the motion for reconsideration, and the motion for judicial notice, it is

ORDERED that the motion to exceed the word limit be dismissed as moot. Because the court construes appellant's filing as a motion for reconsideration rather than a petition for rehearing, the applicable limit is 5,200 words. See Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2). Appellant's motion for reconsideration does not exceed that limit. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for judicial notice be granted. Insofar as appellant seeks judicial notice of materials from the records of other courts, this court takes notice only of the existence of those records, and not the accuracy of any legal or factual assertions made therein. See Crumpacker v. Ciraolo-Klepper, 715 Fed. Appx. 18, 19 (D.C. Cir. 2018). It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that reconsideration is warranted.

The Clerk is directed to accept no further filings from appellant in this closed case.

Per Curiam FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk; BY: /s/ Daniel J. Reidy Deputy Clerk

XXI. FEBRUARY 5, 2020 ORDER IN 19-5014 United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit September Term 2019

NO. 19-5014
Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees.
BEFORE Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Circuit Judges
ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for rehearing, the alternative motion to recuse this court and transfer the appeal, and the motion to extend time, it is ORDERED that the motion to extend time be dismissed as moot. No motion is required because the petition for rehearing was filed within 45 days after the entry of judgment. See Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1). It is
FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for rehearing be denied. It is
FURTHER ORDERED that the alternative motion to recuse and transfer be denied. As the court held in its July 31,2019 order, appellant has not demonstrated that the impartiality of any member of the court or the court staff might reasonably be questioned. See 28 U.S.C. § 455(a).
Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk
BY: Is/ Daniel J. Reidy Deputy Clerk

XXII. NOVEMBER 13, 2019 ORDER IN 19-5014
United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit September Term 2019

NO. 19-5014
Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees.
BEFORE Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Circuit Judges
ORDER
Upon consideration of the court's July 31,2019 order to show cause, and the response and supplement thereto; the petition for rehearing; the motions for leave to late file; the motion for judicial notice; and the motions to exceed the briefing word limits and to dispense with a portion of the appendix, it is ORDERED that the motion for leave to late file the response to the order to show cause be granted. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for leave to late file the petition for rehearing be dismissed as moot. No motion is required because the petition for rehearing is not untimely. See Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1). It is
FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for rehearing be denied. Insofar as the petition seeks to disqualify Judge Millett on the basis of an alleged personal relationship with Chief Justice Roberts, appellant has provided nothing that would plausibly support such an allegation, and appellant has not otherwise demonstrated that Judge Millett's impartiality can reasonably be questioned. It is
FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for judicial notice be granted in part, and dismissed in part as moot. Insofar as appellant seeks judicial notice of materials that were filed in the district court in this case and are therefore part of the record on appeal, the motion for judicial notice is unnecessary. See,

e.g., Crumpacker v. Ciraolo-Klepper, 715 Fed. Appx. 18, 19 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (dismissing as moot motion for judicial notice of materials from the record). With respect to materials from the records of other courts, and materials from publicly available websites, the motion for judicial notice is granted to the extent that the court takes notice only of the existence of the records, and not the accuracy of any legal or factual assertions made therein. See i.d,, It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the order to show cause be discharged. It is

FURTHER ORDERED, on the court's own motion, that the district court's January 17, 2019 order dismissing appellant's complaint be summarily affirmed with respect 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).

The district court correctly concluded that it lacked personal jurisdiction over 36 of the appellees. The court correctly rejected appellant's conclusory and unsupported assertion that those parties engaged in conspiratorial actions with parties in the District of Columbia, such that personal jurisdiction could be exercised over those parties. See Junqquist v. Sheikh Sultan Bin Khalifa Al Nahvan, 115 F.3d 1020, 1031 (D.C. Cir. 1997) ("Bald speculation or a conclusory statement that individuals are co-conspirators is insufficient to establish jurisdiction under a conspiracy theory.").

Next, the district court correctly concluded that appellant's claims for monetary relief against Justice Conrad Rushing and Jackie Francis were

barred by judicial immunity. See Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460-61 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (per curiam).

The district court also correctly concluded that, because it lacked authority to grant the relief sought by appellant in several of her claims, appellant lacked standing for those claims. See Swan v. Clinton, 100 F.3d 973, 976 (D.C. Cir. 1996).

In addition, appellant's claims that Google and Youtube engaged in hacking and surveillance activities against her at the behest of Chief Justice Roberts were properly dismissed as patently insubstantial. Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974). Likewise, appellant's allegations that appellees Orlando, Fadem, Mitchell, Sussman, and Wang aided and abetted a conspiracy against her are patently insubstantial; she has not plausibly alleged any facts to support such a claim. See Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007) (complaint must "state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.").

Insofar as appellant argues in her response to the order to show cause that procedural errors or irregularities in the district court make summary affirmance inappropriate, those arguments lack merit. The district court did not err in sua sponte dismissing appellant's claims as to those parties that did not move to dismiss. See, e.g., Gonzalez v. Thaler, 565 U.S. 134, 141 (2012) ("[C]ourts are obligated to consider sua sponte issues" related to subject matter jurisdiction); Lee's Summit, MO v. Surface Transp. Board, 231 F.3d 39, 41 (D.C. Cir. 2000) ("When there is a doubt about a party's constitutional standing, the court must resolve the doubt, sua sponte if need be."); Bakery. Director. U.S. Parole Com'n, 916 F.2d 725, 726-27 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (district court was

permitted to sua sponte dismiss for failure to state a claim where it was "patently obvious that [plaintiff] could not have prevailed on the facts alleged in his complaint discovery prior to dismissal, she has not shown that discovery of any particular facts would have altered the district court's jurisdictional analysis, which rested on legal principles rather than factual findings. Nor has appellant shown that the district court failed to consider her arguments in favor of recusal or to fully explain its denial of her recusal motions. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motions to exceed the briefing word limits and to dispense with a portion of the appendix be dismissed as moot.

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

FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk BY: /s/Lynda M. Flippin Deputy Clerk

XXIII. JULY 31, 2019 ORDER IN 19-5014

United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit September Term 2019

NO. 19-5014

Yi Tai Shao, Appellant v. John G. Roberts, Chief Justice, et al., Appellees.

BEFORE Millett, Pillard, and Wilkins, Circuit Judges, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the amended motion to recuse and transfer, and the supplement thereto; the motion for summary affirmance, the opposition thereto reply; the court's April 9, 2019 order to show cause, and the response thereto; the amended motion to strike the reply; the motion for summary reversal, the supplement thereto, the response thereto, and the reply; the motion for judicial notice; the motion to exceed word limits; and the motion to dispense with the filing of an appendix, it is

ORDERED that the order to show cause be discharged. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the amended motion to recuse and transfer be denied. Appellant has not demonstrated that the impartiality of any member of the court or the court staff might reasonably be questioned. See 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to strike the reply in support of the motion for summary affirmance be denied. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for summary affirmance be granted and the motion for summary reversal be denied. With respect to the moving 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). The district court correctly concluded that appellant's claims against the moving appellees — that is, that the Inns of Court appellees are engaged in judicial corruption and have participated in a conspiracy to deprive appellant of custody of her child --are patently insubstantial. See, Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974); Best v. Kelly , 39 F.3d 328, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1994). It is **FURTHER ORDERED,** on the court's own motion, that appellant show cause within 30 days of the date of this order why the district court's January 17, 2019 order should not be summarily affirmed with respect to all remaining appellees. The response to the order to show cause may not exceed the length limitations established by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2) (5,200 words if produced using a computer; 20 pages if handwritten or typewritten}. Failure by appellant to comply with this order will result in dismissal of the appeal for lack of prosecution. It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion for judicial notice be granted in part and dismissed in part as moot. Insofar as appellant seeks judicial notice of materials that were filed in the district court in this case and are therefore part of the record on appeal, or of the motion for summary affirmance filed in this court, judicial notice is unnecessary. See, e.g., Crumpacker v. Ciraolo-Klepper, 715 Fed. Appx. 18, 19 (0.C. Cir. 2018) (dismissing as moot motion for judicial notice of materials from the record).

With respect to materials from the records of other federal courts, and materials from appellees' website, the motion for judicial notice is granted to the extent that the court takes notice only of the

existence of the records, and not the accuracy of any legal or factual assertions made therein. See Crumpacker, 715 Fed. Appx. at 19 (citing Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Retches Pork Packers, Inc., 969 F.2d 1384, 1388-89 (2d Cir. 1992)); Goplin v. WeConnect, Inc., 893 F.3d 488., 491 (7th Cir. 2018). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that consideration of the motions to exceed word limits and to dispense with the appendix be deferred pending further order of the court.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this order to appellant both by certified mail, return receipt rnquested, and by first class mail

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 resolution of the remainder of the appeal.

Per Curiam

XXIV. 1/17/2019 ORDER–This is the second round of appeal where the courts at all levels had blocked review on 1/17/2019 order which was made in willful violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i), with numerous misstatements of facts and laws, made without any notice with sua sponte dismissal of the entire case, when two defendants had been entered default, Judge Contreras and Supreme Court defendants were all at default and Contreras blocked the Clerk's Office from entry of default against themselves, when also there were many defendants had not yet made appearance; denial of recusal was done simultaneously with dismissal, without any hearing. "All remaining claims" mentioned in the Order is vague and ambiguous that no reasonable attorney may apprehend what that meant.

Case 1:18-cv-01233-RC ECF 153 **ORDER Filed 01/17/19 Denying Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify And For Change Of Venue, Granting Motions To Dismiss, *Sua Sponte* Dismissing All Claims Against All Remaining Defendants, And Denying All Other Pending Motions As Moot**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Yi Tai Shao, Plaintiff v. John G. Roberts, et al. Defendants

Civil Action No.1:18-cv-01233(RC)

Re Doc.Nos.31,45,58,65,75,80,81,84,117,142

For the reasons stated in the Court's Memorandum Opinion separately and contemporaneously issued, Shao's renewed motion to disqualify this Court and

to change venue (ECF No. 142) and motion to strike the McManis Defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 81) are **DENIED**. The motions to dismiss by the California Judicial Defendants (ECF No. 31), Janet Everson (ECF No. 45), the American Inn Defendants (ECF No. 58), the McManis Defendants (ECF No. 65), Carole Tait-Starnes (ECF No. 75-1), Esther Chung (ECF No. 80), the Google Defendants (ECF No. 84), and the Santa Clara Defendants (ECF No. 117) are **GRANTED**. All remaining claims against all other defendants are **DENIED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. And because this case has been dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, the remainder of the pending motions are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 17, 2019 RUDOLPH CONTRERAS
United States District Judge

Case 1:18-cv-01233-RC ECF 154

MEMORANDUM FILED ON 1/17/2019 Denying Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify And For Change Of Venue, Granting Motions To Dismiss, *Sua Sponte* Dismissing All Claims Against All Remaining Defendants, And Denying All Other Pending Motions As Moot

[*See also App.014-055 in the Appendix to Petition 20-524 published on this court's website for the complete 1/17/2019 Memorandum]*

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Yi Tai Shao, a California resident, has brought this suit against a wide variety of defendants in connection with a California child custody case that has been ongoing since 2005. In her amended complaint, Shao includes fourteen claims

against sixty-seven named and forty- six unnamed defendants, including parties, attorneys, court clerks, judges, and third parties, all linked in some way to the child custody case or to the multiple legal proceedings Shao has instituted in connection with it over the past eight years. After the Court denied a motion to disqualify, Shao has now filed a renewed motion to disqualify and for change of venue. Many of the defendants have also moved to dismiss for lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. For the same reasons it denied the initial motion to disqualify, the Court denies Shao's renewed motion to disqualify and for change of venue. And because it finds that it lacks personal jurisdiction or subject matter jurisdiction over all of Shao's claims, the Court dismisses this case.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. The Underlying Custody Case and Initial Custody Determination

In 2005, Shao filed for divorce from her now ex-husband, Tsan-Kuen Wang, in the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County. *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 5, 8, ECF No. 16; *In re the Marriage of: Linda Shao and Tsan-Kuen Wang*, No. 1-05-FL126882 (Cal. Sup. Ct.).1 Shao and Wang initially agreed to split custody of their daughter 50/50. *Id.* ¶ 87. However, Shao's daughter began complaining about sexual abuse while in Wang's care in early 2010, *id.*, and the

---

1.The Court takes judicial notice of the dockets and published opinions for Shao's related state and federal lawsuits. *See, e.g.*, *Al-Aulaqi v. Panetta*, 35 F. Supp. 3d 56, 67 (D.D.C. 2014) ("A court may take judicial notice of facts contained in public records of other proceedings." (citing *Covad Commc'ns Co. v. Bell Atlantic Co.*, 407 F.3d 1220, 1222 (D.C. Cir. 2005))).

County of Santa Clara investigated the claims, *see id.* ¶¶ 57–58. B.J. Fadem, a California attorney, was appointed as guardian *ad litem* for Shao's daughter in May 2010. *See id.* ¶ 58.
After county workers allegedly conspired to keep Shao's child away from her with Superior Court employees; Wang's attorney, David Sussman; and the judge assigned to her case, Judge Edward Davila,2 *see id.* ¶¶ 43, 54–57, 71, Judge Davila issued an expedited custody order depriving Shao of custody of her daughter on August 5, 2010, *see id.* ¶¶ 88–92.

