

No. # 22-5358

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES L. MILLER,

PETITIONER

VS.

SCOTT S. HARRIS, INDIVIDUALLY & OFFICIAL
CAPACITY, et al. ——— RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR THE REHEARING ON THE
MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
CERTIORARI - SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED
STATES - C.C.A. 9th APPEAL No. # 21-56015

NONE

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS
OF YOUR CASE).

PETITION FOR THE REHEARING ON THE MERITS
ON THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES L. MILLER,

P.O. Box # 122 —

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

90306

(323) 399-5680

(1-2) of (54)

No. # 22-5358

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES L. MILLER,

PETITIONER

VS.

SCOTT S. HARRIS, INDIVIDUALLY & OFFICIAL
CAPACITY, et al. ———— RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR THE REHEARING ON THE
MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
CERTIORARI - SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED
STATES - C.C.A. 9th APPEAL No. # 21-56015

NONE ————
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS
OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR THE REHEARING ON THE MERITS
ON THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES L. MILLER,

P.O. Box # 122 ————

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

90306

(323) 399-5680

(1-b) of (54)

PETITION FOR REHEARING
ON THE MERITS OF THE
CERTIORARI QUESTION PRESENTED,
Case No. #

I, James L. Miller, petitioner in above entitled case, was given "Motion For Leave To Appeal In Forma Pauperis (I.F.P.)" starting with State of California, County of Los Angeles Superior Court case no. # BC416582 (Medical Malpractice); in Court of Appeal for State of California, Second Appellate Dist. Div. Two case no. # B229254 (Medical Malpractice); Supreme Court of the United States cases nos. # 13-7517; 15-6422; 18-6106; 20-5512; 20-5703 under the "same" application with affidavit. Why am I, James L. Miller, being "denied" I.F.P. in cases U.S. Federal Dist. Court cases nos. # CV12-5649-LAS-AM; CV19-8909-PBG-JPR; CV19-8910-AB-KS; U.S. 9th C.A. 19-56319; 19-56385; 12-56895; 14-56597; 17-56567 rather than "vexatious litigant and frivolous" which are "violation" of the U.S. Constitution 13th Amend.; 5th Amend.; 7th Amend.; 9th Amend.; 14th (1a) Amend.?

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 19. (5), Procedure on a Certified Question I, James L. Miller, petitioner would like to know that the [Merits] Mink v. Kelm, 266, App. Div. 184, 41, N.Y.S.2d, 769, 771st of the [cases] are of little importance; 28 U.S.C. §1331

(2.) OF (54.)

PETITION FOR REHEARING
ON THE MERITS OF THE
CERTIORARI QUESTION PRESENTED,
CASES NO. #

(Federal Question) between [Citizen] of the "diff-
erent" State "claiming" U.S. Constitution Article 3,
section (2) "Arai, v. Tachibana N. Hawai-i (1991-
1998, F. Supp. 15325, "with" 28 U.S.C. § 1332.(a)
Devisory of citizenship "without (trial)" or "merits"
(Harlow, v. Penn. R. Co., W. D. Pa., (1966) F. Supp.
925, "and does the [Original Jurisdiction] belong
to the Supreme Court of the State of California or -
the Court of Appeal for the State of California - Sec-
ond Appellate Dist. Div. Two - appeal No. # B224254
"with" Los Angeles Superior Ct. No. # B2416582,
under U.S.C. § 1257.(a); and 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (-
Trevger, v. Mongeon, N. D., 206, N. W., 2d, 50, 53.)
and Supreme Court Rule 24, (a); S. Ct. Rule 14-
1.(a); S. Ct. Rule 33.1. ?

Why is James L. Miller, petitioner - Petitioner
for a writ of certiorari, NOY-IN-good-faith ?

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

✓ 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 Supreme Court whose "names" on the "Judgment" with case "numbers" is the subject of this "petition (petition for a writ of certiorari)" is as follows:

- (1) BYBEE, Circuit Judge et al.; U.S. Supreme Ct. #22-5358; Appeal No. #C.C.A. 9th 21-56015; D.C. No. #2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN (60); previous case no. #D.C. No. #CV19-8910-AB-KS; C.C.A. 9th appeal no. #19-56319; and Supreme Court case no. #20-5512; C.C.A. 9th #21-55384;
- (2) HURWITZ, Circuit Judge et al.; U.S. Supreme Ct. #22-5358; C.C.A. 9th appeal no. #21-56015; D.C. No. #2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN (60); previous case no. #D.C. No. #CV19-8910-AB-KS; C.C.A. 9th appeal no. #19-56319; and Supreme Court case no. #20-5512; C.C.A. 9th #21-55384;
- (3) R. NELSON, Circuit Judge et al.; U.S. Supreme Ct. #22-5358; C.C.A. 9th appeal no. #21-56015; D.C. No. #2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN (60); previous case no. #D.C. No. #CV19-8910-AB-KS; C.C.A. 9th 19-56319; Supreme Court no. #20-5512; C.C.A. 9th #21-55384;
- (4) CHRISTINA A. SYNDER, Dist. Ct. Judge et al.; U.S. Supreme Ct. #22-5358; C.C.A. 9th appeal no. #21-56015; D.C. No. #2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN (60); previous case no. #D.C. No. #19-8910-AB-KS; C.C.A. 9th 19-56319; Supreme Court

(4.) OF (54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

Five 28(4), no. #20-5512; and C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384

(5) Scott Harris, Individual and Official capacity, U.S.
Supreme Court Clerk, D.C. no. #2:12-cv-0549-PA3-AN
(60); (Previous case no. # D.C. no. #19-8910-AB-KS;
C.C.A. 9th 19-56319; Supreme Court no. #20-5512)
C.C.A. 9th 21-55384.

(6) Rawlinson, Individual and Official capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al, C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384; D.C. no. #
CV12-5649-PA3-AN (60); Supreme Court no. #20-5512;

(7) Callahan, Individual and Official capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al, C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384; D.C. no. #
CV12-5649-PA3-AN (60); Supreme Court no. #20-5512;

(8) Vandyke, Individual and Official capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al, C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384; D.C. no. #
CV12-5649-PA3-AN (60); Supreme Court no. #20-5512;

(9) Christina A. Snyder, Individual and Official capacity
Dist. Judge, et. al, C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384; D.C.
no. # CV12-5649-PA3-AN (60); Supreme Court no. #20-
5512;

(10) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official capacity
Supreme Ct. Clerk, et. al, C.C.A. 9th no. #21-55384;
D.C. no. # CV12-5649-PA3-AN (60); Supreme Court no.
#20-5512;

(11) Tashima, Individual and Official capacity, Circuit -

(5.) OF (54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

- Line 28 (10) Judge, - Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A. 9th
No. # 19-56385; D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.
- (12) BYBEE, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit Judge,
Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; D.C. No. # CV19-8909-P
BG-JPR; C.C.A. 9th No. # 19-56385.
- (13) Wofford, Individual and Official Capacity, - Circuit Judge,
Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A. 9th No. # 19-56385;
D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.
- (14) Virginia A. Phillips, Individual and Official Capacity -
Dist. Court Judge, - Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A.
9th No. # 19-56385; D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.
- (15) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, Sup-
reme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A. 9th No. # 19-56385;
D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.
- (16) Phillips S. Gutierrez, Individual and Official Capacity,
D.C. Judge, et al., - Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A.
9th No. # 19-56385; and D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.
- (17) Jean P. Rosenbluth, Individual and Official Capacity,
U.S. Magistrate Judge, et al., - Supreme Court No. # 20-
5703; C.C.A. 9th No. # 19-56385; and D.C. No. # CV19-
8909-PBG-JPR.
- (18) Tashima, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit
Judge, Supreme Court No. # 20-5703; C.C.A. 9th No. # 19-
56385; D.C. No. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR.

(6) OF (54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

- (19.) BYBEE, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 20-5512, C.C.A.
9th no. # 19-56319, and D.C. no. # CV19-8910-AB-KS.
- (20.) Wolford, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 20-5512, C.C.A. 9th
no. # 19-56319, and D.C. no. # CV19-8910-AB-KS.
- (21.) Andre Birnie Jr., Individual and Official Capacity,
D.C. Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 20-5512,
C.C.A. 9th no. # 19-56319, and D.C. no. # CV19-8910-
PBB-JPR.
- (22.) Karen L. Stevenson, Individual and Official Capacity,
U.S. Magistrate Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no.
20-5512, C.C.A. 9th no. # 19-56319, and D.C. no. #
CV19-8910-AB-KS.
- (23.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity,
U.S. Clerk, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 20-5512, C.
C.A. 9th no. # 19-56319, and D.C. no. # CV19-8910-
AB-KS.
- (24.) Ronald M. Gould, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 18-6106,
C.C.A. 9th no. # 17-56567, and D.C. no. # CV12-5649-
CAS-AN (50).
- (25.) Richard C. Tallman, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al., Supreme Court no. # 18-6106, C.
C.A. 9th no. # 17-56567, D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN,

(7.) of (54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

(26.) Mary H. Moravia, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit
Judge-Supreme Court No. #18-6106; C.C.A. 9th No. #17-56567;
D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN (50.)

(27.) Virginia A. Phillips, Individual and Official Capacity, D.C.
Judge-Supreme Court No. #18-6106; C.C.A. 9th No. #17-
56567; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN (50.);

(28.) Geoff S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, U.S.
Clerk, et. al. Supreme Court No. #18-6106; C.C.A. 9th No. #
17-56567; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN (50.);

(29.) Alfred T. Goodwin, Individual and Official Capacity -
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.
C.A. 9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-
AN (33.);

(30.) Johnnie B. Rawlins, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.
C.A. 9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-
AN (33.);

(31.) Alfred T. Goodwin, Individual and Official Capacity -
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432;
C.C.A. 9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-
AN (31.), (32.), (33.)

