

22-5064

No. 2021-971

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 15 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

Mount Sinai Beth Israel

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

State of New York Court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy

(Your Name)

6505 Winfield Blvd, APT. B11

(Address)

Margate, FL 33063

(City, State, Zip Code)

(954) 661-7110

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The original motion uploaded and filed is:

**DervannatroymckoyvMountsinaibethisrael-app-
Dervannatroymckoy -mot-ATTACHMENT**

presented for consideration for relief contain the **fraudulent signature on page 5 (& Appendix D)** above Petitioner's name (Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy) of which Respondent purporting as Petitioner's signature.

This document also contains the Supreme Court of the State of New York decision on **page 6 (& Appendix B)**, indicating that the court did not reviewed Petitioner's complain containing the fraudulent signature of which Petitioner sought relief.

Page 4, Appendix F of Broward Health informed Petitioner of a series of criminal's fraud against Petitioner's **name, address, and medical records**. Therefore, this fraudulent signature was deliberately and maliciously orchestrated by Respondent against Petitioner

Question:

Is it only when a Judge's signature is forged is consider a crime against the Petitioner? (**Reference page 8, APPENDIX F**).

Petitioner also reference the time-barred case of Diaconu v. Cnty. of Franklin that the court consider fraud, and or forgery serious offences (**paragraph 11**) committed by the perpetrator against whom relief is sought.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

Rules of the **Supreme Court of the United States**—
Adopted April 18, 2019--Effective July 1, 2019

Part III. Jurisdiction on Writ of Certiorari

Rule 10

Considerations Governing Review on certiorari

Rule 12

Review on Certiorari: How Sought; Parties

§1, §2, §3, §6, §7

Rule 13

Review on Certiorari: Time for Petitioning

- 1) Petitioners have 90 days from date on entry of March 22, 2022 to appeal

And §2, §3

Part V. motions and Applications

Rule 21

Motion to the Court

- 1) "Every motion to the Court shall clearly state its purpose and the facts on which it is base and may present legal argument in support thereof.
No separate brief may be filed...."

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was March 22, 2022.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

LIST OF PARTIES

~~X~~ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

Cases With Consistent Signatures of
Petitioner:

#17-8207 Dervanna A. Troy-McKay
VS.
University of Illinois

19-8316 Deivanna A.A. Troy-McKoy
vs.
New York City Department of
Parks and Recreation

20-7117 Dervanna H.A. Troy-M4Koy
US.
Mount Sinai Beth Israel

APPENDIX E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	States of New York Court of Appeals
APPENDIX B	Supreme Court of the State of New York New York County
APPENDIX C	Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division, First Department
APPENDIX D	Contain Fraudulent Signature
APPENDIX E	List of Petitioner's Signatures
APPENDIX F	Crime against Petitioner

Appendix G: Uploaded Document to
State of New York
Court of Appeals

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

JURISDICTION

The **jurisdiction** of the **Supreme Court of the United States** is invoked under **28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)**

For resolving cases arising from state courts

Statement of the Case

The uploaded document:

**DervannatroymckoyvMountsinaibethisrael-app-
Dervannatroymckoy -mot-ATTACHMENT**

Filed in New York Appeals Court contain Petitioner's contention of the fraudulent signature (**page 5**) and **APPENDIX D** that the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York county acted prejudicial against Petitioner as clearly indicated by the decision (**page 6**) and attach **APPENDIX B**, that the Supreme Court of the State of New York did not read Petitioner's complaint for which Respondent falsely attach a signature against Petitioner name (**Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy**) and destroyed Petitioner's reputation, internationally.

This prejudice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York was accelerated by granting Respondent motion to dismissed Petitioner.

Again, New York Appeals Court acted prejudicial and reinforced its prejudice and bias against Petitioner by denied Petitioner (**APPENDIX A**).

As the learned Supreme Court of the United States do not require a separate brief, as indicated:

Part V. motions and Applications

(\$21 000 000)=

=Six hundred and one million dollars

(\$601 000 000) relief

Therefore, Petitioner asking the Supreme Court of the United States to grant petitioner relief of

Six hundred and one million dollars **(\$601 000 000) relief**

And any other relief the Court deem just.

REASON FOR GRANTING PETITION

As presented under **Statement of the Case** the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County acted prejudicial against Petitioner and did not read Petitioner's motion of complaint (Appendix B) for which Respondent falsely attach a signature (Appendix D) against Petitioner name (**Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy**) and destroyed Petitioner's reputation, internationally.

These prejudice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York was accelerated by granting Respondent motion to dismissed Petitioner.

- 1) These prejudices were reinforced by both the State of New York Appellate Division, First Department (Appendix C), and by
- 2) New York Court of Appeals (Appendix A) further reinforced their prejudice and bias against Petitioner and thus, magnified these damages against Petitioner.

These malicious acts of these court constitute negligence against Petitioner that violates Petitioner's civil rights to bring an action before the court/s seeking humanitarian resolutions, are denied.

Therefore, in addition to the forgoing argument, Petitioner also reference **APPENDIX F** (Crime against Petitioner never investigated) for consideration

Petitioner pray that the
Supreme Court of the United States
renew petitioner's writ of Certiorari and
grant petitioner:
\$ 601 000 000.00 and any other
relief the Court deem just.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy
~~Dervanna H.A. Troy-McKoy~~

Date: June 15, 2022