On August 20, 2010, Shao hired attorneys James McManis, Michael Reedy, and McManis Faulkner, LLP ("the McManis Defendants") to challenge the expedited custody order. *See id.* ¶¶ 98. However, Shao fired the McManis Defendants within a year after allegedly realizing that they were engaged in a conspiracy with Sussman and Judge Davila to deprive her of custody. *See id.* ¶ 99–104. According to Shao, the conspiracy was facilitated by Judge Davila and the McManis Defendants' common membership in a chapter of the American Inns of Court, *id.* ¶ 98, an organization that she alleges provides a nationwide platform to facilitate private *ex parte* communications and judicial corruption, *see id.* ¶¶ 23, 335–36. Over the next three years, several other Superior Court judges issued a variety of decisions in Shao's custody case. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 103–105. Shao alleges that these judges, too, were involved in conspiracies to deprive her of custody with Sussman or with some or all of the McManis Defendants. *See,*

---

2. Judge Davila now sits on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, following his appointment to the position in 2011.

e.g., id. ¶¶ 102–103, 105. Shao alleges that a final custody order depriving her of the custody of her daughter was eventually entered in November 2013. *See id.* ¶¶ 122.

At various points during the litigation, Shao appealed orders of the Superior Court. *E.g. id.* ¶¶ 109–13, 128–29, 138. Shao's appeals went first to the California Sixth District Court of Appeal, then to the California Supreme Court, and for some to the United States Supreme Court.*E.g. id.* ¶¶ 128–29. Shao attributes the denial of her appeals at all appellate levels to a conspiracy between the McManis Defendants and the judges and justices involved, again facilitated by the platform for corruption offered by the American Inns of Court. *E.g. id.*109–13.

2.Malpractice Suit Against the McManis Defendants and Prefiling Injunction

After Shao fired the McManis Defendants, she brought suit against them for malpractice in 2012. *Id.* ¶ 141. The case was dismissed, and Shao refiled a malpractice suit against the McManis Defendants in federal court in 2014. *Id.* ¶ 142. Judge Lucy Koh dismissed the federal suit and the dismissal was affirmed on appeal. *Id.* ¶ 145. As with previous judicial decisions going against her, Shao alleges that the judges involved all conspired with the McManis Defendants to ensure she would not succeed, "through the influence [the McManis Defendants] wield through their powerful giant social club The American Inns of Court." *Id.* Following the dismissal of her federal case, Shao moved to set aside the dismissal of her state malpractice suit. *Id.* ¶ 146. The McManis Defendants responded by moving to declare Shao a vexatious litigant under California law, and

by asking for a prefiling injunction to issue against her. *See id.* ¶ 147. The Superior Court granted the motion and issued a pre-filing injunction against Shao. *See id.*

3.Continued Litigation in the Custody Case and Alleged Hacking

In the past five years, Shao has extensively litigated her custody case. *See generally id.*¶¶ 156–256. Shao alleges that the McManis Defendants have continued to conspire to deprive her of the custody of her daughter, in a scheme involving the judges issuing decisions in her cases, third parties connected to the litigation, and Wang and his attorney. *See id.* Shao places the McManis Defendants at the center of the conspiracy, allegedly using their various relationships and the connections they made through the American Inns of Court to "ensure that SHAO not regain custody of her child . . . [and] maintain[] their no causation defense to malpractice." *Id.* ¶¶ 159–160. She alleges that various California judicial defendants "knowingly misused the vexatious litigant order" fraudulently obtained by the McManis Defendants to block motions in her custody case. *E.g. id.* ¶ 219. She believes that the many judges involved in her case have engaged in a wide range of improprieties, including issuing secret *ex parte* communications and court orders, illegally altering case dockets, and failing to docket or maliciously dismissing her motions without review. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 159–208. And she alleges that the McManis Defendants organized "the same scheme of illegal notice, alteration of docket and deterrence" in the United States Supreme Court, again through secret, corrupt connections they made there through the American Inns of Court. *See id.* ¶¶ 257–58.

At some point in 2018, Shao "started posting on Youtube several radio show videos . . . about the judicial corruption going on in her cases." *Id.* ¶ 305. In response, Shao alleges that Google and Youtube conspired with the McManis Defendants and Chief Justice Roberts to harass her, *see id.* ¶¶ 305–14, including by deleting comments on her Youtube videos, *id.* ¶ 306, suspending her Google e-mail accounts, *id.* ¶ 307, having vehicles follow her, *id.* ¶ 308, putting her under electronic surveillance, *id.* ¶ 313, and hacking her computer, cell phone, and office phone, *id.* ¶¶ 310–12. Shao attributes Google's decision to conspire with Chief Justice Roberts to a favorable decision he purportedly issued in a pending case Google had before the Supreme Court. *See id.* ¶ 314. Aside from their conspiracy with Google, Youtube, and Chief Justice Roberts, Shao also alleges that the McManis Defendants arranged for hackers to infiltrate her computer and alter or destroy files relating to her pending cases. *See id.* ¶¶ 315–19.

4.**Procedural History of This Case**

Shao brought the instant case on May 21, 2018. *See* Compl. at ¶ 1, ECF No. 1. In her amended complaint, filed on June 29, 2018, Shao brings claims against sixty-seven named defendants: the McManis Defendants; the American Inns of Court, the Honorable William A. Ingram American Inn of Court, and the San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court (the "American Inn Defendants"); the McManis Defendants' attorney in the malpractice action, Janet Everson; United States Supreme Court Justices and clerks (the "Supreme Court

Defendants"3); judges and employees of the United States Judiciary (the "Federal Judicial Defendants"4); members of Congress and several Congressional entities (the "Congressional Defendants"5);California Superior Court Judge Edward Davila and a large number of other judges and employees of the California judicial system (together, the "California Judicial Defendants"6); retired Justice of the California Sixth District Court

---

3. The Supreme Court Defendants include the United States Supreme Court; Chief Justice John G. Roberts; Justice Clarence Thomas; Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg; Justice Stephen Breyer; Justice Samuel Alito; Justice Sonia Sotomayor; Justice Elena Kagan; and Supreme Court clerks Jordan Bickell and Jeff Atkins.

4.The Federal Judiciary Defendants include Judge Koh; Judge Clifford J. Wallace; Judge Rudolph Contreras; and Jackie Francis, a clerk at the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

5. The Congressional Defendants include the U.S. House Judiciary Committee; the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee; Representative Eric Swalwell; and Senator Diane Feinstein.

6. The California Judiciary Defendants include the Supreme Court of California and its Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye; the California Sixth District Court of Appeal and several of its justices, Justice Mary J. Greenwood, Justice Patricia Bamattre-Maoukian, Justice Franklin Elia, Justice Adrienne M. Grover, Justice Eugene Premo; the Clerk's Office of the California Sixth District Court of Appeal; the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County and several of its judges, Judge Maureen Folan, Judge Mary Ann Grilli, Judge Peter Kirwan, Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Beth McGowen, Judge Rise Pichon, Judge Joshua Weinstein, Judge Theodore Zayner, and former Judge Edward Davila; Gregory Salvidar, Commissioner of the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County; and several employees of the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County, Rebecca Delgado, Lisa Herrick, Jill Sardeson, Sarah Scofield, Susan Walker, and David Yamasaki

of Appeal Conrad Rushing; the County of Santa Clara and several of its employees (the "Santa Clara Defendants")7;Google and Youtube (the "Google Defendants"); and Wang, Sussman, Fadem, and several third parties who were at some point or another involved in the custody action.8

Most of the defendants have now moved to dismiss, including the McManis Defendants; Everson; the American Inn Defendants; the California Judicial Defendants; the Santa Clara Defendants; the Google Defendants; custody evaluator John Orlando; psychologist Carol Tait-Starnes; alleged hacker Esther Chung; Fadem; and Fadem's replacement as guardian *ad litem* for Shao's daughter, Elise Mitchell. *See* Docket, *Shao v. Roberts*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC (D.D.C.).

Shao has separately moved to strike a large number of motions and for judicial notice of a wide variety of facts. *See id.* Shao also moved to disqualify this Court and for a change of venue on July 6, 2018, followed by a motion to stay these proceedings on August 5, 2018. *See* Pl.'s First Mot.Disqualify at 1, ECF No. 19; Pl.'s Mot. Stay at 1, ECF No. 42. The Court denied both motions on August 8, 2018. *See Shao v. Roberts*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, ECF No. 48, slip

---

7 The Santa Clara Defendants include the County of Santa Clara (named in the Complaint through its Department of Family and Children's Services and Department of Child Support Services) and employees Misook Oh, Darryl Leong, and Mary L. Murphy.

8. Additional defendants include John Orlando, a custody evaluator appointed by the Superior Court after the 2010 expedited custody order; Carole Tait-Starnes, Wang and Shao's minor daughter's psychologist; Elise Mary Mitchell, the guardian *ad litem* for Shao's daughter after Fadem withdrew; and two alleged hackers, Kevin L. Warnock and Esther Chung

op. at 1 (D.D.C. Aug. 8, 2018). On December 4, 2018, Shao filed a renewed motion to disqualify this Court and for change of venue. *See* Pl.'s Second Mot. Disqualify at 1, ECF No. 142.

All motions to dismiss and the renewed motion for disqualification are now ripe for review.

III. ANALYSIS

The Court first reviews Shao's renewed motion to disqualify and to change venue, before addressing the pending motions to dismiss and the remaining claims against the non-moving defendants. Because it restates much of the same arguments as her first motion, the Court denies the renewed motion to disqualify and to change venue. And because the Court finds that all of Shao's claims should be dismissed on the basis of either personal jurisdiction or subject matter jurisdiction, the Court grants the motions to dismiss, *sua sponte* dismisses all remaining claims, and denies all other pending motions as moot.

A. Motion to Disqualify and for Change of Venue

Before reviewing the pending motions to dismiss, the Court briefly addresses Shao's renewed motion to disqualify and for change of venue. Shao brings her renewed motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144 and 28 U.S.C. § 455. *See* Pl.'s Mem. Supp. Second Mot. Disqualify at 20, ECF No. 142-1. Because Shao's motion reasserts much of the same arguments brought in her first motion, the Court denies the renewed motion.

....

Unlike § 455(a), recusal under § 455(b)(1) requires the movant to "demonstrate actual bias or prejudice based upon an extrajudicial source." *Cobell v. Norton*, 237 F. Supp. 2d 71, 98 (D.D.C. 2003). **And finally**

under § 455(b)(5)(i), a judge can be disqualified for being a party to the proceeding. 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(i).

Neither § 455(a) nor § 455(b)(1) warrant recusal based on the allegations Shao brings in this renewed motion because, as this Court noted in its August 8, 2018 opinion, Shao only offers "bald allegations of a conspiracy," Shao, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, slip op. at 8, that neither create the appearance of partiality nor provide evidence of actual bias. Shao reasserts many of the allegations in her initial motion, including that the Court purposefully interfered with filing, docketing, and the issuance of summonses and default judgment, *see* Pl.'s Second Mem. Supp. at 27–29, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications with some of the parties, *id.* at 25, and improperly named the case *Shao v. Kennedy* instead of *Shao v. Roberts*, purportedly to shield Justice Roberts from public exposure, *see id.* at 28. Shao also makes additional allegations of interference with filing, docketing, and the general administration of her case since the Court's August 8, 2018 opinion. *See generally id.* at 25–29. As the Court explained in that opinion, Shao provides "no factual matter to form a basis for those allegations," and instead "bases her allegations on purely speculative conspiracy." *Shao*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, slip op. at 8. Shao reads the clerical discrepancies between court documents and her communications with the Court, and supposedly irregular timing of the issuance of summonses and clerk's defaults, to imply a broader conspiracy this Court is a part of to deny her justice. These allegations do not create an appearance of impropriety under § 455(a) because they offer "no facts that would fairly convince a sane

and reasonable mind to question this Court's impartiality." *Walsh v. Comey*, 110 F. Supp. 3d 73, 77 (D.D.C. 2015). Because they offer no evidence of bias, the allegations also do not require recusal under § 455(b)(1).

Similarly, **§ 455(b)(5)(i) does not warrant this Court's recusal.** As the Court noted in its August 5, 2018 opinion, multiple courts have "made clear that disqualification is patently unwarranted" in the circumstances where a plaintiff amends a complaint to add the assigned judge as a defendant in an attempt at judge-shopping. *See Shao*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, slip op. at 9–10 (citing cases). And the Court also noted that Shao's amendment adding claims against this judge were "very clearly an attempt at judge-shopping." *Id.* at 9. In this renewed motion, Shao again argues that her claims against this judge, and the threat of default they pose, warrant recusal. *See* Pl.'s Second Mem. at 22–25. For reasons already elaborated on in the August 5, 2018 opinion, the Court rejects that argument.

Finally, Shao renews her request to disqualify the D.C. Circuit, the Third Circuit, and the U.S. District Courts in Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New Jersey because this judge has professional and personal ties to those jurisdictions, and to transfer her case to New York. *See id.* at 25; *Shao*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, slip op. at 10. The Court denies that request for the same reasons it denied the request in Shao's first motion to change venue. "Shao's conspiratorial allegations are . . . an attempt to judge-shop and a vehicle to express her dissatisfaction with the timeliness of this action," and are "insufficient . . . to transfer her case to New York." *Shao*, No. 18-cv-1233-RC, slip op. at 10.....