(32.) Jerome Farris, Individual and Official Capacity, Circuit
Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A. 9
th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN
(31a), (32.), (33.);

(8.) of (54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

TABLE OF CONTENT (No. #22-5358)

OPINION BELOW	17 (app. D. 18)
JURISDICTION	19 (app. A. 20-21)
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	22-26 (app. B. 27-30)
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	31-35
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	52-53
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	(A) - 1
(1)	(B) - 1
QUESTION(S) PRESENTED	2-3
LIST OF PARTIES	4-8 (app. E. 9-11)
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	12-16
CONCLUSION	54

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX - A. CONY. JURISDICTION	20-21
APPENDIX - B. CONY. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	22-30
APPENDIX - C. CONY. STATEMENT OF THE CASE - CIV. DOCK.	36-51
APPENDIX - D. CONY. OPINIONS BELOW	18
APPENDIX - E. CONY. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION, SUPRA	52-53
APPENDIX - F. CONY. LIST OF PARTIES	4-11

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Burgess, v. Nail, C.C.A. Okl., 103, F.2d 37, 43.

(Page 34.)

Hamill, v. Hawk, C.C.A. Okl., 58, F.2d 41, 42.

(Page 31.)

Gulfstream Casino, Ltd. vs. Reliance Ins. Co., C.A. Fla.,
409, F.2d 974, 981.

(Page 32.)

Hadding Castle, Inc. v. City of Mesquite, C.A. Tex., 130 F.2d
1029, 1039.

(Page 32.)

Munn, v. Illinois, 94, U.S. 116, 134, 24, L.Ed. 77.

(Page 33.)

Williams, v. Roberts, C.A. 5, (La.) 1997, 116, F.3d 1126,

(Page 33.)

Bail, v. Familia, C.A. 3, (Pa.) 2013, 726, F.3d 498.

(Page 33.)

Bierregu, v. Ashcroft, D.D.J., 2003, 259, F.Supp. 2d 342.

(Page 33.)

Parker, v. Lowe, N.D. Ill., 1981, 528, F. Supp. 1254,

(pages 33-34.)

Liebowitz, v. Amexio Inc., Colo. App., 701, P.2d 140, 142.

(Page 34.)

Martinez, v. Bureau of Prisons, C.A. D.C. 2006, 444, F.2d,

620, 370, U.S. App. D.C. 275 Federal Civil Procedure

2734. (Page 31.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Schwartz, v. Kominski, 25, Ill., App. 3d 789, 324, N.E.
2d, 91, 93.

(Page 34.)

State ex Rel. Smith, v. Smith, 199, Or. 96, 252, P. 2d, 527,
555.

(Page 34.)

Cook, v. Singer Sewing Mach. Co., 138, Cal. App. 418, 32,
P. 2d, 430, 431.

(Page 34.)

State, v. Draper, 83, Utah 115, 27, P. 2d, 39.

(Page 35.)

Ex parte Jones, 246, Ala. 433, 20, So. 2d, 859, 862.

(Page 35.)

Harvey, v. State, Okl., Cr., 458, P. 2d, 826, 338.

(Page 35.)

Norman, v. Department of Labor and Industries, 10, Wash.
2d, 180, 116, P. 2d, 360, 362.

(Page 35.)

Conwell, v. Swisher County, Tex. Civ. App., 78, S.W. 2d 1072,
1074.

(Page 35.)

Jeffries, v. Turkey Run Consolidated School Dist., Cal.
Wd., 492, P. 2d, 163. (Page 35.)

(14) OF (54)

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
2 REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

3 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

4 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

5 Angelo Payson Enterprises, Inc., v. South Cent. Bell Telep-
6 hone Co., La. App. 4th Cir., 459, 39.2d. 1223, 1226.

7 (Page 48.);

8 State ex-rel. Smith, v. Smith, 197, Or. 96, 252, P.2d. 550, 555.

9 (Page 48.);

10 M. & A. Elec. Power Co-op., v. True, Mo. App. 480, S.W.2d.

11 310, 314. (Page 48.);

12 Standard Accident Ins. Co., v. Standard Surety & Casualty Co.,

13 N.Y., 53, F.2d. 119, 120. (Page 48.);

14 Thompson, v. Anderson, 107, Utah 331, 153, P.2d. 665, 666. (-

15 Page 48.);

16 United States, v. Perlstein, 126, F.2d. 799.

17 (Page 48.);

18 Commonwealth, v. Russo, 40, Super., 470, 11, A.2d. 359. (-

19 Page 48.);

20 Silver, v. U.S., 7, 14, Ct., 305, 324.

21 (Page 48.);

22 Roberts, v. State, Ind., 492, N.E. 2d. 310, 313.

23 (Page 48.);

24 Pennover, v. NePA, 95, U.S. 732, 24, L. Ed. 565.

25 (Page 49.);

26 Aman, v. Pacific Power & Light Co., 10 Wash. App. 782,

27 520, P.2d. 481, 484.

28 (Page 49.);

(15)OP(54.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Kazubowski, v. Kazubowski, 43 Ill. 2d 405, 259 N.
E. 2d 282, 290. (Page 49.);

Perry, v. Penn. La., App. 180, 30, 2d, 66, 69.
(Page 49.);

U.S., v. Smith, D.C. Iowa, 249, F. Supp. 515, 516.
(Page 49.);

Trinity Episcopal Corp., v. Romney, D.C. N.Y. 387, F. Supp.
879, 883. (Page 49.);

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: Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights
D.C. Case # CV12-5649-CAS-AM (60-62); CV19-8910-AB-KSI

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix N/A to the petition and is C.C.A. 9th District No. #21-56015; 19-56319.

☒ reported at N/A; 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 N/A to the petition and is D.C. No. # CV12-5649-CAS-AM; CV19-8910-AB-KSI

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

☒ For cases from state courts: State of California Court of Appeal-Second
Appellate Dist. Div. TWO-Case No. # B224254.

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

☒ reported at Page 18; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the State of California Court of Appeal #B224254 court appears at Appendix D. to the petition and is

☒ reported at Page 18; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, Rule 8.111(a), prohibits courts and parties from filing or making any documents not available for public inspection or review. Documents that are exempt from public inspection or review are identified by rule 8.111(b). This document has not been certified for publication or approval for purposes of rule 8.111(c).

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION TWO

JAMES L. MILLER,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

AMIR KASHANI et al.,

Defendants and Respondents.

B224254

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BC416582)

COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIS
FILED
MAR 24 2011

JOSEPH A. LAKE

Clerk

Deputy Clerk

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Amy D. Hogue, Judge. Affirmed.

James L. Miller, in pro. per., for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Pollack, Vida & Fisher and Daniel P. Barer for Defendants and Respondents.

(18) of (54)

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 09-20-2021 C.P.A. No. # 21-56015 & 04-13-2020 C.P.A. No. # 19-56319

☐ 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: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

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

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

☐ For cases from state courts: State of California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate Dist. Div. Two appeal No. # B224254.
The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Mar. 24, 2011.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix N.

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

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

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

(19) of (54)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MAY 27 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JAMES L. MILLER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

AMIR KASHANI, Dr.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-56015

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN
Central District of California,
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: BYBEE, HURWITZ, and R. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

The district court certified that this appeal is not taken in good faith and has denied appellant leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. *See* 28 U.S.C.

§ 1915(a). On November 4, 2021, the court ordered appellant to explain in writing why this appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious).

Upon a review of the record, the response to the court's November 4, 2021 order, and the opening brief filed on November 4, 2021, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (Docket Entry No. 3) and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

(20) 6A (54) -

MN/MOATT

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

DISMISSED.

FROM NOV. 4, 2021 held to
MAY 23, 2022 postage pay
MAY 31, 22

received by plaintiff
JUNE 2, 2022

7:34 to get
for the I.F.P. a "response"

of "statement" and
the appeal should go forward
with application for
an appeal from

7 and 3/4 mo
for a "reply"

(21) OF (54.)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVES
3 United States (U.S.) Constitution (CONSY.) Amendment (Amend.),
4 (1st) U.S. CONSY. 1st Amend. [1791];

5 Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment
6 of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or
7 abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right
8 of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition
9 the Government for a redress of grievances. (in U.S.

10 Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of California - Western Div.

11 case name - James L. Miller, v. Scott S. Harris, Ind-

12 individually & Official capacity, case no. # CV12-5649-CAS-

13 AD (60.) - Lodged on 03-26-2021; Notice of Appeal

14 case name James L. Miller, v. Scott S. Harris, Ind-

15 individually & Official capacity - appeal no. # 21-55384;

16 U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif. - Western

17 Div. - case name James L. Miller, v. Scott S. Harris,

18 individually & Official capacity, et al. (Filed 10-16-2019) case no. #

19 CV19-8910-AB-KS; Notice of Appeal - James L. Miller, v.

20 Scott S. Harris, individually & Official capacity, et al.

21 appeal no. # 19-56319 (11-01-2019) Petition for a writ of

22 Certiorari - case name James L. Miller, v. Tashiro,

23 Bybee, and Watford, Circuit Judge, (Aug. 14, 2020) (1)

24 U.S. Supreme Court - Supreme case no. # 20-5512; Re-

25 hearing on the merits of a Petition for a writ of

26 Certiorari; U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - case no. # CV12-5649-

27 CAS-AD (60.) ; U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of

28 Calif. - Western Div. - case name James L. Miller, v.

(22) of (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVES

3 Virginia H. Phillips, Individually & Official Capacity, et
4 al. (Filed 10-16-2019) case no. # CV19-8909-PBG-JPR;

5 Notice of Appeal - case name James L. Miller, v. Tashiana
6 Bybee, and Wayford, Circuit Judges (11-12-2019) et

7 al. - case no. # 19-56385 (Filed 11-12-2019); U.S. Supreme
8 Ct. - Supreme case no. # 20-5703; Rehearing on the

9 merits of a petition for a writ of Certiorari; U.S. Fed.
10 Dist. Ct. - case no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN(60);

11 U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif. - Western Div.
12 case name James L. Miller, v. Christina H. Snyder.