XXV. PRESENT DOCKET OF 21-5210: DC Circuit altered many docket entries for the records filed by Appellant; original texts for the altered docket entries are inserted under each present altered docket entry in different typesetting (See, App.18-22 for all crimes)
Yi Tai Shao, Plaintiff-Appellant vs.
John G. Roberts, Chief Justice; Anthony M. Kennedy, Associate Justice; Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice; Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Associate Justice; Stephen G. Breyer, Associate Justice; Samuel A. Alito, Jr., Associate Justice; Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice; Elena Kagan, Associate Justice; Jordan Bickell; Jeff Atkins; U.S. House Judiciary Committee; U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee; Eric Swamwell, House Representative; Diane Feinstein, Senate; United States Supreme Court; William A. Ingram, American Inn of Court;; San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of **American Inns of Court**; **James McManis; Michael Reedy; McManis Faulkner, LLP; Janet Everson**; Santa Clara County Superior Court of California; Rebecca Delgado; Susan Walker; David H. Yamasaki; Lisa Herrick; California Sixth District Court of Appeal; Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal; Conrad Rushing, Justice; Eugene Premo, Justice; Franklin Elia, Justice; Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Justice; J. Clifford Wallace, Judge; Edward Davila, Judge; Patricia Lucas, Judge; Rice Pichon; Theodore Zayner, Judge; Joshua Weinstein, Judge; Mary Ann Grill, Judge; Maureen Folan; Lucy H. Koh, Judge; Peter Kirwan, Judge; Gregory Saldivar, Commissioner; Darryl Young; Mary L. Murphy; Sarah Scofield; Jill Sardeson; Misook Oh; BJ Fadem; John Orlando; David Sussman; Tsan-

Kuen Wang; Elise Mitchell; Carole Tait-Starnes; Department of Family and Children Services; Youtube, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Google Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Kevin L. Warnock; Esther Chung; Does 4-50; Supreme Court of California, Doe Dft. No. 4; Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice as Doe Dft No. 5; Adrienne M. Grover, Doe Dft. No. 1; **Rudolph Contreras**; County of Santa Clara; **Jackie Francis**; California Supreme Court as Doe No. 2,

Defendants – Appellees

09/29/2021	US CIVIL CASE docketed. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:38 PM]
09/29/2021	NOTICE OF APPEAL [1916104] seeking review of a decision by the U.S. District Court in 1:18-cv-01233-RC filed by Yi Tai Shao. Appeal assigned USCA Case Number: 21-5210. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:39 PM]
09/29/2021	CLERK'S ORDER [1916107] filed directing party to file initial submissions: APPELLANT docketing statement due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT certificate as to parties due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT statement of issues due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT underlying decision due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT deferred appendix statement due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT entry of appearance due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT transcript status report due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT procedural motions due 10/29/2021. APPELLANT dispositive motions due 11/15/2021; directing party to file initial submissions: APPELLEE certificate as to

	parties due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE entry of appearance due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE procedural motions due 10/29/2021. APPELLEE dispositive motions due 11/15/2021, Failure to respond shall result in dismissal of the case for lack of prosecution; The Clerk is directed to mail this order to appellant by certified mail, return receipt requested and by 1st class mail. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/29/2021 02:42 PM]
9/29/2021	DOCKETING STATEMENT [1916171] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 09/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 09/29/2021 05:25 PM]
09/30/2021	CERTIFIED AND FIRST CLASS MAIL SENT [1916209] with return receipt requested [Receipt No.7019 0700 0000 5269 2475] of order [1916107-2]. Certified Mail Receipt due 11/01/2021 from Yi Tai Shao. [21-5210] [Entered: 09/30/2021 10:22 AM]
10/08/2021	CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT [1917870] received from Lily for order [1916209-2] sent to Appellant Yi Tai Shao [21-5210] [Entered: 10/13/2021 01:14 PM]
10/18/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1918488] filed by James A. Lassart on behalf of Appellees Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy. [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:28 AM]
10/18/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1918492] filed by Janet Everson, James McManis, McManis Faulkner, LLP and Michael Reedy [Service

	Date: 10/18/2021] [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:30 AM]
10/18/2021	MOTION [1918497] for summary affirmance filed by Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy (Service Date: 10/18/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail) Length Certification: 782 words. [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 10:34 AM]
10/18/2021	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITS [1918627] for motion [1918497-2] filed by Janet Everson, McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis and Michael Reedy. [21-5210] (Lassart, James) [Entered: 10/18/2021 03:55 PM]
10/28/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920033] filed by Michael E. Barnsback on behalf of Appellees American Inns of Court, San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court and William A. Ingram. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 10/28/2021 01:41 PM]
10/28/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1920034] filed by American Inns of Court, William A. Ingram and San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court [Service Date: 10/28/2021] [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 10/28/2021 01:43 PM]
10/28/2021	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]

Original docket entry	**See above in Exh. IV**
	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)
10/28/2021	PROPOSED JUDGMENT [1920121] submitted by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/28/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/28/2021 06:52 PM]
10/28/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1920126] to MOTION [1920120] to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210]--[**Edited 10/29/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/28/2021 11:29 PM]
original	SUPPLEMENT [1920126] to motion for attorney fees [1920120-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6] filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai)
10/29/2021	STATEMENT OF ISSUES [1920222] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:38 PM]

10/29/2021	NOTICE [1920223] to supplement record filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:41 PM]
10/29/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920228] filed by James S. Aist on behalf of Appellee Carole Tait-Starnes. [21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:57 PM]
10/29/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1920230] filed by Carole Tait-Starnes [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 10/29/2021 02:58 PM]
10/29/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920272] filed by Drew T. Dorner on behalf of Appellees Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Edward Davila, Rebecca Delgado, Franklin Elia, Maureen Folan, Mary Ann Grill, Adrienne M. Grover, Lisa Herrick, Peter Kirwan, Patricia Lucas, Rice Pichon, Gregory Saldivar, Santa Clara County Superior Court of California, Jill Sardeson, Sarah Scofield, Supreme Court of California, Susan Walker, Joshua Weinstein, David H. Yamasaki and Theodore Zayner. [21-5210] (Dorner, Drew) [Entered: 10/29/2021 04:40 PM]
10/29/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1920274] filed by Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Edward Davila,

	Rebecca Delgado, Franklin Elia, Maureen Folan, Mary Ann Grill, Adrienne M. Grover, Lisa Herrick, Peter Kirwan, Patricia Lucas, Rice Pichon, Gregory Saldivar, Jill Sardeson, Sarah Scofield, Supreme Court of California, Santa Clara County Superior Court of California, Susan Walker, Joshua Weinstein, David H. Yamasaki and Theodore Zayner [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Dorner, Drew) [Entered: 10/29/2021 04:50 PM]
10/29/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1920285] to motion [1920120-2] to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 10/29/2021 06:59 PM]
10/29/2021	ENTRY OF APPEARANCE [1920286] filed by Paul N. Harold on behalf of Appellees Google Inc. and Youtube, Inc.. [21-5210] (Harold, Paul) [Entered: 10/29/2021 08:48 PM]
10/29/2021	CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS AND RELATED CASES [1920287] filed by Google Inc. and Youtube, Inc. [Service Date: 10/29/2021] [21-5210] (Harold, Paul) [Entered: 10/29/2021 08:51 PM]
11/01/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1920463] to notice [1920223-2], motion to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions [1920120-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/01/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/01/2021 02:51 PM]
Original entry	SUPPLEMENT [1920463] to notice [1920223-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6] filed by Yi Tai Shao filed by Yi Tai Shao...

11/03/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1920875] to motion to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions [1920120-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/03/2021] [21-5210]--[**Edited 11/05/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/03/2021 07:18 PM]
Original	SUPPLEMENT [1920875] to motion for attorney fees[1920120-2] motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6]filed by Yi Tai Shao.....
11/04/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1921033] to motion to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions [1920120-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/04/2021] [21-5210]--[**Edited 11/05/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/04/2021 05:40 PM]
Original	SUPPLEMENT [1921033] to motion for attorney fees[1920120-2] motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6]
11/05/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1921294] motion to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions [1920120-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/05/2021] [21-5210]--[**Edited 11/08/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/05/2021 08:29 PM]
Original	SUPPLEMENT [1921294] to motion for attorney fees [1920120-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6]filed by Yi Tai Shao filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/05/2021] [21-5210]

11/11/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1921981] motion to vacate, change venue, for summary affirmance and for sanctions [1920120-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210]--[Edited 11/12/2021 by SRJ] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/11/2021 05:16 PM] [21-5210]--**[Edited 11/12/2021 by SRJ]** (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/11/2021 05:16 PM]
Original docket entry	SUPPLEMENT [1921981] to motion for attorney fees [1920120-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6]filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210]
11/12/2021	MOTION [1922201] to transfer styled as a motion to change place of appeal filed by Yi Tai Shao (Service Date: 11/12/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email) Length Certification: 20 pages about 5200 words typeset 14. [21-5210]--**[Edited 11/15/2021 by SRJ–RELIEF REPLACED]** (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/12/2021 06:26 PM]
Original	Motion [1922201] to recuse filed by Yi Tai Shao.....
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922290] for summary affirmance filed by Carole Tait-Starnes (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA) Length Certification: 322 words. [21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 11/15/2021 09:42 AM]
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922390] for summary affirmance filed by American Inns of Court, William A. Ingram and San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by

	CM/ECF NDA, US Mail) Length Certification: 1,022 Words. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 11/15/2021 12:55 PM]
11/15/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1922455] to motion [1922201-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/15/2021 02:21 PM]
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922459] to recuse, to recuse filed by Yi Tai Shao (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email) Length Certification: 5090 words, 19 pages, 14 size of words. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/15/2021 02:24 PM]
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922467] for summary affirmance filed by Supreme Court of California, Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Franklin Elia, Adrienne M. Grover, Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, County of Santa Clara, Maureen Folan, Mary Ann Grill, Peter Kirwan, Patricia Lucas, Rice Pichon, Joshua Weinstein, Theodore Zayner, Edward Davila, Gregory Saldivar, Rebecca Delgado, Lisa Herrick, Jill Sardeson, Sarah Scofield, Susan Walker and David H. Yamasaki (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail) Length Certification: 400 words. [21-5210] (Dorner, Drew) [Entered: 11/15/2021 02:39 PM]
11/15/2021	*CORRECTED* MOTION [1922515] for summary affirmance filed by Carole Tait-Starnes (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA) Length Certification: 388. [21-5210] (Aist, James) [Entered: 11/15/2021 04:32 PM]

11/15/2021	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITS [1922534] for motion [1922467-2] filed by Supreme Court of California, Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Franklin Elia, Adrienne M. Grover, Clerk's Office of California Sixth District Court of Appeal, Maureen Folan, Mary Ann Grill, Peter Kirwan, Patricia Lucas, Rice Pichon, Joshua Weinstein, Theodore Zayner, Edward Davila, Gregory Saldivar, Rebecca Delgado, Lisa Herrick, Jill Sardeson, Sarah Scofield, Susan Walker and David H. Yamasaki. [21-5210] (Dorner, Drew) [Entered: 11/15/2021 05:40 PM]
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922538] for summary reversal filed by Yi Tai Shao (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email) Length Certification: 3888 words, 15 pages, 14 typeset. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/15/2021 05:55 PM]
11/15/2021	MOTION [1922545] to vacate filed by Yi Tai Shao (Service Date: 11/15/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email) Length Certification: 3456 words 13 pages 14 typeset. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/15/2021 08:45 PM]
11/16/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1922760] to motion to vacate [1922545-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/16/2021 05:49 PM]
11/16/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1922762] to motion to transfer case [1922201-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/16/2021] [21-5210]--[Edited 11/16/2021 by SHA] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/16/2021 05:59 PM]
11/24/	RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1924035] to motion [1922515-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao

2021	[Service Date: 11/24/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 1919 words in 14 typeset, within 16 pages.. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/24/2021 03:36 PM]
11/24/2021	RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1924078] to motion for summary affirmance [1922390-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 11/24/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 2187 words. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/24/2021 06:16 PM]
11/24/2021	REPLY [1924079-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao to response in opposition [1924035] to motion [1922538] for summary reversal [Service Date: 11/24/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 2,464 words. [21-5210]--[**Edited 12/03/2021 by SRJ–RELIEF REPLACE**]. (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 11/24/2021 06:46 PM]
11/26/2021	RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1924095] to motion for summary reversal [1922538-2] filed by American Inns of Court, San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court and William A. Ingram [Service Date: 11/26/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail] Length Certification: 2339 words. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 11/26/2021 02:21 PM]
11/26/2021	RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1924096] to motion to vacate [1922545-2] filed by American Inns of Court, San Francisco Bay Area American Inn of Court and William A. Ingram [Service Date: 11/26/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail] Length Certification: 670 words. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 11/26/2021 02:24 PM]
12/01/	REPLY [1924925] filed by American Inns of Court, William A. Ingram and San Francisco

2021	Bay Area American Inn of Court to response [1924078-2] [Service Date: 12/01/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, US Mail] Length Certification: 367 words. [21-5210] (Barnsback, Michael) [Entered: 12/01/2021 03:51 PM]
12/01/2021	**NOTICE [1924935] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/01/2021] [21-5210]–[Edited 12/02/2021 by SRJ - MODIFIED EVENT–NOTICE FILED]** (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/01/2021 04:23 PM]
Original	**PROPOSED JUDGMENT [1924935]**
12/01/2021	REPLY [1924988] filed by Yi Tai Shao to response and RESPONSE IN SUPPORT filed to Cross Motion [1922545-2] [Service Date: 12/01/2021 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 1590 words 9 pages. [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/01/2021 07:48 PM]
12/02/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1925085] to motion to recuse [1922459-2], motion to recuse [1922459-3] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/02/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/02/2021 12:08 PM]
12/02/2021	REPLY filed to the RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION [1924079] to MOTION [1922538] for summary reversal filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/02/2021] Length Certification: 2330 words. [21-5210]--[**Edited 12/03/2021 by SRJ**] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/02/2021 07:41 PM] Length Certification: 2330 words. [21-5210]-
Original	APPELLANT REPLY MEMORANDUM OF LAW ANF FACTS [1925205] filed by Yi Tai Shao {Service Date 12/02/2021}

12/07/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1925602] to Appellant/Petitioner reply brief [1925205-2], response [1924988-2], reply [1924988-3], notice for other relief [1924935-3], motion to vacate [1922545-2], motion for summary reversal [1922538-2], motion to recuse [1922459-2], motion to recuse [1922459-3], motion for attorney fees [1920120-2], motion to transfer case [1920120-3], motion to remand case [1920120-4], motion to vacate [1920120-5], response [1920120-6] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/07/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/07/2021 12:15 AM]
12/07/2021	SUPPLEMENT [1925603] to Appellant/Petitioner reply brief [1925205-2], response [1924988-2], reply [1924988-3], notice for other relief [1924935-3], motion to vacate [1922545-2], motion for summary reversal [1922538-2], motion to recuse [1922459-2], motion to recuse [1922459-3], motion to transfer case [1922201-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/07/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/07/2021 01:47 AM]
12/07/2021	*AMENDED* SUPPLEMENT [1925604] to response [1924988-2], reply [1924988-3], notice for other relief [1924935-3], motion to vacate [1922545-2], motion for summary reversal [1922538-2], motion to transfer case [1922201-2] filed by Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 12/07/2021] [21-5210] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 12/07/2021 02:06 AM]
02/23/2022	PER CURIAM ORDER [1936331] filed that the request for en banc consideration be denied [1922459-2]. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motions to recuse and transfer be denied

	[1922459-2] [1922459-3]. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motions to reopen appeal No. 19-5014 and vacate orders therein be denied [1922545-2] [1920120-5]. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for sanctions be denied [1920120-3]. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the motions for summary reversal be denied [1922538-2] [1922515-2] [1922467-2] [1922390-2] [1918497-2], and, on the court's own motion, the district court's order entered August 30, 2021, be affirmed as to all remaining appellees. 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. Before Judges: Henderson, Tatel, and Pillard. [21-5210] [Entered: 02/23/2022 01:25 PM]
03/10/2022	PETITION [1938513] for rehearing and rehearing en banc filed by Appellant Yi Tai Shao [Service Date: 03/10/2022 by CM/ECF NDA, Email] Length Certification: 4118 words. [21-5210] --[RELIEF ADDED--Edited 04/20/2022 by LMC] (Shao, Yi Tai) [Entered: 03/10/2022 01:02 AM]
03/10/2022	MOTION [1938533] to extend time to file petition for rehearing enbanc filed by Yi Tai Shao (Service Date: 03/10/2022 by Email) Length Certification: 2 pages. [21-5210] [Entered: 03/10/2022 09:12 AM]
05/09/	CLERK'S ORDER [1946023] filed dismissing as moot the motion to extend time for filing a petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc

2022	[1938533-2]. [21-5210] [Entered: 05/09/2022 04:41 PM]
05/09/2022	PER CURIAM ORDER [1946024] filed denying appellant's petition for rehearing [1938513-3]. Before Judges: Henderson, Tatel and Pillard. [21-5210] [Entered: 05/09/2022 04:43 PM]
05/09/2022	PER CURIAM ORDER, En Banc, [1946027] filed denying appellant's petition for rehearing en banc [1938513-2]. Before Judges: Srinivasan, Henderson, Rogers, Tatel, Millett, Pillard, Wilkins, Katsas, Rao, Walker and Jackson*. (* Circuit Judge Jackson did not participate in this matter.) [21-5210] [Entered: 05/09/2022 04:51 PM]
05/17/2022	MANDATE ISSUED to Clerk, U.S. District Court. [21-5210] [Entered: 05/17/2022 02:32 PM]

*1925602, 1925603 and 1925604 demonstrate the fact that the hacker Kevin L. Warnock has been closely stalking Petitioner that he was able to hack into her filing activities instantly, and were able to remove the appendix within 1-2 minutes when Petitioner was filing ECF1925602.
The hacker's removal of appendix from 1925602 caused Petitioner having to re-file the same with another document number of 1925603.

XXVI. A Motion for TRO was filed in the second case of Shao v. Roberts, et al (2:22-cv-00325) **regarding D.C. Circuit's refusal to transfer court in 21-5210 even though Motion to Transfer all Dispositive Motions to a Neutral Court of Appeal and recusal of judges [ECF 192459], motion to transfer place of appeal [1922201] as well as cross-motion to vacate orders, to change venue, to summary reversal and for attorney fees [ECF 1920121] were all UNCONTESTED.**

2:22-cv-00325 Proceeding; SHAO v. ROBERTS, et al. pending 9th Circuit Appeal

ECF 21 Checklist
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSFzbY41wm8ccRd4

ECF 21-1 Memorandum of Points and Authorities
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgR3Cg_IqsxV4fD68

ECF 21-2 Declaration of Yi Tai Shao
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgRsQlR8ZtDTLTDoY

ECF 21-3 Exh. Judge Henderson being a member of Federal American Inn of Court, a child of Appellee American Inns of Court
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgRzlEFPdQ9ocFj3q

ECF 21-4 Request for Judicial Notice
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgR77PVXPcCHBb1Q8

ECF 21-5 exhibits for Request for Judicial Notice
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgS2Hqfc_wMxgpzwi

ECF 21-6 JN-6 Petition for Rehearing filed in Petition 20-524 that was returned

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSK1UdDMRbQwddbS
ECF 21-7 JN-7 Docket of 20-524 as well as Petition for Writ of Certiorari
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSBWwwTYU90VxwZB
ECF 21-8 JN-8 ECF192120 filed in 21-5210 "Declaration Of Yi Tai Shao In Support Of 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"
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTBzFRvAf1hWi_Uj
ECF 22 Supplemental Declaration Of Yi Tai Shao In Support Of Motion For Temporary Restraining Order And Order To Show Cause For Preliminary Injunction; Having Given Notice Of TRO Motion to Defendants
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSW7Gy8F-t3PEQ22

ECF 24 order
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgSewC1bkkfD926XT
ECF 29 Amended Motion/Request for Recusal Of Judge John A. Mendez And Magistrate Judge Allison Claire pursuant To 28 U.S.C. §455 (A), (B)(5)(I) And 28 U.S.C.§144 And Request The Chief Judge To Re-Assign This Case To Another Judge In Accordance With This Court's Screening Policy To Ensure No Conflicts Of Interest when There Are Four Pending Motions For Temporary Restraining Order[ECF#27 filed on 3/6/2022]
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpfyK3hhKInQ02i1I
ECF 29-1 proposed order re recusal
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpeAoLXkeQdnmSUOM
ECF 31 Magistrate Judge Allison Claire's order in response to ECF 29
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpe-_aSBBZjOhFN04
ECF 32 Amended Motion To Disqualify Judge John A. Mendez And Magistrate Judge Allison Claire Under 28 U.S.C. §144and 28 U.S.C. §455(A)And/Or 28 U.S.C. §455(B)(5)(I)Including Plaintiff's Response to The 3/2/2022 Order To Show cause and Motion To Set Aside Or Rehearing Of The 3/2/2022 Orderand Order To Show Cause And the 3/7/2022 Minute Order, Certificate Of Good Faith
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQHAHnyU1qs_6bet
ECF 33: "Objection To ECF 31, ECF 24, ECF 28,And Motion To Set Aside Pursuant To Rule 60(b); SUPPLEMENT TOAmended Motion to Disqualify

Judge John A. Mendez and Magistrate Judge Allison Clairein ECF 32"
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpfFHipeXVxEmGG1A
ECF 33-1
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQX7zD0M7vk61IUK
ECF 33-2 complete deposition transcript of James McManis:https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpfan4tyhncQz_1GI
ECF 33-3 Declaration of Meera Fox filed in H040395 on May 10 2018 with docket entry removed later on by California Sixth District Court of Appeal
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQNaIJ5VBxX45eSI
ECF 33-4 Declaration of Meera Fox filed in H039823 on April 27 2017
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQCjMxyyKTo53Csk
ECF 33-5 recusal orders of Judge Socrates Manoukian on 12/2/2015 obtained from the email of McManis defendants' trial attorney as the order was concealed from filing by Santa Clara County Superior Court when Judge Patricia Lucas was the Presiding Judge; Judge Peter Kirwan on 12/15/2017
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQKSEyMj5yRlrcG_
ECF 33-6 8/25/2021 Order of California Supreme Court in S269711 and the uncontested "REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE; VERIFIED STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION OF CHIEF JUSTICE" that was filed on 7/7/2021, 50 days prior to the order
ECF 35 Magistrate Judge Allison Claire's Order, Finding and Recommendation filed on 3/30/2022

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTqj2vKhIUVX Uw_7
ECF 36 returned Summons showing service of Summons upon U.S. Supreme Court defendants; filed on 3/31/2022
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTt7ycHvqBuEV owt
ECF 51 Dissent to Magistrate Judge Allison Claire filed on 4/4/2022
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTnQT-XsOwk1NVgK
ECF 68: Objections To Magistrate Judge Allison Claire's Order And Findings And Recommendations [Ecf 35]; Plaintiff's Motion To Strike Ecf 35 Order And Findings And Recommendations As It Was Made Without Jurisdiction Pursuant To 28 U.S.C.§636(B)(1)(A) And Was Untimely Pursuant To Local Rules 304(D) And 230(C), Filed On 4/12/2022
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVmpsqJCv7l3a hed
ECF 78 DEFENDANT COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgTwVR59byPv0 wro4
ECF 81 state bar defendants' notice of motion and motion to dismiss complaint; memorandum of points and authorities in support thereof, filed on 4/19/2022
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgUelBfL4krSHk Wxm
ECF 82 STATE BAR DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT filed on 4/19/2022

https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgT0XLO4ZrBV_JFDZ
ECF 83 Minute Order
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgT50V6WEhw29Qioz
ECF 84 4/20/2022 8:59 a.m. filed a short Order of Judge John A. Mendez
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgURzjwum4jsSBgpv
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgT-BpcttLAnRRfaw
ECF 85 Judge John A. Mendez on 4/19/2022 ADOPTING [35] Findings and Recommendations in full,DENYING [32] Motion to Recuse Magistrate Judge; and DISMISSING this actionwith prejudice in its entirety because plaintiff cannot state a claim forwhich relief can be granted. CASE CLOSED.
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgUKUfcev3LZlBBQ8
ECF 86 Judgement filed on 4/20/2022
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU2a_C4KE78EHFXo
ECF 87
Returned Summons showing service of process done on 4/14/2022 over James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm and judges at Santa Clara County Superior Court.
Complaint:
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgQ60HZStTgEb2tRb?e=evTcFS

XXVII. On 7/28/2022, Petitioner discovered that she was blocked from accessing the new appeal No. 22-15857 (appeal from the second Shao v. Roberts, et al. 2:22-cv-00325) either by searching case number, name of John G. Roberts, or name of Petitioner.

On 7/28/2022, Petitioner searched on Pacer.gov; the search engine could not go to civil but sticked with Bap court records:

---

unable to access case 22-15857 at the Ninth Circuit
Yi Tai SHAO
Thu 7/28/2022 12:53 PM
To: pacer@psc.uscourts.gov Cc: questions@ca9.uscourts.gov
3 attachments (533 KB) Cannot find 22-15857 from pacer.pdf; cannot find John G. Roberts.pdf; Cannot find the case under SHAO.pdf;
Dear Pacer,
Attached please find several screenshots that indicate that my pacer account may be hacked as I was blocked from accessing the appeal information for Appeal Case No. 22-15857, Shao v. Roberts, et al.

I just made a phone call to the Clerk's Office and was told that I have to file electronically for anything, but I am virtually blocked from accessing the case. My account number is 2707632. Would you please help reset my account so that I may have access to 22-15857? Many thank

---

No case found with the search criteria:
Case: 22-15857

PACER Service Center
Transaction Receipt
BAP for the Ninth Circuit 7/28/22 12:33:11

PACER Login	shaolawfirm	Client Code:	2215857
Description:	Case Selection table	Search Criteria	case
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.1

No case found with the search criteria:
Name: John G. Roberts (pty)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
BAP for the Ninth Circuit 7/28/22 12:33:55			
PACER Login	shaolawfirm	Client Code:	2215857
Description:	Case Selection table	Search Criteria	Name John G. Roberts (pty)
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.1

Case selection page

Case number title	Opening date	party	Last Docket Entry	Originating Case Number Origin
03-1150 Stromsheim et al. v. Shao	10/28/2003	Linda Shao	11/08/2004 15.01.00	0971-4 01-45924 17 Lead 02-7231 AT California Northern-Oakland
05-1432	11/10/2005	Linda Shao	12/11/2006	[omitted]

			15:39:00	
07-1159	04/20/2007	Linda Shao	06/14/2011 14.30.55	[omitted]

Note
Click on case no. to get Case Summary
[omitted]

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
BAP for the Ninth Circuit 7/28/22 12:34:30			
PACER Login	shaolawfirm	Client Code:	2215857
Description:	Case Selection table	Search Criteria	Name Shao (pty)
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.1

See the above, also, in Case: 22-15857, 07/29/2022, DktEntry:4, pages 4-6.

Petitioner's registered email with the 9th Circuit still could not receive any CM/ECF record for this filing and the clerk's order granting extension for two months to file appellant opening brief.