13 Individually & Official Capacity, et al. - case no. #
14 CV12-5649-CAS-AN(50) 09-28-2017; Notice of

15 Appeal - case name James L. Miller, v. Virginia H.
16 Phillips, Individually & Official Capacity, et al. (10-

17 11-2017); appeal no. # 17-56567; U.S. Supreme Ct.
18 Supreme Ct. no. # 18-6106 (03-18-2018); and Rehear-

19 ing on the merits of a petition for a writ of Certiorari
20 (Filed on 12-21-2018);

21 U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif. - Western Div.
22 case name James L. Miller, v. Christina H. Snyder, indiv-

23 idually & Official Capacity, et al. - case no. # CV12-
24 5649-CAS-AN(35) - 09-30-2014; Notice of Appeal

25 case name James L. Miller, v. George H. King, et al
26 appeal no. # 14-56597; U.S. Supreme Ct. - Supreme

27 Ct. no. # 15-6432;
28 U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif. - Western Div.

(23) of (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF AFFIDAVIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

3 Case Name James L. Miller, v. Amir Keshavi, L.A.C. -
4 U.S.C. Med. Center (General Hosp.) - Case No. # CV12 -
5 5649-CAS-AN (1); Notice of Appeal - appeal Name
6 James L. Miller, v. Christina A. Snyder, Individually
7 & Official Capacity & Arthur Nakazato, Individually
8 & Official Capacity, et al. - appeal No. # 12-56895
9 U.S. Supreme Ct. - Supreme Ct. No. # 12-7517; Complaint
10 For Deprivation of Civil Rights - D.C. case no. # CV12-9198
11; Complaint For Civil Action For Deprivation of Rights - D.C. -
12 Case No. # CV12-1660; Complaint For Civil Action For De-
13 rivation of Rights - case no. # CV12-3137; Complaint For
14 Civil Action For Deprivation of Rights - D.C. case no. #
15 12-3601; and "with" the "Filing" of the Complaint
16 For Civil Action For Deprivation of Rights - "with" Sum-
17 mon - D.C. case no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN on June 29,
18 2012 [1]; Answer Complaint For Civil Action For Deprivation
19 of Rights - "Filed" on July 31, 2012; D.C. case no.
20 # CV12-5649-CAS-AN [2]; Answer to Order to Show Ca-
21 use, by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato, on 08-
22 08-2012 [2], [9]; Notice of Appeal "Filed" on 10-
23 15, 2012 - appeal no. # 12-56895 [19]; [Response] -
24 from the 9th C.C.A. - appeal no. # 12-56895 - appeal no. -
25 # [1]; and [Appellant] [Informal] [Brief] - appeal no.
26 for the 9th C.C.A. on Feb. 02, 2013; Complaint For Civil
27 Action For Deprivation of Rights - "Lodged" on Aug. 05,
28 2014, case name James L. Miller, vs. Christina A.

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A writ
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVES

3 Snyder, Individually & Official Capacity - Case No. # CV
4 12-5649-CAS-AN - dep. [31]; Complaint for Civil
5 Action For Deprivation of Rights - Case Name James
6 L. Miller, pro-se v. Christina H. Snyder, Individually &
7 Official Capacity, dep. - "Lodged" Aug. 27, 2014 [32]
8 Case No. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN; and Complaint for
9 Civil Action For Deprivation of Rights with [N]otice
10 of Motion and Motion For Live Trial, case name
11 James L. Miller, pro-se v. Christina H. Snyder, Ind-
12 individually & Official Capacity, et. al. [33] "Lodged"
13 Sept. 08, 2014 case no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN; [N]-
14 otice of [A]ppeal - appeal no. # 14-56597 [38] Filed
15 Appellant Informal Brief Jan. 02, 2015 - appeal doc-
16 no. # 8 case no. # 14-56597 - C.C.A. 9th; "Response" to 9th
17 C.C.A. (C.Sal.) app. doc. (10); [N]otice of Motion and
18 motion For [A]ction to [C]ancel an [O]fficer of the
19 United States to [P]erform his (or her) duty; - "Re-
20 ceived" but not "Filed" on May 30, 2017, Case Name -
21 James L. Miller, pro-se v. George H. King, Indiv-
22 idually & Official Capacity, et. al. - Case No. # CV12-
23 5649-CAS-AN [48]; Complaint For [C]ivil [A]c-
24 tion For [D]eprivation of [R]ights - "Received" but
25 not "Filed" on Sept. 20, 2017, Case Name James L.
26 Miller, pro-se v. Christina H. Snyder, Individually
27 & Official Capacity, et. al. - D.C. Case No. # CV12-
28 5649-CAS-AN [50]; [N]otice of [A]ppeal "Filed"

(25) of (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF ATUKU
2 AND CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
3 ON OCT. 11, 2017 [52]; appeal no. # 17-56567 [54];
4 [Appellant's Informal Brief] "I.F.P." Filed on Dec. 26
5 2017 (C.C.A. 9th) appeal doc. no. # [3], [4]; [State-
6 ment that Appeal should go Forward] Filed Feb. 15
7 2018; "C.C.A. 9th" appeal doc. no. # [6]; "Prior"
8 Cases for [Complaint for Civil Action for Deprivation
9 of Rights: CV11-998; CV12-1660; CV12-3137; CV12-
10 3601] which "the [108] 4] were "deny I.I.F.P.T. but
11 did in "fact" [paid] document "fee" for Complaint
12 for Deprivation of Civil Rights, on June 29, 2012, case
13 name James L. Miller, pro-se v. Amir Kashani, et
14 al., def. - case no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN(6); and
15 "Amend" Complaint for Civil Action for Deprivat-
16 ion of Rights - case name James L. Miller, pro-se v.
17 Amir Kashani, et al., def. - case no. # CV12-5649-
18 CAS-AN(7). "Filed" on July 31, 2012, and there
19 other cases "that" "pertain" to this "number" CV
20 12-5649-CAS-AN(7), (1) Complaint for Civil Action
21 for Deprivation of Rights - case name James L.
22 Miller, pro-se v. Sept S. Harris, Individually & Off-
23 icial Capacity, et al. - case no. # CV19-8910-AB-
24 KS. "Filed" on Oct. 16, 2019; Notice of Appeal -
25 appeal no. # 19-56319; Petition for Writ of "Certiorari"
26 to the U.S. Supreme Ct. - U.S. Supreme Ct. no. # 20-
27 5512; and a Rehearing on the Merits - for Petition
28 for a Writ of Certiorari U.S. Supreme Ct. case -

(262 of 64)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (No. #22-5358)

(a.) On Oct. 17, 2022 the United States Supreme Court Clerk (Scott S. Harris, et. al. Emailed out [order] case No. #22-5358, by way of the United States Supreme Court Office of the Clerk's — "Filed (Aug. 09, 2022). [which] was from the filing of a "Petition For a Writ of Certiorari" with a Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma pauperis and place on docket Aug. 17, 2022 as No. #22-5358 with Form Notifying opposing that the case was docketed, and Notice is Hereby Given.

The "Response" from the United States Supreme Court Office of the Clerk's Emailed out on Oct. 17, 2022 and "received" by Petitioner James L. Miller, on Oct. 22, 2022, and had "denied" Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma pauperis, and the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari [which is not only a "violation" of the Rules of the U.S. Supreme Ct. Rules 39. (1, 2, and 4); Rule 12. (3); 29. (4. b. c); and Rule 14. with Rule 44. (1), (2), but also "violation" of U.S. Constitutional Rights (Supra, 03/22-26) and infra 03/21-30), which Scott S. Harris, Clerk dismissed "Only" 3rd-4th requirement to proceed in Forma pauperis is - good faith and does not require that the underlying claim be "meritorious" (Martinez, v. Bureau of Prisons, C.A.D.C. 2006, 444, F. 3d, 620, 370, U.S. App. D.C. 275 Federal Civil Procedure § 2734.

(31) of (54)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (No. #22-5358)

"Uberima Fides (the most abundant - good-faith) -
"absolute" and perfect candor or openness and honesty;
the absence of any concealment or deception, however
slight. A phrase used to express the "perfect-good-faith",
concealing nothing, "with" which a "contract" (Supra, p. 22, *thru* 27) "must be made" (Gulfstream Caroro, Ltd vs
Reliance Ins. Co., C.A. Fla., 409 F.2d, 974, 981).

(b) There were no "answer" to petition for a writ of
Certiorari; or petition for rehearing on the merits of petition
for a writ of Certiorari cases No. # (22-5358; 20-5512;
20-5903; 18-6106; 15-6432; and 13-7517) "with" (11
Clerks; 40 Clerks reviewed) but Sect. 3, Harris et
al on "reviewed" of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals No.
#21-56012; 21-55384; 19-56567; 14-56597; 12-56895;
19-56382; and 19-56319 "with" (U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. No. CV12-5649)-
CAS-AN (1) "Frivolous" of little weight or importance. A plea-
dine is "frivolous" when it is clearly insufficient on its face
(Complaint for Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights; Notice of
Appeal; Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; Supra p. 22, *thru*
26, and app. B, 27, *thru* 30) "with" the Bill of Rights (6
Supra p. 22-26, and app. B, p. 27, *thru* 30. Ignored does
not controvert the material points of the opposite plea-
dine (U.S. Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif. (Western Div. - L.A.)
Civil Nockey case No. # 2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN (1, *thru* 14); U.S.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (No. #22-5358)

Dist. Ct. - Central Dist. of Calif (Western Div. - L.A.) Civil Docket
case no. # 2:19-cv-08910-AB-KS (1-2); U.S. Dist. of Calif.
(Western Div. - L.A.) Civil Docket case no. # 2:19-cv-08909-
PBG-JPR (1-2) all 12 ps. [Infra] 1; where, is the "re-
sponded" for each "document" (Supra, ps. 22, 26, and
app. B, 27, 30; on the U.S. Civ. Document) from the
defendants 21, A claim (Complaint for Civil Action for
Deprivation of Rights "Supra, ps. 22, 26 and app. 27)
or defense is frivolous if a proponent can present NO
rational argument based upon the evidence or law in sup-
port that claim or defense (this test require that classi-
fications created by a state must be reasonable, not arbit-
rary, and must rest on some ground of "difference" hav-
ing a fair and substantial relation to the object of the
legislation" *Aladdin's Castle, Inc. v. City of Mesquite, Cal.*
Tex., 630 F.2d 1029, 1039; *Muniz v. Illinois*, 94, U.S. 113
134, 24, L. Ed. 27, 1; (PLRA) were design to deter "frivo-
lous prisoner (not a prisoner) seeking to bring "lawsuits
(Supra, ps. 22, 26, and app. B, 27); 28 U.S.C. § 1915
(a); *Williams v. Roberts*, Cal 5 (6) 1997, 116 F.3d 1126;
Bell v. Familion, Cal 3 (10) 2013, 726 F.3d 448; the dis-
trict court must be mindful to construe it liberally (*Bierley*
v. Ashcroft, D.N.J. 2003, 259 F. Supp. 2d 342, 42 H.S.C. § 1983 (ab-
olishing the deprivation of civil rights by state action) (Par-Yee

(33) OF (54)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (No. #22-5358)

V. Lowe, U. N. II, 1981, 528, F. Supp. 1854; Liebowitz,
v. Amexco Inc., Colo. App. 701, P.2d, 140, 142; "with" the
"violation" (U.S. Constitutional Right; Supra. p. 22, Thur. 26.
and app. B. 27, Thur. 30.)

Abuse of discretion:

A failure to exercise a sound, reasonable, and "legal
discretion". It is a strict legal term indicating that appellate
court (Scott S. Harris, Clerk et al.) is of opinion that there
was commission of an error (error in exercise of jurisdiction-
ion in determination) of questions of law or fact (Buepess,
v. Nail, C.L.A. 103, F.2d 32, 43; Schwartz, v. Kominets
25, Ill. App. 3d 789, 324, N.E. 2d 91, 93.) of law by trial
court (U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. Central Dist. of Calif. (Western Div. L.A.) case
No. #2:12-cv-05649-63-AM; 2:19-cv-08909-P8G-JPR; 2:19-cv-
08910-AB-K3-Appx. F. 08 36 Thur. 47). It does not imply intent-
ional wrong or bad faith, or misconduct, but means "the
clearly erroneous (on) act involving a departure from "the
truth or accuracy" (State ex rel. Smith, v. Smith, 197, Or. 96
232 P. 2d, 550, 555.)". Conclusion and judgment, are is that
clearly against "logic" and effect of such "facts" as are pre-
sented in support of the application (Supra. p. 22, Thur. 26, and
app. B. 27, Thur. 30.) or against the "reasonable" and "probable"
(Cook, v. Singer Sewing Mach. Co., 138, Cal. App. 418, 32, P.2d
430, 431.) deductions to be drawn from the "facts" disclosed

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (No. #22-5358)

Supra, pp. 22, thru, 26, and app. B, 27, thru, 30.) upon the hearing (State v. Draper, 83, 114, 22, P.2d 39; Ex parte Jones, 246 Ala. 485, 20, 30, 2d, 859, 162 Sup. Abuse of discretion by trial court" U.S. Fed. 10:34. (L. - Central Dist. of Calif. (Western) Div. - L.A. case No. # 2:12-cv-05649 - CAB-AD) is any unreasonable, unconscionable and arbitrary action taken without proper consideration of "fact" and "law" pertaining to matters submitted (Harvey v. State, Okla. Civ. 458, P.2d 331, 238).

The essence (that without which a thing cannot be itself "Norman v. Department of Labor and Industries, 10 Wash. 2d 180, 116 P.2d 360, 362.) of "substantive due process" (Supra, pp. 22, thru, 26 and app. B, 27, thru, 30.) is protection from "arbitrary (unreasonable manner" (Correll v. Swisher County, Tex. Civ. App. 28 S.W.2d 1072, 1074) and unreasonable action (Jeffries v. Turkey Run Consolidated School Dist., Cal. Ind. 492, F.2d 1, 3).

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

REASONS FOR GRANTING: THE REHEARING

Without correction their will be "great (exceeding the common or ordinary measure of) standard (conformity to established practice) Standard Accident Ins. Co. v. Standard Surety & Casualty Co. N.C. N.Y. 53, F.2d 119 126." (Thompson v. Anderson, 107, 114, 231, 153, P.2d 665, 666.) importance "If Injustice the "withholding of evidence (United States v. Perks, 126, F.2d 799, Commonwealth v. Russo, 177, Pa. Super. 470, 111, A.2d 359, or "denial of justice (Silver v. U.S. 7, Cl. Cl. 305, 324.) "Fraud is deception practiced by the party (M. & A. Elec. Power Co.-op. v. True, Mo. App. 480, S.W. 2d 310, 314.) "If Injustice it's the fault is a breach of a duty imposed by law (Angelo Pavan Enterprises, Inc. v. South Cent. Bell Telephone Co., La. App. 4, Cir. 459, So. 2d 1223, 1226.) or "error (false conception) or application of the law (State ex rel. Smith v. Smith, 197, or 96, 252, P.2d 550, 555.) of the court; so grave that, if not rectified" would result in "denial" of "fundamental" [due] [process] (Supra. p. 11, lines 1-28, 17, lines 1-19.) Roberts v. S. State, Ind., 492, N. E. 2d 310, 313. [S]afeguards for the protection of individual rights subject-matter (Medical Malpractice" Los Angeles County Superior Court No. # BC 416 582; Court of Appeals for the State of Calif. or via Second Appellate Dist. Div. Two - Appeal No. # B224254; U.S. Fed. Dist. Ct. No. # CV12-5649-CAS-

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS:
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE REHEARING

AND OF THE SUPREME COURT (PENNINOY, v. NEFF, 95, U.S. 222, 24, L. Ed. 565.) [Due] process of law (have the "right" of [B]ill of [R]ights and [C]ivil [R]ights of [C]onstitution by "proof" every [M]aterial [F]act (pleading and practice "Amant, v. Pacific Power & Light Co., 10 Wash. App. 785, 520, P. 2d. 481, 484.) "explore and protect his (James L. Miller, pro-se, / plaintiff / petitioner / appellant "Supra. p. 11, lines 1-28, thru. p. 17, lines 1-19.") "rights before a court (Kazubowski, v. Kazubowski, 42, Ill. 2d. 405, 259, N.E. 2d. 282, 291) and it forbids condemnation (U.S. Const. 5th Amend.) nor shall any State deprive and person (James L. Miller) of life, liberty, or property (Supra. p. 11, lines 1-28, thru. p. 17, lines 1-19) or of any "rights" [C]onferred him (James L. Miller) (Petitioner, v. Penn. La. App. 180, Sp. 2d. 66, 69.) [S]hall have reasonable and substantial relation to the object being sought (U.S. v. Smith, D.C. Iowa, 249, F. Supp. 512, 516) "Fundamental" [E]ssential [P]art of [D]ue [P]rocess (Supra. p. 11, lines 1-28, thru. p. 14, lines 1-28) is the opportunity to be "heard" (Trinity Episcopal Corp., v. Romney, 10, C.N.Y., 287, F. Supp. 1044, 1084.) "Due process" means fundamental fairness and substantial of real worth and importance (U.S. Const.) Seale, v. Kelly Oil Co., 145, Kan. 216, 65, P. 2d. 553, 554).

CONCLUSION

[S] upr, p8.52 thru p.53.]

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES L. MILLER
James L. Miller, pro-se

Date: Nov. 08, 2022

(54) OF (54.)

APPENDIX - A.