XXVIII. Appellees apparently influenced Christine Ohl-Gigliotti, Dean of the Student Affairs of Hagerstown Community College to interfere Petitioner's work on this Petition regarding Shao v. Roberts, et al. on 8/3/2022; with prior harassment on 2/26/2022 when Petitioner was working on Shao v. Roberts, et al. (Upon Petitioner's request, the policeman created an event number of 200019 but still no report.)

This Christine Ohl-Gigliotti repeatedly stalked Petitioner, and interrupted Petitioner's work on Shao v. Roberts, et al proceedings. She refused to respond if these acts were caused by Chief Justice Roberts.

On 8/3/2022, Christine was able to know Petitioner's entering into the library, public library inside the college, at 9 am and showed up at 9:25 a.m. on August 3, 2022 and called the campus police to evict Petitioner. See Facebook live recording.

The hacker interrupted the Facebook recording live; therefore, there are two recordings:
https://www.facebook.com/linda.shao.75/videos/1752781091780775/?d=n
https://www.facebook.com/linda.shao.75/videos/2631995290267197/?d=n
At 9:25 a.m., Christine handed Petitioner her letter dated 3/28/2022, which apparently was prepared during the 25 minutes between Petitioner's arrival and meeting on 8/3/2022 [Note: **Her letter fabricated non-existent "incidents" and non-existent appointment**]:

March 28, 2022
Linda Shao
Regarding Case Number: 2021041501
Dear Linda

Although we were scheduled to meet on March 23, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. to discuss two incidents that took place on March 16th and March 17th, you failed to show for the informal hearing. As a result, a hold has been placed on your HCC student account; this hold presents you from enrolling in the future classes and it will be removed once you complete the conduct process. My office records indicate that on March 17th at 10:14 p.m., you retrieved the electronic letter that outlined the most recent conduct charges against you and notified you of the March 23rd informal hearing. A hard copy was also sent via certified mail to your mailing address on file with the College (P.O. Box 280; Big Pool, MD). In the event that you did not receive this letter (despite electronic records and the certified mailing), please come by my office in the Student Center, room 142, to receive a hard copy.

It is my sincere hope to meet with you soon to discuss the student code of conduct charges from March 16th and March 17th. If you fail to reschedule your hearing by the end of the current semester-charges against you are resolved.

If you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact my office at 240-500-2526.

Sincerely,

Dr. Christine Ohl-Gigliotti, Dean of Students

Prior similar harassment took place on 2/26/2022 when Petitioner was preparing papers also regarding Shao v. Roberts, et al. without any police report.

On 2/26/2022, Saturday morning, in working on the second complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et al., this same Christine Ohl-Gigliotti called the policeman to evict Petitioner from the Computer

Learning Center of the school with a false excuse of "trespass" [she denied stating "trespass" during her hearing later. Yet, on 8/3/2022, the same policeman showed up upon her request who further repeated the ground as "trespass" when she was present. So far, there is no police dispatchment record on this incident of 2/26/2022.]

At all time when Petitioner's cell phone was on the school premises on 8/3/2022, the signal became only 1 or even without service, which indicates that this Dean's bizarre behaviors are connected with the hacker hired by Appellee McManis.

As there was no court order 2 hours later, Christine got a letter from President of Hagerstown Community College, without a hearing, as below:

August 3, 2022 letter from President James S. Klauber

Ms. Linda Shao:

Hagerstown Community College strives to make the college campus and it's off campus locations safe and secure for all persons who use the college facilities. When something or someone poses a threat to the safety or security of the college campus or it's off campus locations, the College will take measures to ensure that the conduct is removed.

Therefore, you are hereby advised that you are not to enter upon any property, owned or leased by the College, at any time. Your failure to obey this notice of "No Trespassing" will result in charges of Trespass being placed against you. You may contact the Dean of Student Office by phone at 240-500-2526 to reschedule your unresolved Spring 2022 conduct case.

Sincerely,James S. Klauber, PhD, President

XXIX. **Undisputed/Undisputable Court Crimes In Petition 21-881 proved the 7 Justices indeed had conspiracies with James Mcmanis**

A. Felonious concealment the names of James Mcmanis and his partner, Michael Reedy from being Respondents; same patters for concealment of McManis's names in Petition No.17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, as well as this 21-881.

B. concealment of 7 filings in Petition 21-881

(See also, Supplement to Request for Recusal filed on 9/16/2022 in Petition 22-28)

12/10/2022	Motion to transfer court to Second Circuit Court of Appeal	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVGb6rx_Q1xA_txv?e=jjxATR
12/10/2022	Appendix to Request for Recusal, which are evidence as the grounds of recusal of the 7 Justices of this Court.	https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU50Ydme-jI8Mgph?e=53YLaR
12/30/2022	Petitioner's **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"	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVIeVRdA6WjRwRpz?e=KUjMNg
1/6/2022	Petitioner's Motion for Judicial Notice	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVO_FsCV2sbP5d

		LC?e=pPuIM9
1/24/2022	Petition for Writ of Mandate [28 U.S.C.§1651(a)] based on this Court's **concealment of the name of James McManis as a Respondent,** and concealed filings.	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgVAHmvPNd__VrIBp?e=1NPd4v
1/24/2022	**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)	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwpgU-2UwmrDUYdRt2t?e=3k4iy9
3/30/2022	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& 28 USC§2109,¶1 [28 U.S.C. §1651(a)] filed on 3/30/2022	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTwMgQ14mRF-1bZY5QMz?e=kWWyFU

Chief Justice Roberts received three(3) 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

C. 7 Justices conspired not to decide on Request for Recusal; they conspired to illegally keep the voting power in order to ensure their friend Mcmanis's crimes and California judges' conspiracies with them will be suppressed forever.

D. 7 Justices conspired not to vacate 2/23/2022 order even though Chief Justice Roberts who participated in the voting for the 2/23/2022 Order conceded his conflicts of interest by not participating in voting the 5/9/2022 order, such that the 2/23/2022 order Roberts participated should have been vacated.

E. McManis tacitly admitted that they conspired with the Supreme Court to purge 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; See original docket of 18-569 in App.116-117.

F. McManis Faulkner law firm admitted to their drafting the child custody order of Judge Patricia Lucas dated 11/4/2013, then blocked this appeal in order to seal the crimes embedded therein.

XXX. The court crimes in Petition 22-28 which is on-going, proves unambiguously Chief Justice Roberts' conspiracies with James McManis, to block Petitioner's access to the court in the past 12 years, to implement McManis's common plan to deter child custody return to Petitioner (this corroborated with California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye's admission on 8/25/2021)

A. Regarding this appeal from California Chief Justice's delay and blocking Petitioner's access to California Supreme Court by blocking decision on her Petition for Habeas Corpus, this Court delayed publishing the Petition for Writ of Certiorari for a week.

B. This Court willfully concealed the names of 4 Respondents shown on Page v of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, in disregard of 8 requests by Petitioner from early July until 9/21/2022; the concealed Respondents contributed significantly to the 10+ years' parental deprival; **without a conspiracy, no court would do this concealment of Respondents' names.**

All of the 40 books submitted by Petitioner had Page v., but this Court persisted on not publishing it, which proved the conspiracies between Chief Justice Roberts, and McManis in covering up his judicial co-conspirators who contributed significantly to his common plan of continuous parental deprival of Petitioner. The concealed Respondents include: (1) Patricia Lucas, who allowed McManis Faulkner to draft her child custody order of 11/4/2013 to permanently deprive Petitioner of child custody

when she knew[9] the order was not supported by records; who purged Julie Serna's "Certificate of Court Reporter's Waiving Deposit" filed on 5/8/2014 from being a record in Petitioner's family case, blocked Petitioner from accessing her own family case by 10 months in order to hide the fact that Julie Serna's Certificate was purged, conspired with Appellate Unit to block Julie Serna from filing the child custody trial transcript, and conspired with the Appellate Unit to generate false notices using the false ground that Petitioner had not paid child custody trial transcript to dismiss child custody appeal from her fraudulent child custody order of 11/4/2013;
(2) Theodore Zayner, who *reactivated* Judge Edward Davila's unconstitutional orders of 8/4/2010 and 8/5/2010, without a hearing, and conspired with

---

[9] On 7/11/2013 early afternoon at about 1:15 p.m., after hearing all experts' testimonies at trial, Judge Patricia Lucas stated on the record 3 times of apologies that she could not back the clock to 3 years ago but would ensure that the order would no longer be the same, which suggested that Petitioner should have got her child custody back; yet, the next day she changed to a different person. She started blocking witness presentation by Petitioner, disallowing interviewing the minor (who was 8 years old) for her wishes.
Then 3 weeks before 11/4/2013 order, Lucas ordered to destroy trial evidence, including Minor's medical records on abuses, injuries and police photos on Lydia's complaint of injuries. Then Julie Serna was coerced to remove Lucas's apologies. The Court then blocked Serna from filing her transcripts, blocked Petitioner from accessing her family case, then blocked Petitioner from access to the court, forged notices to dismiss the child custody appeal from this fraudulent order, that contained 5 pages of recital of facts not presented at trial. McManis Faulkner tacitly admitted in 1920120 proceeding (1921981) and Petition 21-881 that they wrote the custody order.

Lucas and McManis to issue 11/4/2013 child custody order; Zayner stole the original deposition transcripts of James McManis and Michael Reedy and Volume 5 of the court records of Shao v. McManis, et al., fraudulently dismissed the appeal from Prefiling Order, and now is blocking a hearing date for Petitioner's new motion to set aside dismissal by Judge Christopher Rudy, and all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan (including Prefiling Order) which was filed on 11/4/2021;
(3) Maureen A. Folan, who fraudulently issued the Prefiling Order without any supporting statement of decision knowing that Prefiling Order was used to block Petitioner's access to the Family Court;
(4) Rise Pichon, who issued 5/27/2016 order, sua sponte, without a hearing, nor a motion to illegally apply the Prefiling Order to family case to block Petitioner to access the family court.

C. The Court's reaction after 8/2/2022 letter proves that Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. led the 177 court crimes of concealment of filings, forging records, alterations of dockets and blockage of Petitioner's access to the court.

Letter of August 2, 2022 with returned receipts

August 2, 2022

Via certified mail with returned receipt and email

Legal Counsel Ethan Torrey
Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
Clerk Scott S. Harris
Deputy Clerk Danny Jordan Bickell
Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins
Emily Walker, "Case Analyst"
US Supreme Court

Washington DC 20543

Re: 3 documents that had not been posted on Petition NO. 22-28 after filing since July 24, 2022

Dear Mr. Torrey, Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Mr. Bickell, Mr. Atkins and Ms. Walker:

I am writing about the additional felonies that would take place or additional violation of the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment of my right to access the court and due process in this proceeding of Petition 22-28 and urge you to cease the evil doings and immediately file the three documents. Please be advised that a formal complaint to Judicial Conference of the United States will be made.

There were already 84 felonies committed by Chief Justice Roberts, Harris, Bickel and Atkins in Petitions 17-82 (James Mcmanis's name was concealed later from the docket), 17-256 (James Mcmanis's name was concealed from being a Respondent on the docket), 17-613, 18-344 (James Mcmanis's name was concealed from being a Respondent on the docket), 18-569 (Amicus Curiae motion was purged after May 9, 2019), 18-800 (James Mcmanis's name was concealed from being a Respondent on the docket), 19-613, 20-524 and 21-881. If you persisted on not filing the three matters duly filed on July 24, 2022 and July 28, 2022, that will constitute another 3 felonies of 18 U.S.C.§1506 and §2071.

It will be disingenuous to believe that Chief Justice Roberts as the head of Judicial Conference of the United States will [illegible]shield[illegible] all of you from impeachment. All new felonies committed after I filed the second complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et al.,

2:22-cv-00325 will be in a new lawsuit, if you continue the wrongdoings.

About the irregularities in this Petition No. 22-28, I have contacted Mr. Torrey, the only Legal Counsel of this Court, and Ms. Emily Walker who Clerk Harris assigned to handle my cases on July 27 through August 1 2022.

I talked to Mr. Torrey as he is the only legal counsel to the Supreme Court and should take the responsibility of correcting the court crimes or any violations of the Constitution. Previously he sent me a letter dated April 13, 2022 returning all subpoenaed checks where I would depose the Supreme Court Justices defendants about the subject matters in Shao v. Roberts, et al., 2:22-cv-00325-JAM-AC. On April 19, 2022, I talked to Mr. Torrey and he agreed with me that to stop the depositions he would need to file a motion for protective order. Then on April 20, 2022, Judge John A. Mendez, an officer to Defendant American Inns of Court and Defendant Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court of the American Inns of Court, suddenly dismissed the case with very short order. **It is apparent for the purpose of blocking my First Amendment Right to access the court and to block depositions of the Justices from being taken place.**

Ms. Sarah Simmons succeeded the seat of Deputy Clerk Michael Duggan who handled filings of my cases in the Petitions 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524 and 21-881. At some unknown time, Duggan was retired and replaced with Ms. Simmons. However, my case is removed from Ms. Simmons but to be handled by Emily Walker, who appeared to be an assistant to

Clerk Scott S. Harris, instead of regular deputy clerk.

On January 26, 2022, in the case of Petition No. 21-881 where James McManis is again concealed from being named as a Respondent on the docket, you authorized Ms. Emily Walker to return, de-filed Petition for Writ of Mandamus [28 U.S.C.§1651(a)] against Clerk's Office, Clerk Scott Harris, Jordan "Danny" Bickell and Jeff Atkins, as well as Application to Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett for a stay and transfer the Petition to the Second Circuit Court of Appeal. She alleged that this Court had no jurisdiction, which contradicts Rule 20 and Rule 23 of Supreme Court Rules.