Pages

LIST OF PARTIES; INTEREST.

pp 222229 P. - 16

Appendix - A.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

(32.) Michelle T. Friedland, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A.
9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN(-
31), (32), (33);

(34.) George H. King, Individual and Official Capacity, D.C.
Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A.
9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN(31), (32), (33);

(35.) Dru Van Dam, Individual and Official Capacity, Appeal
Clerk, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A. 9th No. #
14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN(33);

(36.) Christina A. Snyder, Individual and Official Capacity, D.C.
Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A. 9th
No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN(31), (32),
(33) - (14), (15);

(37.) Arthur Nakazato, Individual and Official Capacity, U.S.
Magistrate Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #15-6432;
C.C.A. 9th No. #14-56597; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN
(31), (32), (33) - (14), (15);

(38.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official, et. al. Capacity,
Supreme Court No. #15-6432; C.C.A. 9th No. #14-56597;
D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN(33);

(39.) William C. Cowby, Individual and Official Capacity, Cir-
cuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court No. #13-1517; C.C.A.
9th No. #12-56895; D.C. No. #CV12-5649-CAS-AN-

Appendix (app.) A - (9) of (54)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

- (40.) [redacted] live 28. - (1. thru 30.) with (14.), (15.):
(40.) Richard R. Clifton, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. # 13-7517; C.C.
A. 9th no. # 12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CAS-
AN (1. thru 30.) (14.), (15.):
(41.) Niarmuid F. O'Scannlain, Individual and Official Capacity
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. # 13-7517; C.C.
A. 9th no. # 12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN (1. thru
30.) (14.), (15.):
(42.) William A. Fletcher, Individual and Official Capacity, Cir-
cuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. # 13-7517; C.C.
A. 9th no. # 12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN (1. thru
30.) (14.), (15.):
(43.) Consuelo M. Callahan, Individual and Official Capacity,
Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. # 13-7517; D.C. no. #
CV12-5649-CAS-AN (1. thru 30.) (14.), (15.), C.C.A. 9th no.
12-56895;
(44.) Christina A. Snyder, Individual and Official Capacity, 10-
th Circuit Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. # 13-7517; C.C.A.
9th no. # 12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CAS-AN (1. thru
30.) (14.), (15.):
(45.) Arthur Nakazawa, Individual and Official Capacity,
U.S. Magistrate Judge, et. al. - Supreme Court no. #
13-7517; C.C.A. 9th no. # 12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-
CAS-AN (1. thru 30.) (14.), (15.):

app. F. - (10) of (54)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: PETITION FOR
REHEARING ON THE MERITS OF THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

LIST OF PARTIES: INTEREST

(46.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, U.S.
Supreme Court Clerk, et al. - Supreme Court no. #13-7517;
C.C.A. 9th Cir. #12-56895; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CA3-
AN (U. S. 30.) (14), (15).

(47.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, "with
(40 U.S. Supreme Ct. John Doe on Rehearing on the "Merits" of
a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; and 11 U.S. Supreme
Ct. John Doe on Petition for a Writ of Certiorari) Supreme
Ct. no. #20-5512; D.C. no. # CV19-8910-AB-KS; D.C. no. #12-5649-
CA3-AN (15).

(48.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, "with
(40-U.S. Supreme Ct. John Doe, on Rehearing on the "Merits"
of a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari) Supreme Ct. no. #20-
5703; D.C. no. # CV19-8904-PSC-JPR

(49.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, "with (-
40-U.S. Supreme Ct. John Doe, on Rehearing on the "Merits"
on a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari)" Supreme Ct. no. #
18-6106; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CA3-AN (56).

(50.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, "with (-
40-U.S. Supreme Ct. John Doe, on Rehearing on the "Merits"
on a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari)" Supreme Ct.
no. #15-6432; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CA3-AN (31, 46);

(51.) Scott S. Harris, Individual and Official Capacity, "with (40-
U.S. Supreme Ct. John Doe, on Rehearing on the "Merits"
on a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari)" Supreme Ct.
no. #13-7517; D.C. no. # CV12-5649-CA3-AN (U. S. 30.);

app. F. (11) of (54.)

APPENDIX - B.

Page 8

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED, pp. 27-30.

Appendix-B.

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

3 COPY.

4 NO. #20-5512; (2) Complaint for Civil Action for
5 Deprivation of Rights - Case Name James L. Miller,
6 pro-se v. Virginia H. Phillips, Individually & Official
7 Capacity, et al. - Case No. # CV 19-8909-PJB -
8 JPR, Filed COV. 16, 2019; Notice of Appeal - Appeal
9 No. # 19-56385; Petition for Writ of Certiorari to
10 the U.S. Supreme Ct. - U.S. Supreme Ct. No. #20-5703;
11 and Rehearing on the Merits for a petition for a
12 writ of Certiorari (U.S. Supreme Ct. No. #20-5703);
13 Petition for a Writ of Certiorari - U.S. Supreme Ct.
14 No. #20-5703; 20-5512; 18-6106; 15-6432; and
15 13-7517; and Rehearing on the Merits for a Pet-
16 tion for a Writ of Certiorari - U.S. Supreme Ct. case
17 No. #20-5703; 20-5512; 18-6106; 15-6432; and
18 13-7517 all were "deny" by Scott S. Harris, Individ-
19 ually & Official Capacity, et al.

20 (2) U.S. CONST. 4th Amend.;

21 The right of the people (citizen) to be secure in
22 their persons (James L. Miller, pro-se), houses, papers,
23 (U.S. Supra p. 16, Thursday, 2019), and effects, against unreason-
24 able searches and seizures, shall not be violated
25 (U.S. Supra p. 16, Thursday, 2019), and no warrants shall issue,
26 but upon probable cause, supported by oath or
27 affirmation, and particularly describing the place
28 to be searched, and the persons (citizen) or things

app. B. - (27) OF (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
3

4 (3.) U.S. CONST. 5th Amend. :
5

6 No person (CIVILIAN) shall be held to answer for a
7 capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a
8 presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except
9 in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in
10 the militia, when in actual service in time of war
11 or public danger. Nor shall any person (CIVILIAN)
12 be subject for the same offense to be twice put
13 in jeopardy of life or limb nor shall be compelled
14 in any criminal case to be a witness against
15 himself, nor be deprived of life (conspiracy), lib-
16 erty (the "invasion" of privacy by "individual" on
17 the "internet communication system"), or property
18 (Supra, p. 16, ¶ 24); "documents of medical mal-
19 practice cases No. CV08-4945, CV08-6081, CV08-
20 7396, and CV09-3897), without due process of law
21 Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights CV11-9198, CV
22 12-1660, CV12-3157, CV12-3601, CV12-5649, etc.
23 All Supra, p. 16, ¶ 24). Nor shall private property
24 be taken for public use, without just compensation.

25 (4.) U.S. CONST. 7th Amend.
26

27 in Suits (Supra, p. 16, ¶ 24) of common law,
28 where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty
dollars (Supra, p. 16, ¶ 24), the right of trial
by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury

opp. B. - (28) of (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

3 shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the
4 United States, than according to the rules of the court
5 on law.

6 (5) U.S. CONST. 9th Amend.:

7 The enumeration in the constitution (Supra, ps. 16,
8 Thur. ps. 24) of certain rights (Supra, ps. 16, Thur. ps.
9 24) and infra ps. 23, Thur. ps. 24), shall not be construed
10 to deny (Supra, ps. 16, Thur. ps. 24 and infra, ps. 23, Thur. ps.
11 24) or abridge (Supra, ps. 16, Thur. ps. 24) others (other
12 such like) retained by the people (Citizen);

13 (6) U.S. CONST. 14th sec. 1:

14 All persons born (Citizen) or naturalized in the
15 United States, and subject (Citizen) to the jurisdic-
16 tion thereof (Los Angeles, California), are citi-
17 zens of the United States and of the state wherein they
18 reside (California). No state shall make or enforce
19 any law which shall abridge (suppresses or substi-
20 tentially interferes) the privileges or immunities of
21 citizens (James L. Miller) of the United States; nor
22 shall any state deprive (James L. Miller) any
23 person (Citizen) of life, liberty (conspiracy), or
24 property (Supra ps. 16, Thur. ps. 24), without due
25 process of law (Supra ps. 16, Thur. ps. 24); nor deny
26 to any person (Citizen) within its jurisdiction
27 the equal protection of the laws (Supra ps. 16,
28 Thur. ps. 24).

app. B. - (29) of (54)

1 U.S. SUPREME COURT, PETITION FOR REHEARING ON MERITS OF A WRIT
2 OF CERTIORARI - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

3 U.S. Statute

4 (a) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1851 (b) (2) (3) ;

5 (b) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1257 (a) ;

6 (c) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291 ;

7 (d) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1381 ;

8 (e) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1332 (a) ;

9 (f) 28 U.S.C.A. § 2072 ;

10 Rules of Supreme Court of the U.S.

11 (g) Rule 29. 4 (b) (1) ;

12 (h) Rule 33 (1) (2) ;

13 (i) Rule 39. (1) - 2 and 4 ;

14 (j) Rule 44 (1) (2) (3) ;

15 (k) Rule 13 (1) (2) ;

16 (l) Rule 14 ;

17 West Annotated California Codes - Cal. Definition

18 (m) Cal. P. § 391. 8 ;

19 U.S. Statute ; Rule of Supreme Court of the U.S.

20 (n) Rule 12. 3.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
app. B - (20) of (54)

[Query](#) [Reports](#) [Utilities](#) [Help](#) [Log Out](#)

194, APPEAL, CLOSED

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (Western Division - Los Angeles)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:12-cv-05649-CAS-AN**

James L. Miller v. Dr. Amir Kashani et al
Assigned to: Judge Christina A. Snyder
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato
Case in other court: 9th CCA, 12-56895/
9th Circuit, 14-56597
9th CCA, 17-56567
9th CCA, 21-55384
9TH CCA, 21-56015

Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 06/29/2012
Date Terminated: 09/17/2012
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

James L. Miller

represented by **James L. Miller**
PO Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306
323-399-5680
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

Dr. Amir Kashani

Defendant

**L.A.C. and U.S.C. Medical Center Gen.
Hosp.**

Defendant

John Doe
Oriental Dr./Physician (#1)

Defendant

John Doe
#2

Defendant

John Doe
#3

app-C-(36)0A(5)

26-947

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
06/29/2012	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT filed against Defendants Dr. Amir Kashani, L.A.C. and U.S.C. Medical Center Gen. Hosp. Case assigned to Judge Christina A. Snyder and referred to Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato; (Filing fee PAID); filed by plaintiff James L. Miller.(esa) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
06/29/2012		21 DAY Summons Issued re Complaint <u>1</u> as to defendants Amir Kashani, L.A.C. and U.S.C. Medical Center Gen. Hosp. (esa) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
06/29/2012	<u>2</u>	CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (esa) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
06/29/2012	<u>3</u>	NOTICE OF REFERENCE to United States Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato. (esa) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
07/11/2012	<u>4</u>	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Hardship filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (db) (Entered: 07/12/2012)
07/26/2012	<u>5</u>	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato, WHY COMPLAINT SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED AND PLAINTIFF BE DECLARED A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT: (See document for details.) Plaintiff is hereby ordered to show cause why the Magistrate Judge should not report and recommend that his complaint be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, and why he should not be declared a vexatious litigant and barred from filing any future civil rights complaints without the approval of a Judge of this Court. Plaintiff is ordered to comply with this OSC by: (1) filing a written response to this OSC no later than noontime, August 2, 2012, and (2) appearing in person before the Court at 10:00 a.m. sharp, August 9, 2012, in Courtroom 6B of this Court located at 411 W. 4th St., Santa Ana, California, 92701. Plaintiff is notified and warned that his failure to comply with any aspect of this OSC will result in his complaint being dismissed, and that he will be declared a vexatious litigant. No further notice will be given. (rla) (Entered: 07/26/2012)
07/26/2012	<u>6</u>	MINUTES (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato: denying <u>4</u> Motion for Order for hardship. (twdb) (Entered: 07/27/2012)
07/31/2012	<u>7</u>	AMENDED COMPLAINT against defendants Amir Kashani, L.A.C. and U.S.C. Medical Center Gen. Hosp., John Doe #1, John Doe #2, John Doe #3 amending Complaint <u>1</u> ,filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (twdb) (Entered: 08/01/2012)
08/02/2012	<u>8</u>	NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES AND ORDER by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato ORDERING Answer of Plaintiff James L. Miller to the Order to Show Cause submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller received on 08/02/2012 to be filed and processed; filed date to be the date the document was stamped Received but not Filed with the Clerk. (db) (Entered: 08/02/2012)
08/02/2012	<u>9</u>	Answer/RESPONSE filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller to Order to Show Cause <u>5</u> (twdb) (Entered: 08/02/2012)
08/08/2012	<u>10</u>	NOTICE OF DISCREPANCY AND ORDER: by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato, ORDERING ANSWER OF PLAINTIFF JAMES L. MILER TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller; received on 8/7/12 is not to be filed but instead rejected. Denial based on: these documents were previously filed, therefore, accepting them would constitute a duplicate filing. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> PART 2, # <u>2</u> PART 3, # <u>3</u> PART 4) (rla) (Entered: 08/10/2012)

app. = C- (37) of (6)

08/09/2012	<u>11</u>	MINUTES OF Show Cause Hearing held before Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato: Hearing re Court's Order to Show Cause (OSC) <u>5</u> : The Magistrate Judge ruled that he would issue a report and recommend that Miller's pending complaint be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, and that Miller be declared a vexatious litigant and barred from filing any future actions against the defendants without the prior written approval of a judge of this Court. Court Recorder: CS 8/9/2012. (rla) (Entered: 08/17/2012)
08/17/2012	<u>12</u>	NOTICE OF FILING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato. Objections to R&R due by 8/31/2012 (sty) (Entered: 08/17/2012)
08/17/2012	<u>13</u>	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION issued by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato Re Complaint <u>1</u> (sty) (Entered: 08/17/2012)
09/17/2012	<u>14</u>	ORDER by Judge Christina A. Snyder, Accepting the Findings and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and Declaration Plaintiff James L. Miller A Vexatious Litigant <u>13</u> . (twdb) (Entered: 09/17/2012)
09/17/2012	<u>15</u>	JUDGMENT by Judge Christina A. Snyder. IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED that this action is dismissed with prejudice for the reasons set forth in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.(MD JS-6, Case Terminated). (twdb) (Entered: 09/17/2012)
09/20/2012	<u>16</u>	NOTICE AND ORDER RE FILING BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT by Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato, re Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion. IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff may not file the document presented in the above-referenced matter. (rla) (Additional attachment(s) added on 9/24/2012: # <u>1</u> PART 2, # <u>2</u> PART 3) (rla). (Entered: 09/24/2012)
10/15/2012	<u>17</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Judgment <u>15</u> Filed On: 09/17/2012; Entered On: 09/17/2012; Filing fee \$ 455 billed. (dmap) (Entered: 10/16/2012)
10/16/2012	<u>18</u>	FILING FEE LETTER issued as to Plaintiff James L. Miller re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> . (dmap) (Entered: 10/16/2012)
10/17/2012	<u>19</u>	NOTIFICATION by Circuit Court of Appellate Docket Number 12-56895 9th CCA regarding Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller. (dmap) (Entered: 10/17/2012)
10/18/2012	<u>20</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> filed by James L. Miller, CCA # 12-56895. Appellant has not paid the docketing and filing fees for this appeal. Within 21 days from the date of this order, appellant shall: 1) file a motion with this court to proceed in forma pauperis; 2) pay \$455.00 to this court as the docketing and filing fees for this appeal and provide proof of payment to this court; or 3) otherwise show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. If appellant fails to comply with this order, this appeal will be dismissed automatically by the Clerk for failure to prosecute. [See document for further information] Order received in this district on 10/18/12. (car) (Entered: 10/19/2012)
10/30/2012	<u>21</u>	NOTICE OF DISCREPANCY AND ORDER: by Judge Christina A. Snyder, ORDERING Proof of Service submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller received on October 29, 2012 is not to be filed but instead rejected. Denial based on: Case on appeal; judicial determination is required. (im) (Entered: 11/02/2012)

app. Cr (38) OF (50)

11/01/2012	<u>24</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller, re Time Schedule Order, and Transcript Order, designate, served on 11/2/2012. (gk) (Entered: 11/06/2012)
11/02/2012	<u>22</u>	TRANSCRIPT ORDER re: Show Cause Hearing, <u>11</u> , as to Plaintiff James L. Miller Court Smart (CS). Transcript portion requested: Other: 8/09/12. Transcript preparation will not begin until payment has been satisfied with the court reporter/recorder. (ml) (Entered: 11/02/2012)
11/05/2012	<u>23</u>	NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES AND ORDER by Judge Christina A. Snyder, ORDERING Proof of Service submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller received on 11/2/2012 to be filed and processed; filed date to be the date the document was stamped Received but not Filed with the Clerk. (gk) (Entered: 11/06/2012)
01/23/2013	<u>25</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> filed by James L. Miller, CCA # 12-56895. Appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is denied because we find that the appeal is frivolous. If appellant wishes to pursue this appeal despite the courts finding that it is frivolous, then within 21 days after the date of this order, appellant shall pay \$455.00 to the district court as the docketing and filing fees for this appeal and file proof of payment with this court. Order received in this district on 1/23/13. [See document for further information]. (car) (Entered: 01/28/2013)
02/05/2013	<u>26</u>	APPEAL FEE PAID: re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller; Receipt Number: LA063188 in the amount of \$455. (car) (Entered: 02/08/2013)
04/02/2013	<u>27</u>	TRANSCRIPT for proceedings held on 8/9/13 9:54 A.M.. Court Reporter/Electronic Court Recorder: Jams Certified Transcription, phone number (661) 609-4528. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or purchased through the Court Reporter/Electronic Court Recorder before the deadline for Release of Transcript Restriction. After that date it may be obtained through PACER. Notice of Intent to Redact due within 7 days of this date. Redaction Request due 4/23/2013. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 5/3/2013. Release of Transcript Restriction set for 7/1/2013. (mo) (Entered: 04/02/2013)
04/02/2013	<u>28</u>	NOTICE OF FILING TRANSCRIPT filed for proceedings 8/9/13 9:54 A.M. re Transcript <u>27</u> THERE IS NO PDF DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ENTRY.(mo) TEXT ONLY ENTRY (Entered: 04/02/2013)
05/29/2013	<u>29</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> filed by James L. Miller CCA # 12-56895. The decision of the district court is affirmed. Order received in this district on 5/29/2013. (dmap) (Entered: 06/03/2013)
06/21/2013	<u>30</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>17</u> filed by James L. Miller CCA # 12-56895. The decision of the district court is affirmed. Mandate received in this district on 6/21/2013. (dmap) (Entered: 06/25/2013)
08/05/2014	<u>31</u>	NOTICE AND ORDER RE FILING BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT by Judge George H. King: Plaintiff attempted to file a Complaint/Petition. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff may not file the document presented in the above matter. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2, # <u>2</u> Part 3, # <u>3</u> Part 4) (gk) (Entered: 08/06/2014)
08/27/2014	<u>32</u>	NOTICE AND ORDER RE FILING BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT by Judge George H. King: Plaintiff, attempted to file a Complaint/Petition in the matter. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff may not file the document presented in the matter. This is yet

app C. (39) of (5)