In addition to the two matters returned, de-filed, illegally by Ms. Walker, you had concealed from filing (1) Motion for Judicial Notice, (2) Motion to Transfer from this Court to Second Circuit Court of Appeal, (3) Motion to file the motion to transfer, and (4) all appendix to Request for Recusal. There are totally 7 felonies committed by Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Deputy Clerk Bickel, Deputy Clerk Atkins. **I sent letters to Chief Justice Roberts, Harris, Bickel and Atkins on 2/4/2022 and 2/12/2022**.

In view of your disregard of my letters, I filed a Motion for TRO at Shao v. Roberts, et al. on 2/22/2022 against Roberts, Harris, Bickel and Atkins. Magistrate Judge Allison Claire, even though objected to by me to act in that civil right case, issued an order to deny the motion for TRO, with willful violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and (b)(5)(i) and Judge Mendez even used her to allege blindly that he could be exempt from 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) with concession of undisputed fact that he is an officer of

Defendant Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court of the American Inns of Court Foundation and of Defendant American Inns of Court Foundation.

The same concealment of filings took place in Petition 20-524 where **the December 14, 2020 Order and January 15, 2021 Judgment were even forged and were taken off from the docket three times**. There, you misused your connection with U.S.P.S to intercept the mail for Petition for Rehearing and Second Request for Recusal (Gorsuch and Kavanaugh) in order to block filing of them that was supposed to arrive at this Court on January 8, 2021. You further returned, de-filed Motion to file Petition for Rehearing.

In addition, Mr. Bickel refused to file many Motions for Judicial Notice duly filed in Petitions Nos. 18-344, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524 and 21-881 and Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in Petition No. 17-82 where James McManis is a Respondent. None of the motions were returned. Mr. Bickel talked to me in January 2022 that this Court never filed a motion for judicial notice, which contradicted the filing of Motions for Judicial Notice in Petition No. 14-527 where this Court did file the motion for judicial notice on 12/30/2014.

Now you created a new title of "Case Analyst" for all deputy clerks handling filing. Yet, no matter how you created the title, it is beyond the jurisdiction of the Clerk's Office to review the substance of the matters duly submitted for filing.

After I brought the new lawsuit on 2/22/2022 against Roberts, Harris, Bickel and Atkins, this morning, I saw on the docket of **Petition No. 20-757 an entry "Motion to take Judicial Notice of Timothy Ashford not accepted for filing** (Jan.06,

2011)", which I did not see before on 2/22/2022. According Rule 10(b) of Supreme Court "Guidelines for the Submission of Documents to the Supreme Court's Electronic Filing System" (effective since 11/20/2017), the Clerk's Office is required to enter into the docket any rejection of filing. However, ***none*** **of the aforementioned motions and petitions I filed was entered into the dockets as being rejected from filing as required by Rule 10(b).**

On July 27 and 29, I received two voice mails from Ms. Walkner confirming receipt of the two matters filed on 7/24/2022, i.e., Motion for Judicial Notice as well as Request for Recusal as well as "every filing" which I believe is my Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett that was filed at about 1:20 a.m. on 7/28/2022. I called Ms. Walker on 8/1/2022 asking her **who is the person reviewing the documents but Ms. Walker did not respond**.

I informed Ms. Walker that she missed posting the second page of "Parties to the Proceeding" for Petition 22-28, which is page number "v" as I spoke to her on the phone, for the Petition for Writ of Certiorari that she missed the page from posting; in missing such page from posting, she missed posting the names of Respondents Judges Patricia Lucas, Theodore Zayner, Rise Pichon and Maureen Folan. **Ms. Walker may easily locate that page from the 40 booklets I filed, if she had truly lost the scanning page "v".** That is significant as missing the names of Respondents. **It appeared that Ms. Walker pretended not understand what I meant by stating that the second page for "Parties to the Proceeding" was missing.**

As of today, Ms. Walker had not posted Page "v". Such misrepresentations on the docket have repeatedly done by the Clerk's Office in Petitions 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, 20-524 and 21-881 whereever James Mcmanis is a party.

In filing Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, I enclosed a letter for Ms. Emily Walker dated July 27, 2022. **I informed her on the case laws regarding her ministerial duty to file and that her willful breach of such duty will not be covered by judicial immunity for a 42 U.S.C.§1983 claims as such concealment from filing violates both the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment.** I suspected that Ms. Walker were co-conspiring with the Chief Justice Roberts and Clerk Harris and worked under Clerk Scott Harris according to what she did on January 26, 2022 in illegally returning, de-filed, the Petitions for Writ of Mandate that is authorized by Rule 20 and Application to Justice Barrett that is authorized by Rule 22 and 23. Ms. Walker's phone number is further *different* from other deputy clerks who all have phone numbers of 202479-3xxx. I suspected that she could be related to Susan Walker, supervisor at the Appellate Unit of Santa Clara County Court. Yet, none of you have not responded to me whether Ms. Emily Walker have this conflicts of interest, when she appears to be assigned by you for the sole purpose of handling my Petitions.

As the application to Justice Barrett was properly made based on Rule 23 of Supreme Court Rules and Motions for Judicial Notice were filed by this Court in other cases; for example, Petition 14-257, **both the Application and Motion for Judicial Notice must be filed in Petition 22-28**

but had not been filed after already more than a week's "review".

Requests for Recusal had been filed previously by me in Petitions Nos. 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881. **Please file this Request for Recusal as well as Motion for Judicial Notice and Application to Justice Barrett, without any further delay and postpone the August 8, 2022 conference for Petition for Writ of Certiorari No. 22-28 due to the court's unreasonable delay in filing, which, hopefully, not complete bar from filing to constitutes another 3 felonies of 18 U.S.C.§1506 and §2071.**

Thank you very much for your time and consideration on the letter. Look forward to hearing from you for your corrected actions.

Sincerely,

Yi Tai Shao

Chief Justice Roberts' leading this Court to block Petitioner's fundamental right to seek grievance is demonstrated by the Court's fraudulent blockage of filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett and the Court's reaction to the 8/2/2022 letter-concealment/return the four documents from filing in Petition No. 22-28:

After the letter of 8/2/2022, the Court's reaction demonstrated its conspiracies with James McManis in blocking Petitioner's access to the court trying to get back her child custody:

Block filing of Application to Justice Barrett

(1) Emily Walker, who used the same false[10] ground of lack of jurisdiction to return filings of Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett in Petition 21-881 on 1/26/2022, **returned, de-filed** the Motion for Judicial Notice filed on 7/24/2022, ***after 12 days' "inspection"***, on 8/5/2022, immediately after her signed receipt of 8/2/2022 letter, with the same ground of beyond jurisdiction. The ground is false and fraudulent as 8/2/2022 letter informed them of the court's history of filing motions for judicial notice in Petition 14-527 on Dec. 30, 2014 (see 8/2/2022, App.159) and in 22O129 on July 22, 2003. See the motion for judicial notice in https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDf3Jmx2ugpH1rFJ;
Exhibits JN-1 through JN-8 attached to the Motion: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDqfrJCk9hDSrp9F?e=IaK5ZW

(2) Emily Walker entered the docket of the Request for Recusal of 8 Justices that was filed on 7/24/2022 on or about 8/9/2022, after 15 days' "inspection", but failed to post it until 9/21/2022 when the Appendix was still concealed:
Part1:https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDtP4PAsZqOZZIbg?e=ayQPJh
Part2:https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDxc1karTcTkCJ-T?e=P7x8Aa

---

[10] It is certainly fraudulent to allege the Petition for Writ of Mandate under 28 U.S.C.§1651(a) and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett to be beyond the court's jurisdiction when the Petition is authorized by Rule 20 and Application, Rule 22, of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

(3) On 8/4/2022, immediately upon receipt of the letter by Chief Justice Roberts, Lorie Wood (Atty) returned de-filed Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret filed on 7/28/2022 (see supra) with the excuse that the Application needs to state jurisdiction and to identify opinions, in violation of Rule 22.1; see the Application returned in:
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDmJQYUV15TTb2cW?e=JI8rkI

(4) After Petitioner spent 3 weeks in modifying the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett to satisfy the requirement by Lorie Wood despite her requirement was made without jurisdiction of the Clerk's office and violating the Clerk's ministerial duty to file, **the court's intent to block filing of the application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, which is the only way Petitioner may get fair decision became crystally clear on** Robert Meek's fraudulent return on 8/24/2022 where Meek hided his identity as an attorney for Emergency Relief Application at the Court, lied that the Application was the same as that was returned by Lorie Wood and avoided phone call of Petitioner; see his letter supra. See the re-submitted Application in Part 1 (Application plus exhibits A through E:
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTwMgS4np4jvYNkl554j?e=105dAy;
Part II including Exhibits F through K in
https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArYtZQIfQTwMgS83fCI2VpzGeUbM?e=x6YLHk

(1) Petitioner resubmitted the Motion for Judicial Notice as the ground of beyond jurisdiction stated in

Emily Walker's letter of 8/5/2022 is false; Emily Walker immediately returned on 9/8/2022, persistent on maintaining the same false ground. See her letter of 9/28/2022 supra.

(2) Petitioner resubmitted the same Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett as Robert Meek's letter of 8/24/2022 is illegal and not true; Robert Meek again returned with the same false ground on 9/7/2022. See his second 9/7/2022 letter, supra.

(3) On 9/15/2022, Petitioner filed a Supplement to the Request for Recusal (link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgQj6SBU0fanmk3fU?e=HLC86c). Emily Walker eventually posted it on 9/21/2022 but concealed the Appendix. Petitioner notified Emily Walker on 9/16/2022 of such filing.

On 9/19/2022, Ms. Walker, Ms. Atkins, Scott Harris, Chief Justice Roberts and Supreme Court's Legal Counsel Ethan Torrey were informed of the fact that the Supplement was not entered into the docket and the Request for Recusal filed on 7/24/2022 as well as concealment from publication of Page v. The body of the RR and Supplement to RR were published on 9/21/2022, but the Appendixes are still concealed.

1. **8/4/2022 letter of Laurie Wood, a Case Management Staff attorney, summoned by Chief Justice to withheld the Application for 6 days, after 8/2/2022 letter (supra), returning the Application filed on 7/28/2022 by acting beyond the jurisdiction of the clerk's office, in an effort to block filing, in disregard of child safety issues involved and disregarded Rule 22.1 requires her to immediately give the Application to Justice Barrett. Laurie Wood refused to answer phone call, nor responding to Petitioner's phone call.**

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

August 4, 2022

Yi Tai Shao P.O. Box280; Big Pool, MD 21711

RE: **"Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett for immediate stay, emergency relief, and/or change of venue"**

Dear Ms. Shao:

Your application for immediate stay, emergency relief, and/or change of venue received July 29, 2022 is herewith returned for the following reason(s):

You failed to comply with Rule 23.3 of the Rules of this Court which requires that you first seek the same relief in the appropriate lower courts and attach copies of the orders from the lower courts to your application filed in this Court.

You failed to identify the judgment you are asking the Court to review and to attach a copy of the order or opinion as required by Rule 23.3 of this Court's Rules.

In accordance with Rule 23.3 of this Court's Rules you must set forth with particularity why relief is not available from any other court and why a stay is justified.

You are required to state the grounds upon which this Court's jurisdiction is invoked, with citation of the statutory provision.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By Laurie Wood (202)479-3031

---

2. **8/24/2022 Letter of Robert Meek showed this Court's intent to block filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, to avoid an impartial decision, in order to block Petitioner's access to the court to seek relief to get back her child custody. On the same date of Meet's letter, the court set the Petition 22-28 on Conference.**

Robert Meek, who **also concealed him being an Emergency Application Attorney,** promptly returned on 8/24/2022, **beyond the jurisdiction of the Clerk's office,** willfully stated that the Application resubmitted on 8/23/2022 was the same as what was returned by Laurie Wood. The 8/23/2022 Application is significantly different from the one filed on 7/28/2022 and satisfied all requirements by Ms. Wood: :https://1drv.ms/b/s!ApQcXu9BWrwphDmJQYUV15TTb2cW?e=JI8rkI.

It is obvious for this Court's trying to manipulate their common scheme of injustice summary denial in disregard of the imminent child safety issue, with clear intent to block the matter to be in front of Justice Amy Coney Barrett, the only justice that was not influenced by James Mcmanis.

It is an obvious violation of Rule 22.1 as well as violation of the Clerk's Office's ministerial duty to file.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001
August 24, 2022
Yi Tai Shao P.O. Box 280 Big Pool, MD 21711
RE: **Application to Justice Barrett**
Dear Ms. Shao:
Your application to Justice Barrett received August 24, 2022 is herewith returned for the following reason(s):
You application appears to be duplicative of your July 24, 2022, as the relief you request is to have Justice Barrett decide whether to grant your petition for certiorari.

Your request for recusal has been docketed and thus this application is moot.

Furthermore, an application to an individual justice is not the proper filing to request recusal on a pending petition for certiorari.

For any relief that you have requested that does not deal with requested recusals in case number 22-28, this Court is **without jurisdiction** to reconsider denied petitions after the period for reconsideration has ended.

Your papers are returned.
Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By: Robert Meek (202) 479-3027

3. **Refusal to respond to emails: Robert Meek, Laurie Wood conspired with Chief Justice Roberts and Clerk Scott S. Harris to block Petitioner's First Amendment Right to Access the Court by willfully blocking filing of the Application in this Petition 22-28 beyond the jurisdiction of a clerk in repeated violation of Rule 22.1 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States and ignored Petitioner's emails based on voice recording of Robert Meek**

From: attorneyshao@aol.com,
To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov
Subject: Your return de-filed my Application in Petition 22-28
Date: Fri, Aug 26, 2022 11:51 am
Attachments:
16615290308085832431001840870787.jpg (2306K) **[attaching Robert Meek's letter in App.182-183, above]**

Dear Mr. Meek

I received your illegal return of my duly prepared application. Your letter is attached to this email.