		another attempt to file a virtually identical complaint to the one rejected in our 8/4/2014 Order. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (gk) (Entered: 08/28/2014)
09/19/2014	<u>33</u>	NOTICE AND ORDER RE FILING BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT by Judge George H. King. James L Miller, plaintiff attempted to file a pleading in the above referenced matter. IT is ordered that plaintiff may not file the document as presented in the above referenced matter. (shb) (Additional attachment(s) added on 9/23/2014: # <u>1</u> part 2, # <u>2</u> part 3, # <u>3</u> part 4, # <u>4</u> part 5) (shb). (Entered: 09/23/2014)
09/19/2014	<u>34</u>	NOTICE OF CLERICAL ERROR: Due to clerical error Re: Order, <u>33</u> . (Attachments: # <u>1</u> part 1, # <u>2</u> part 2, # <u>3</u> part 3, # <u>4</u> part 4, # <u>5</u> part 5) (shb) (Entered: 09/23/2014)
09/30/2014	<u>35</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Order, <u>32</u> , Order, <u>31</u> and Order <u>33</u> . Filed On: 8/5/2014, 8/27/2014 and 9/19/2014; Entered On: 8/6/2014, 8/28/2014 and 9/23/2014; Forma Pauperis Pending. (dmap) (Entered: 10/02/2014)
09/30/2014	<u>36</u>	Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration In Support filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (dmap) (Entered: 10/02/2014)
09/30/2014	<u>37</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by plaintiff James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>35</u> , Order, <u>32</u> , Order, <u>31</u> and Order <u>33</u> served on 9/30/2014. (dmap) (Entered: 10/02/2014)
10/02/2014	<u>38</u>	NOTIFICATION by Circuit Court of Appellate Docket Number 14-56597, 9th Circuit regarding Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>35</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 10/06/2014)
10/06/2014	<u>39</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Order, <u>31</u> Filed On: 8/5/14; Entered On: 8/6/14; In Forma Pauperis pending. (mat) (Entered: 10/06/2014)
10/06/2014	<u>40</u>	Request for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis on a Notice of Appeal filed by petitioner James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 10/06/2014)
10/06/2014	<u>41</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>39</u> , Request for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis <u>40</u> served on 9/30/14. (mat) (Entered: 10/06/2014)
10/14/2014	<u>42</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>35</u> filed by James L. Miller, CCA # 14-56597. Because the September 30, 2014 notice of appeal was not filed within 30 days of the orders entered on August 6, 2014 or August 28, 2014, the scope of this appeal is limited to review only of the district courts notice and order re filing by vexatious litigant, entered September 23, 2014. See 28 U.S.C. § 2107(a); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1). Appellants motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis will be addressed by separate order. Order received in this district on 10/14/14. (mat) (Entered: 10/16/2014)
12/02/2014	<u>43</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>35</u> filed by James L. Miller, CCA # 14-56597. Appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is denied because we find that the appeal is frivolous. If appellant wishes to pursue this appeal despite the court's finding that it is frivolous then, within 21 days after the date of this order, appellant shall pay \$505.00 to the district court as the docketing and filing fees for this appeal and file proof of payment with this court. Order received in this district on 12/2/14. (car) (Entered: 12/05/2014)

app-C: (40) OF (E)

12/22/2014		APPEAL FEE PAID: as to Plaintiff James L. Miller; Receipt Number: LA108946 in the amount of \$505. (rsm) (Entered: 12/22/2014)
03/04/2015	<u>44</u>	ORDER from 9th CCA filed re: 9th CCA Assigned Case Number Notice <u>35</u> filed by James L. Miller, CCA # 14-56597. This appeal is dismissed for failure to respond to the order of this court dated December 2, 2014. This order served on the district court shall constitute the mandate of this court. Order received in this district on 3/4/15. (mat) (Entered: 03/05/2015)
05/11/2015	<u>45</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>35</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 14-56597. Appellant's motion to reinstate this appeal is granted. Accordingly, we (9th CCA) summarily affirm the district court orders dated August 5, 2014, August 27, 2014, and September 5, 2014. (mat) (Entered: 05/11/2015)
06/03/2015	<u>46</u>	MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal <u>35</u> , CCA # 14-56597. The judgment of the 9th Circuit Court, entered May 11, 2015, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of the 9th CCA Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. [See USCA Order <u>45</u> AFFIRMED] (mat) (Entered: 06/05/2015)
02/11/2016	<u>47</u>	NOTICE of Change of address to: P.O. Box 122 Inglewood, CA 90306. Filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (dml) (Entered: 02/12/2016)
06/01/2017	<u>48</u>	NOTICE OF DISCREPANCY AND ORDER: by Judge Christina A. Snyder, ORDERING Plaintiff Notice of Motion submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller received on 5/30/2017 is not to be filed but instead rejected. Denial based on: Case termed. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Supplement) (iv) (Entered: 06/02/2017)
06/01/2017	<u>49</u>	NOTICE OF DISCREPANCY AND ORDER: by Judge Christina A. Snyder, ORDERING Plaintiff Proof of Service submitted by Plaintiff James L. Miller received on 5/30/2017 is not to be filed but instead rejected. Denial based on: Case termed. (iv) (Entered: 06/02/2017)
09/28/2017	<u>50</u>	NOTICE AND ORDER RE FILING BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT by Chief Judge Virginia A. Phillips: Plaintiff attempted to file a Complaint/Petition. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff may not file the document presented in the above matter. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (gk) (Entered: 10/02/2017)
10/11/2017	<u>51</u>	MOTION and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis filed by plaintiffs James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 10/16/2017)
10/11/2017	<u>52</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Order, <u>50</u> Filed On: 9/28/17; Entered On: 10/2/17; In forma pauperis is pending. (mat) (Entered: 10/16/2017)
10/11/2017	<u>53</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE by Personal Delivery, filed by plaintiff James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>52</u> , NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis <u>51</u> served on 10/11/17. (mat) (Entered: 10/16/2017)
10/17/2017	<u>54</u>	NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 17-56567 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>52</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller. (lom) (Entered: 10/17/2017)

app. l. (41.) of (5)

10/17/2017	<u>55</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>52</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 17-56567. A review of this court's docket reflects that the filing and docketing fees for this appeal remain due. Within 21 days after the date of this order, appellant shall pay to the district court the \$505.00 filing and docketing fees for this appeal and file in this court proof of such payment or file in this court a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. If appellant fails to comply with this order, this appeal will be dismissed automatically by the Clerk for failure to prosecute. (mat) (Entered: 10/17/2017)
04/25/2018	<u>56</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>52</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 17-56567. Appellant motion to proceed in forma paueris denied and diss appeal as frivolous. (lc) (Entered: 04/26/2018)
05/17/2018	<u>57</u>	MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>52</u> , USCA Memorandum/Opinion/Order <u>56</u> , CCA # 17-56567. The judgment of this Court, entered April 25, 2018, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. (car) (Entered: 05/17/2018)
03/26/2021	58	ORDER RE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FILING by Judge Christina A. Snyder, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the documents presented not be filed. (shb) (Entered: 03/30/2021)
03/26/2021	59	ORDER RE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FILING by Judge Christina A. Snyder, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the documents presented not be filed. (shb) (Entered: 03/31/2021)
03/26/2021	<u>60</u>	ORDER RE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FILING by Judge Christina A. Snyder, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the documents presented not be filed. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2, # <u>2</u> Part3, # <u>3</u> Part4, # <u>4</u> Part 5, # <u>5</u> Part 6, # <u>6</u> Part 7) (shb) (Entered: 04/01/2021)
04/19/2021	<u>61</u>	MOTION and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 04/19/2021)
04/19/2021	<u>62</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Vexatious Litigant Filing (CV-115) 59 , Vexatious Litigant Filing (CV-115) <u>60</u> Filed On: 3/26/21; Entered On: 3/30/21, 3/31/21 and 4/1/21; Motion for In forma pauperis is pending. (mat) (Entered: 04/19/2021)
04/19/2021	<u>63</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by plaintiff James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, <u>62</u> , NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis <u>61</u> served on personal services. (mat) (Entered: 04/19/2021)
04/20/2021	<u>64</u>	NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 21-55384 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, <u>62</u> as to plaintiff James L. Miller. (es) (Entered: 04/20/2021)
07/15/2021	<u>65</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, <u>62</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 21-55384. We deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss this appeal as frivolous. Dismissed. [See document for details.](mat) (Entered: 07/15/2021)
08/06/2021	<u>66</u>	MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, <u>62</u> , CCA # 21-55384. The judgment of this Court, entered July 15, 2021, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued

app. Ct (42) OF (6)

		pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. [See USCA Order, <u>65</u> , DISMISSED.] (mat) (Entered: 08/06/2021)
09/01/2021	<u>67</u>	ORDER RE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FILING by Judge Christina A. Snyder, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the documents presented not be filed. (shb) (Entered: 09/02/2021)
09/13/2021	<u>68</u>	MOTION and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Lodged Order on Motion for IFP) (mat) (Entered: 09/15/2021)
09/13/2021	<u>69</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Vexatious Litigant Filing (CV-115) <u>67</u> Filed On: 9/1/21; Entered On: 9/2/21; In forma pauperis is pending. (mat) (Entered: 09/15/2021)
09/13/2021	<u>70</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by plaintiff James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>69</u> , NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis <u>68</u> served on 9/13/21. (mat) (Entered: 09/15/2021)
09/14/2021	<u>71</u>	AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL to 9th CIRCUIT filed by plaintiff James L. Miller. Amending Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>69</u> Filed On: 9/13/21; Entered On: 9/15/21. (mat) (Entered: 09/16/2021)
09/16/2021	<u>72</u>	NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 21-56015 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>69</u> as to plaintiff James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 09/20/2021)
09/20/2021	<u>73</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>69</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 21-56015. A review of this court's docket reflects that the filing and docketing fees for this appeal remain due. Within 21 days after the date of this order, appellant shall pay to the district court the \$505.00 filing and docketing fees for this appeal and file in this court proof of such payment or file in this court a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. If appellant fails to comply with this order, this appeal may be dismissed by the (9th CCA) Clerk for failure to prosecute. (mat) (Entered: 09/21/2021)
09/24/2021	<u>74</u>	ORDER ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS <u>68</u> by Judge Christina A. Snyder. The court has considered the motion and the motion is DENIED. The Court certifies that the proposed appeal is not taken in good faith under 28 U.S.C. 1915(a) and is frivolous, without merit and does not present a substantial question within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. 753(f). See order for details. (lom) (Entered: 09/24/2021)

app. C. - (43) OP (5)