As acting on behalf of Clerk Scott Harris, **you know the Clerk's Office is not allowed to rule on the substance of a submission** but has the ministerial duty to file a document satisfying all formalities.

Laurie Wood, Esq. returned my Application by pointing out that there is missing parts for Jurisdiction. She never said that I was not allowed to file an Application as such would be illegal. Therefore, I modified and re-submitted the Application.

She never said that an Application is disallowed. Your letter of August 24, 2022 directly conflicts Rule 22, and violated Rule 22.1.

I called you at about 11:16 am on 8/26/2022. You did not pick up the phone. As I could not leave a voice mail, I called again which I believe you picked up at the 4th ring, yet you were silent. I recorded my talking to you. You remained silent thought my talking.

You have conspired with Chief Justice to block filing of my Application which is not only a violation of the First Amendment but a felony of 18 USC sections 1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001, 371.

As an attorney for Emergency Application, you knew or should have known that you must enter into the docket of your rejection of filing.

Instead, you concealed the filing. You knew your behavior was a felony and therefore would not talk to me. I am sending you this email giving you a chance if correction of your illegal act.

If you do not want any further legal actions against you, please respond if you will allow filing. You owed me my 4 hours' trip to the Supreme Court, my time worthy of thousands of dollars and willfully ignoring the risk of imminent hard to my daughter. You will be held against all resulting damages.

Look forward to hearing from you before I pursue a formal action(s) against you.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao, SHAO LAW FIRM, PC 4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100 Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888 **attorneyshao@aol.com**

The same email to Mr. Meek including his letter, was forwarded to Chief Justice John G. Roberts, and Clerk Scott S. Harris two minutes later.

From: attorneyshao@aol.com,
To: jroberts@supremecourt.gov,
sharris@supremecourt.gov,
Subject: Fw: Your return defiled my Application in Petition 22-28
Date: Fri, Aug 26, 2022 11:53 am
Attachments:
16615290308085832431001840870787.jpg (2306K)

New email at 12:34 p.m. on 8/26/2022 to Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Ms. Laurie Wood, and Mr. Robert Meek
From: attorneyshao@aol.com,
To: jroberts@supremecourt.gov,
sharris@supremecourt.gov,
jatkins@supremecourt.gov,
ewalker@supremecourt.gov,
Cc: rmeek@supremecourt.gov,
lwood@supremecourt.gov,
Subject: Re: Your return defiled my Application in Petition 22-28
Date: Fri, Aug 26, 2022 12:34 pm
Attachments: 20220826_120929.jpg (2688K)
Dear Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Ms Wood

Attached please find my letter dated August 22, 2022 in refiling my Application modified from the one Ms. Wood returned on August 4, 2022.

Based on attorney Meek's returning and the fact that you backdated your sending the Petition 22-28 for conference, Attorney Wood was used by you in conspiracy to block filing of my Application to Justice Barrett, when you used her to try to find fault in returning my filing. In

fact her intent was to block filing as expressed in Mr. Meet's letter.

As the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, you had authorized 87 felonies of the US Supreme Court to block filing, conceal filing and alter the dockets.

It is obvious that you received my letter of August 2, 2022, but Chief Justice was able to influence the USPS in not signing back the returned receipt.

Any reasonable person will believe the mail interception incident on 8/8/2021 to deter filing of my Petition for Rehearing and Second Request for Recusal in response to 12/14/2020 order of Petition 20-524 was done by you the Chief Justice.

You are involving more attorneys in your systematic crimes of blocking filings and prejudicing my First Amendment right to seek grievance with the court.

Were you the person drafting or authorizing 12/14/2020 order? Who took it off from the docket of 20-524 on January 12, 2021? Who took the 1/15/2021 judgment off twice from the docket of 20-524?
Was that all done by you?
You are giving warning that I will pursue criminally for this systematic large amount of court crimes led by you as well as your co-conspirators.

Not only you blocked my access to the court, in conspiracy with James McManus, you have committed 87 felonies of 18 USC sections 1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371.

You conspired with Mr.Meek to illegally return my Application duly filled in 22-28 in

outright violation of Rule 22 of the Rules of The Supreme Court of the United States.

Please notify me not later than End of August 26, 2022 if you will correct such illegal act and allow filing of the Application that I had modified after receipt of Ms Wood's letter and submitted in early morning of 8/23/2022.

Thank you all for your attention.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
Shao Law Firm, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

4th email to Mr. Robert Meek, Clark Scott S. Harris, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jeff Atkins, Laurie Wood at 2:27 p.m. of 8/26/2022

From: attorneyshao@aol.com, To:
rmeek@supremecourt.gov,
sharris@supremecourt.gov,
jroberts@supremecourt.gov,
jatkins@supremecourt.gov, lwood@supremecourt.gov,
Subject: Re: Your return defiled my Application in Petition 22-28
Date: Fri, Aug 26, 2022 2:27 pm

My resubmitted Application on 8/23/2022 is substantially different from the one returned by Ms Wood (filed on 7/28/2022). I believe you should have a scanned copy of the Application.

As I have given you the legal authorities at least 5 times, the Clerk's Office has a ministerial duty to file and breach of the duty in concealment of filing violates the First Amendment and Due Process, and the individual clerk, especially attorneys, are NOT

immune from judicial immunity for a civil right lawsuit of 42 U.S.C.1983.

This is to urge you not to commit the 87th felony of willful violation of 18 U.S.C sections 1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371. If you persisted on rejection of filing, you must enter into the docket of Petition 22-28 about your rejection of filing of something and post your rejection letter. You cannot just surreptitiously fabricate non-existence of the action that I spent at least a week of my time of preparing.

Again, if you will not make correction by end of today, I will pursue full length of all recourses against each of you. Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100 Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888 **attorneyshao@aol.com**

4. **Meek's 8/24/2022 return after receiving Petitioner's cover letter dated 8/22/2022 to Laurie Wood which demonstrated Meek's knowledge that the Application involves issue of imminent child safety:**

8/22/2022 Stamped receipt on 8/23/2022 1:20 a.m.

Via hand delivery
Lori Wood, Esq.
Clerk's Office
US Supreme Court
1 First St., NE
Washington, DC 20543

Re: Re-submission of Application to Justice Barrett in Petition 22-22

Dear Ms. Wood

Please be noticed that **you are required to promptly give this application to Justice**

Barrett and not act as a screener for Clerk or Chief Justice in order to block my fundamental right to access the court. I left a voice mail to you on 8/16/2022 when I received your quiet return. My voice mail was cut off somehow, not by me. It was recorded.

I have provided more than enough information satisfying all requirement. Please file and post the entire paper, including all appendix to the docket of Petition 22-28 without any delay.

My daughter's life is at jeopardy due to her father's dangerous mental illness. Please do not delay, when you already have a duty to "promptly" deliver to Justice Barrett.

Enclosed please find one original and two copies.

If you have any questions, please call me at (408) 873-3888.

Sincerely yours,

Yi Tai Shao

[forwarded again 8/26/2022 11:51 a.m. email to Mr. Robert Meek]

5. **On 9/5/2022, Petitioner re-submitted the same Application wrongfully returned on 8/24/2022 with a letter to Robert Meek and emails following up**

Robert Meek Emergency Application Attorney
Clerk's Office US Supreme Court 1 First Street N.E.
Washington, DC 21711
rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Subject: **Re-file of my Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret in Petition 22-28 due to your wrongful return on August 24, 2022**

Dear Mr. Meek: You have received 4 emails of mine on August 26, 2022 in response to your illegal return of my Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett

properly made based on Rule 22 and 20. While you concealed your identity as an attorney, you were acting on behalf of the Clerk's Office, then you have a ministerial duty to file.

As I wrote to you on August 26, 2022, at 11:51 a.m., your return on August 24, 2022 is an illegal act in violation of the First Amendment, Due Process Clause of the Constitution, Rule 22.1 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is well beyond the role of the Clerk's Office to determine the substance of an Application, instead, you have a duty to immediately submit that to Justice Amy Coney Barrett. You should not and are not permitted to block my reasonable access to the Court, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution.

I modified significantly the Application pursuant to the comments of Laurie Wood, Esq. She never said that I was not allowed to file an Application as an Application to a Justice is expressly prescribed in Rule 22.

You saw the cover letter I gave Ms. Wood but still willfully returned and further set the case to Conference. I called you at about 11:16 am on 8/26/2022. You did not pick up the phone. As I could not leave a voice mail, I called again which you picked up at the 4th ring, yet you were silent. I recorded my talking to you. You remained silent thought my talking.

I believe you are fully aware of 18 U.S.C. §1001 and §371,¶1 for conspiracy to disrupt the normal function of a government unit. Clerk's Office is a government Unit. Your conspiracy with Chief Justice Roberts and Clerk Harris to block filing based on unreasonable ground was a crime.

Moreover, **you have concealed from filing by failing to enter into the docket that you rejected for filing of the Application**, as required by #10 of Guidelines for Electronic Submission to the Supreme Court's Website. Rejection for filing must be noted on the docket if you persist on rejection. Concealment of filing is not only a violation of the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause, but also a felony of 18 USC sections 1506, 1512(c), 2071(b), 1001, 371. My daughter's safety is at issue.

You cannot disregard my civil right to have reasonable access to the court to unilaterally block filing of my Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret. I hereby re-submit, taking my time of driving 4 hours due to your lack of response to my accusations of your criminal act on August 24, 2022 in returning the Application. I demand you to file and post completely to the docket of Petition 22-28.

You know I have a right to sue you for damages as your act is not covered by judicial immunity when you were acting as if you were a deputy clerk.

You have never returned my calls nor emails. Please contact me if you have any questions not to file the Application that has been modified to satisfied all requirements of Ms. Wood. One original and two sets are re-filed.

Sincerely, Yi Tai Shao (408) 873-3888

6. **With clear knowledge that Petitioner was asking for immediate child custody release based on imminent risk of harm to the minor, Meek still returned Application to Justice Barrett.**

From: Attorney Shao, Yi-Tai
attorneyshao@aol.comHide

rmeek@supremecourt.gov,
sharris@supremecourt.gov,
To jroberts@supremecourt.gov,
jatkins@supremecourt.gov,
lwood@supremecourt.gov

Dear Mr. Meek

Please respond. I checked with the docket today, 9/8/2022, already 3 days passed but you had not complied with Rule 22.1 and still concealed filing.

Please be reminded that delay in filing constitutes violation of due process. E.g., Critchley v. Thaler, 586 F.3d 318 (5th Cir. 2009), Wickware v. Thaler, 404 Fed.Appx.856, 862 (2010).

I encourage you to cease commission with the already 157 felonies of 18 USC Sections 1506, 1513(c), 2071(b), 1001 and 371.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

On Wednesday, September 7, 2022, 03:13:49 PM EDT, Attorney Shao, Yi-Tai <attorneyshao@aol.com> wrote:

This noon, 9/7/2022, I called you leaving a voice mail to check in the status of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett.

There is a request for immediate release my child's custody as she has been confined to illegal child custody and she has been suffering imminent risk of harm as her father Tsan-Kuen has dangerous mental illness.

This fact has never been disputed since discovery in the past 8 years.

But for judicial conspiracies, she would have been released to have a freedom life.

Please respond. I have not heard any from you regarding my 4 emails and voice mail to you dated 8/26/2022 as well as the voice mail today on 9/7/2022.

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

On Tuesday, **September 6, 2022, 09:27:59** PM EDT, Attorney Shao, Yi-Tai <attorneyshao@aol.com> wrote:

Mr Meek,

Have not heard from you after sending you four emails. Yesterday I resubmitted the same Application that you illegally returned on 8/24/2022. I believe you have received the same. **Please send to Justice Amy Coney Barrett immediately pursuant to Rule 22 without any more delay as imminent child safety is at issue.**

Attorney Yi-Tai Shao
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
4900 Hopyard Road, Ste. 100
Pleasanton, CA 94588
Telephone: (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com

7. **Robert Meet's 9/7/2022 letter persistently on blocking filing of the Application to Justice Barrett:**

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

September 7, 2022
Yi Tai Shao
P.O. Box 280
Big Pool, MD 21711
RE: Application to Justice Barrett
Dear Ms. Shao:
As you have made no effort to correct any of the deficiencies noted in this Court's August, 24, 2022 letter, your papers are again returned.
A copy of the August 24, 2022 letter is enclosed.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris
By: Robert Meek (202) 479-3027

Block filing of "Motion for Judicial Notice"

8. **Illegal blocking filing of "Motion for Judicial Notice" with false excuse of "without jurisdiction" in violation of due process and First Amendment right to access the Court when the court had accepted filing of a motion for judicial notice in at least two other cases: 8/5/2022 letter issued after receipt of 8/2/2022 letter.**

This Court had filed a motion for judicial notice in Petition 14-527 on Dec. 30, 2014 and in 22O129 on July 22, 2003, which proved this Court simply blocked Petitioner's right to access the court. Ms. Walker used the same false excuse of without jurisdiction to block Petitioner's filings of Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Barrett that were filed in 21-881.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001
August 5, 2022
Yi Tai Shao P.O. Box 280 Big Pool, MD 21711
RE: "Motion for Judicial Notice"
Dear Ms. Shao:

In reply to your letter or submission, hand delivered on July 24, 2022, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.

Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court. Your papers are herewith returned.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk,By /s/Emily Walker

---

9. **9/5/2022 letter to Emily Walker with re-submission of Motion for Judicial notice.[FILED ON 9/5/2022]**

Emily Walker
Clerk's Office
US Supreme Court
1 First Street N.E.
Washington, DC 21711
ewalker@supremecourt.gov

Subject: Petition No. 22-28: Re-filing Motion for Judicial Notice which your wrongful returned on August 24, 2022

Dear Ms. Emily:

Re-filing of Motion for Judicial Notice that should have been filed on 7/24/2022 but illegally returned

Enclosed please find one original (I re-signed so that you may have original signature) and two sets of Motion for Judicial Notice duly filed and served on or about July 24, 2022, which you withheld for about 12 days and quietly returned by mailing to me on August 5, 2022, in disregard of many of my phone calls inquiry of the filing status due to your lengthy withholding from filing. I was made known your return only a week later.

I refile it as you were wrong in returning the motion for judicial notice. The motion is well within this Court's jurisdiction. Not only a motion is permissible by the Rules, but in fact, this Court had accepted for filing multiple times of a motion for judicial notice. For example, Petition 14-527. As

this Motion is referred to in Request for Recusal and necessary to be considered as part of the Request for Recusal, I hereby re-submit the same motion for judicial notice. Enclosed please also find a proof of service submitted before and I added my original signature. Also a copy of the Certificate of Word Count submitted before; I hereby re-notarize it as I could not find the original.

As I have informed you many times, you cannot return a properly filed motion that is within this Court's jurisdiction. Your repeated returning have severely infringed my fundamental right to access the court as guaranteed by the First Amendment of Constitution and further violates due process as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment. E.g., Critchley v. Thaler, 586 F.3d 318 (5th Cir. 2009); Wickware v. Thaler, 404 Fed.Appx.856, 862 (5th Cir. 2010).

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). Concealing records is not covered by any immunity. Lowe v. Letsinger, 772 F.2d 308 (7th Cir.1985)

Moreover, as I have informed you many times, as the courts records are public records, the concealment of filing is a felony in every jurisdiction throughout the United States. For federal courts, the penal statutes are 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(c), 2071(b). As since 2017, this Court has committed 157 felonies of the same crimes of concealment of filing, alterations of dockets, forging court records and even orders (20-524), your behaviors in 21-881 and 22-28 and my appeal from DC Circuit case 21-5210 are part of the systematic court crimes led by Chief Justice

John G. Roberts, Jr. Therefore, there are two additional statutes applicable to your illegal acts: 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and 371, Paragraph 1.

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Clerk Scott S. Harris, Jeff Atkins and Jordan Danny Bickel are already at default in one of my lawsuits. They could hardly be shielded from criminal prosecutions. I encourage you to not join their systematic court crimes having already accumulated 157 incidents.

With this letter, I ask you to file the Motion for Judicial Notice without any further delay. If you persisted on not following the laws and blocked my filings, please be sure that your name will be on the public record in the very near future.

There is another problem associated with your prior illegal return of my Motion for Judicial Notice in that you failed to enter into the docket that my motion for judicial notice was not accepted for filing. It is required by Supreme Court's Guideline For Submission #10, that you must post on the docket if a document is not accepted for filing. There are 100 records presently available on the court's website that this Court entered into the dockets on the submissions that were not accepted for filing. For example, 22A184, 21-1271, 20-882, and 20-757.

Your discriminative concealment of Request for Recusal duly filed.

Despite of my numerous requests by phone as well as by letters on August 2, 2022, you persisted on not to post on the docket the filed records of Request for Recusal for Petition 22-28.

You withheld from filing of the Request for Recusal for about 2 weeks then eventually entered into the docket of filing of Request for Recusal on July 24, 2022. Yet you failed to post the document on the

Court's website. You were aware that all records of the courts are public records and the local rule requires all records filed to be posted on the court's website.

In the past 5 years, Jeff Atkins at least will post the Request for Recusal while he concealed the Appendix. This time, you concealed the entire Request for Recusal from being posted. This is equivalent to concealment of filing, not only this will cause you to have civil liability under 42 U.S.C. §1983, but also a felonious act in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 1506, 1512(c), 2071, 1001, and 371.

You used the same frivolous ground of lack of jurisdiction in illegally blocking my three filings of Petition for Writ of Mandate and two Applications to Justice Amy Coney Barrett in Petition 21-881

Your blocking my fundamental right to access this Court is recurring as you have done the same in fraudulently returning de-filing my Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett duly filed in Petition 21-881 on January 26, 2022. You concealed the Second Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett filed on March 30, 2022 from filing, nor returning. You also failed to enter into the docket about your returning the filed records.

While Petition for Writ of Mandate based on 28 U.S.C.§1651(a) is stated in Rule 20 and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, in Rule 22, you used the same ground of beyond this Court's jurisdiction in returning my Motion for Judicial Notice duly filed in Petition 22-28. It appears that you know the ground is frivolous but you just wanted

to block filing so you created such a false ground to return.

In both your letters of January 26, 2022 and August 5, 2022, you presented the frivolous ground of beyond this Court's jurisdiction by stating:
"Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court."
Your grounds on these returns are all fraudulent as each of them was authorized by the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States. Your return of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret in Petition 21-881 conflicts with Rule 20 and Rule 22 of the Rules of Supreme Court of the United States. Your return of Petition for Writ of Mandate based on 28 U.S.C.1651(a) filed in Petition 21-881, conflicts with Rule 20. Your return of the Motion for Judicial Notice in 22-28 is frivolous as well as I had informed you at least three times that this Court had accepted for filing the other Motions for Judicial Notice.

I believe your returns of duly filed matters were in conspiracies with Clerk Scott Harris, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, two supervising Deputy Clerks, Jeff Atkins and Jordan Danny Bickel, Legal Counsel Ethan Torrey, Attorney Laurie Wood and Attorney Robert Meek.

You have discriminated against me in blocking filing, which is an act blocking my access to the court. It is a sham for you to work at the US Supreme Court but willfully violated the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and even violated federal penal

statutes, in conspiracy to block my reasonable access to the Court by discriminatively returning filings, blocking filings or conceal filings.

As I have informed you in two letters dated August 2, 2022, your return de-filing my Motion for Judicial Notice not only violated the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause of the Constitution, and local Rules, but also constituted systematic violation of 18 U.S.C.§§1506, 1512(c), 2071,1001 and 371, ¶1.

Your concealment the names of Respondents by persistent in concealing from posting on the court's website page v, which is the second page of "Parties in the proceeding" for Petition 22-28.

Moreover, I have communicated about five times of your concealment of posting page v. of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari No. 22-28, since early July. You have 40 booklets of Petition 22-28 that you may easily refer to about page v, but you persisted on concealing from posting the second page of the "Parties in the proceeding" which contains the names of Respondents Judge Patricia Lucas, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, Judge Rise Pichon and Judge Maureen A. Folan who worked for James McManis in causing 11 years' lengthy parental deprival after the initial unconstitutional orders of 8/4/2010 and 8/5/2010 were set aside.

Your refusal to post the names of all Respondents affect the integrity of the court records and docket of Petition No.22-28, is another violation of 18 U.S.C.§§1506, 1512(c), 2071, 1001 and 371, ¶1.

I hereby re-submit, give you last chance to file and post completely to the docket of Petition 22-28

my Motion for Judicial Notice. You know I have a right to sue you for damages under 42 U.S.C.§1983 as your act is not covered by judicial immunity. See, Lowe v. Letsinger, supra. Please file the entire Motion without any further delay. Please also post Page v. of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in 22-28. Your anticipated cooperation will be greatly appreciated.
Sincerely,
Yi Tai Shao, Esq.
(408) 873-3888
CC: all respondents in Petition No.22-28

10. **Emily Walker 9/8/2022 letter repeatedly returning Motion for Judicial Notice**

RE: "Re-filing of Motion for Judicial Notice that Should Have Been Filed on 7/24/2022 but Illegally Returned"
Dear Ms. Shao:
In reply to your letter or submission, originally received on July 24, 2022, was received again on September 7, 2022, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.
Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court.
Your papers are herewith returned.
Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk,
By /s/Emily Walker

XXXI. Emily Walker illegally returned Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Barrett in 21-881 with the same false ground of without jurisdiction, that are inconsistent with Rule 20 and Rule 22 of this Court.

January 26, 2022
Yi Tai Shao
P.O. Box 280
Big Pool, MD 21711
RE: "Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett to Stay the Proceeding of Petition for Writ of Certiorari and Issue Writ of Mandate..." and "Petition for Writ of Mandate"
Dear Ms. Shao:
In reply to your letter or submission, received January 26, 2022, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.
Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court.
Your papers are herewith returned.
Your two checks, each in the amount of $300, are herewith returned.
Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk,
By /s/Emily Walker
(202) 479-5955

XXXII. Emily Walker's 8/18/2022 letter proved that her returning filing of Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Barrett in Petition 21-881 with the ground of beyond jurisdiciton as shown in her 1/26/2022 letter (App.231, above)was fraudulent as her 8/18/2022 letter acknowledged the 1651(a) Petition for Writ of Mandate was indeed within this Court's jurisdiction.

==========

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001
August 18, 2022
Yi Tai Shao P.O. Box 280 Big Pool, MD 21711
RE: "Petition for Writ of Mandamus [Rule 20; 28 u.s.c. section 1651(a)], or, Petition for Writ of Certiorari with Motion for Extension to Justice Amy Coney Barrett Pursuant to Rule 30, Rule 20 Rule 22 under the Most Extraordinary Circumstances
To Justice Amy Coney Barrett" USAPDC No.21-5210
Dear Ms. Shao:

Your submission related to the above-entitled matter was hand delivered on August 12, 2022 and is returned here within.

The petition for a writ of certiorari and application for extension of time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari are out-of-time. The date of the lower court judgment or order denying a timely petition for rehearing was May 9, 2022. Therefore,

the petition was due on or before August 7, 2022. Rule 13.1, 29.2 and 30.1. When the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in a civil case (habeas action included) has expired, the Court no longer has the power to review the petition or consider an application of extension.

If you wish to file a petition for an extraordinary writ of mandamus, **you may do so in compliance with Rule 20 and all applicable Rules of the Court.** The petition for a writ of mandamus may not be combined with any other filing. The Rules of this Court make no provision for the filing of a petition for an extraordinary writ addressed to an individual Justice. Statutory language notwithstanding, the Rules distinguish between applications to individual Justices and petitions to the Court. The sole mechanism established by the Rules by which to seek issuance of a writ authorized by 28 U.S.C.§1651(a), §2241, or §2254(a), is Rule 20, and such petitions are reviewed by the full Court, not by an individual Justice. Your check in the amount of $300 is returned here within.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk,
By /s/Emily Walk

XXXIII. 177 felonious acts of the US Supreme Court until 9/20/2022

# of acts	Case No.	incidents	
4	11-11119	18 U.S.C §1001&§371,1 Conspiracy with Tani, McManis,Justice Kennedy, Chief Justice Roberts to summarily deny relief to return child custody to Petitioner in 10/1/2012 and 12/3/2012 orders	
10	14-7244 &14A 677	18 U.S.C §1001&§371,1 Conspiracy with Tani, McManis, Kennedy to summarily deny both Petition and Application 14A677 on 12/23/2014, 1/26/2015, 2/23/2015 and 4/25/2015, with conspiracy **not to decide** "Motion to defer consideration of the Petition for Rehearing based on evidence of mental illness of Wang. (5 acts plus 5 conspiracies)	
2	16A 863	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 *and* removed from the docket the name of James McManis as a respondent (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C.	Conspired with James McManis to block filing

		§1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	and concealed filing of Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children ***twice;*** 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 *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	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,	Conspired with James McManis and Concealed from the docket the name

		§1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	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), §1001 & §371,¶1	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)
		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 misreprsented 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 petition for rehearing, (3)&(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. Conspired not to post on the docket of the rejections of filing. (6 acts)
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),	Concealed and blocked filing of (1)motion to transfer,(2)motion for judicial notice, (3) motion to file motion to transfer,

		§1001 & §371,¶1	(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)
21	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 **conceal posting Respondents' names shown on Page v. of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari,** 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. (2 act)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	**Conspired and Concealed filing of Request for Recusal** 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 ***beyond the ministerial duty*** **to file of the Clerk's Office,** violated Rule 22.1 wilfully and returned on 8/4/2022, after withholding 6 days, the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett; further **refused to enter into the docket of the rejection of filing** (3 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c),	Emergency Application attorney Robert Meek conspired with Roberts, Harris, Atkins, Bickell to

		§2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	illegally block filing of Application to Justice Amy Barrett **on 8/24/2022 and again on 9/7/2022** 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.(4 acts) ========== Refused to enter into the docket of such rejections of filing (2 acts)
		18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	After withholding 12 days from filing, in conspiracy, Emily Walker returned, de-filed a motion for judicial notice on 8/5/2022, 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 cases); and further refused to enter into the docket of rejection of filing (3 acts); Petitioner resubmitted which she

			returned with the same false notice on 9/8/2022, and further failed to docket not acceptance of filing **with clear intent to block access to the court and conceal filing**. (3 additional acts)
		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 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 acts)
4	21-5210 appeal With case number to	18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371,¶1	Conspired and return in willful violation of Rule 22.1, because (1) Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Petition for Writ of Certiorari, and (2) Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett for

	be assig ned		extension and other relief; the two grounds are not supported by any legal authorities and are in violation of Rule 30 (Petitioner had provided the 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)