(JPRx),CLOSED,DISCOVERY,MANADR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (Western Division - Los Angeles)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:19-cv-08909-PSG-JPR
Internal Use Only

James L. Miller v. Virginia A. Phillips et al
Assigned to: Judge Philip S. Gutierrez
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth
Case in other court: 9th CCA, 19-56385
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 10/16/2019
Date Terminated: 11/01/2019
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government
Defendant

Plaintiff**James L. Miller**

represented by **James L. Miller**
PO Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306
323-399-5680
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

Virginia A. Phillips
individual

Defendant

Virginia A. Phillips
official capacity

Defendant**Does**

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
10/16/2019	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT against Defendants Does, Virginia A. Phillips. Case assigned to Judge Philip S. Gutierrez for all further proceedings. Discovery referred to Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth. Jury Demanded, filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Civil Cover Sheet) (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/16/2019	<u>2</u>	CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE of Interested Parties filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller, (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/16/2019	<u>3</u>	REQUEST to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration in Support filed

app. C. (44) of (5)

		by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019).
10/16/2019	<u>4</u>	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT to District Judge Philip S. Gutierrez and Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth. (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/16/2019	<u>5</u>	NOTICE TO PARTIES OF COURT-DIRECTED ADR PROGRAM filed. (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/25/2019		RECOMMENDATION issued by Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth. Re REQUEST to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, Declaration in Support <u>3</u> . Proposed Order forwarded to the District Judge for approval.(bem) (Entered: 10/25/2019)
11/01/2019	<u>6</u>	ORDER by Judge Philip S. Gutierrez: Denying <u>3</u> REQUEST to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: IT WAS RECOMMENDED that the Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis be DENIED by Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth. Reason: Claims are frivolous, and the judges and the clerks he sues have absolute immunity. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that: This case is hereby DISMISSED immediately. MD JS-6, Case Terminated. (bm) (Entered: 11/04/2019)
11/12/2019	<u>7</u>	MOTION and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (mat) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/12/2019	<u>8</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Order on Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration in Support (CV-60), <u>6</u> Filed On: 11/1/19; Entered On: 11/4/19; In forma pauperis is pending. (mat) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/18/2019	<u>9</u>	ORDER by Judge Philip S. Gutierrez: Denying <u>7</u> MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis (car) (Entered: 11/20/2019)
11/20/2019	<u>10</u>	FILING FEE LETTER issued as to Petitioner James L. Miller, re Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>8</u> (car) (Entered: 11/20/2019)
11/26/2019	<u>11</u>	NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 19-56385 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>8</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller. (bm) (Entered: 11/27/2019)
04/13/2020	<u>12</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>8</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 19-56385. We deny appellant's motions to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).DISMISSED. [See document for all details.] (mat) (Entered: 04/13/2020)
06/05/2020	<u>13</u>	MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>8</u> , CCA # 19-56385. The judgment of this Court, entered April 13, 2020, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. [See USCA Order, <u>12</u> DISMISSED.] (mat) (Entered: 06/05/2020)

appell (45) of (5)

194,CLOSED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (Western Division - Los Angeles)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:19-cv-08910-AB-KS
Internal Use Only

James L. Miller v. Scott S. Harris et al
Assigned to: Judge Andre Birotte Jr
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson
Case in other court: 9th CCA, 19-56319
Cause: 28:1983 Civil Rights

Date Filed: 10/16/2019
Date Terminated: 10/28/2019
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff**James L. Miller**

represented by **James L. Miller**
PO Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306
323-399-5680
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

Scott S. Harris
individually

Defendant

Scott S. Harris
official capacity

Defendant**Does**

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
10/16/2019	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT filed against Defendants Does, Scott S. Harris(official capacity), Scott S. Harris(individually) Case assigned to Judge Andre Birotte Jr and referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson. Filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Civil Cover Sheet) (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/16/2019	<u>2</u>	CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE of Interested Parties filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller, (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/16/2019	<u>3</u>	REQUEST to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration in Support filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)

app. C: (46) of (51)

10/16/2019	<u>4</u>	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT to District Judge Andre Birotte Jr and referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson. (lh) (Entered: 10/21/2019)
10/23/2019		RECOMMENDATION presented by Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson. Re REQUEST to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, Declaration in Support <u>3</u> , Complaint, <u>1</u> . Proposed Order forwarded to the District Judge for approval. (gr) (Entered: 10/23/2019)
10/28/2019	<u>5</u>	ORDER RE REQUEST TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS by Judge Andre Birotte Jr.: Denying <u>3</u> REQUEST to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is hereby DISMISSED immediately. IT WAS RECOMMENDED that the Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis be DENIED by Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson. Reasons: Legally and/or factually patently frivolous. Immunity as to U.S. Clerk of Court. See document for further details. (MD JS-6, Case Terminated.) (gk) (Entered: 10/29/2019)
11/07/2019	<u>6</u>	MOTION and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Lodged Order) (mat) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/07/2019	<u>7</u>	NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th CCA filed by Plaintiff James L. Miller. Appeal of Order on Request to Proceed In Forma Pauperis with Declaration in Support (CV-60), <u>5</u> Filed On: 10/28/19; Entered On: 10/29/19; In forma pauperis pending. (mat) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/14/2019	<u>8</u>	NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 19-56319 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>7</u> as to Plaintiff James L. Miller. (et) (Entered: 11/18/2019)
11/19/2019		RECOMMENDATION presented by Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson. Re NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis <u>6</u> , Complaint, <u>1</u> . Proposed Order forwarded to the District Judge for approval. (gr) (Entered: 11/19/2019)
11/26/2019	<u>9</u>	ORDER by Judge Andre Birotte Jr: denying <u>6</u> MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis (mat) (Entered: 11/27/2019)
04/13/2020	<u>10</u>	ORDER from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>7</u> filed by James L. Miller. CCA # 19-56319. We deny appellant's motionsto proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). DISMISSED. (mat) (Entered: 04/13/2020)
06/05/2020	<u>11</u>	MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals <u>7</u> , CCA # 19-56319. The judgment of this Court, entered April 13, 2020, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. [See USCA Order, <u>10</u> DISMISSED.] (mat) (Entered: 06/05/2020)

app. Ct. (47) of (5)

APPENDIX-C

Page 8

Statement of the Case; U.S. DIST. COURT - CENTRAL DIST. OF
CALIFORNIA (Western Div. - Los Angeles) Civ. Docket No. #

2:12-CV-05649-CAB-AN, 36-43;

2:19-CV-08909-PSG-JPR, 44-45;

2:19-CV-08910-AB-KS, 46-47;

U.S. SUPREME COURT - Clerk's - Oct. 17, 2022 (Dismissed Letter, 48;

U.S. SUPREME COURT - Case Analyst - Aug. 17, 2022 49;

U.S. SUPREME COURT - Notice is Hereby Given (Aug. 17, 2022 50;

U.S. SUPREME COURT - Waiver Call under U.S. SUPREME CT. No. 22-5358-

17 51.

Appendix-C.

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

October 17, 2022

Mr. James L. Miller
P.O. Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306

Re: James L. Miller
v. Amir Kashani, et al.
No. 22-5358

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

Sincerely,



Scott S. Harris, Clerk

Rules = Supreme Court Rule
39.1 (1-2 and 4) ; 29.4 (b)(c) ;
44 (1-2) ; 14 ;
12 (3) ; appendix C. (48) 61 (54)

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

August 17, 2022

Mr. James L. Miller
P.O. Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306

Re: James L. Miller
v. Amir Kashani, et al.
No. 22-5358

Dear Mr. Miller:

The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed on August 9, 2022 and placed on the docket August 17, 2022 as No. 22-5358.

A form is enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

by



Redmond K. Barnes
Case Analyst

Enclosures

appendix-L(49) of (54.)

Supreme Court of the United States

James L. Miller
(Petitioner)

v.

No. 22-5358

Amir Kashani, et al.
(Respondent)

To Solicitor General of the United States Counsel for Respondent:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to Rule 12.3 that a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States on August 9, 2022, and placed on the docket August 17, 2022. Pursuant to Rule 15.3, the due date for a brief in opposition is Friday, September 16, 2022. If the due date is a Saturday, Sunday, or federal legal holiday, the brief is due on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or federal legal holiday.

Beginning November 13, 2017, parties represented by counsel must submit filings through the Supreme Court's electronic filing system. Paper remains the official form of filing, and electronic filing is in addition to the existing paper submission requirement. Attorneys must register for the system in advance, and the registration process may take several days. Further information about the system can be found at <https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/electronicfiling.aspx>.

Unless the Solicitor General of the United States represents the respondent, a waiver form is enclosed and should be sent to the Clerk only in the event you do not intend to file a response to the petition.

Only counsel of record will receive notification of the Court's action in this case. Counsel of record must be a member of the Bar of this Court.

Mr. James L. Miller
P.O. Box 122
Inglewood, CA 90306

appendix-C(50) OP (54)

NOTE: This notice is for notification purposes only, and neither the original nor a copy should be filed in the Supreme Court.

W A I V E R

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 22-5358

James L. Miller
(Petitioner)

v.

Amir Kashani, et al.
(Respondent)

I DO NOT INTEND TO FILE A RESPONSE to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless one is requested by the Court.

Please check the appropriate box:

- ☐ I am filing this waiver on behalf of all respondents.
- ☐ I only represent some respondents. I am filing this waiver on behalf of the following respondent(s):

Please check the appropriate box:

- ☐ I am a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. (Filing Instructions: File a signed Waiver in the Supreme Court Electronic Filing System. The system will prompt you to enter your appearance first.)
- ☐ I am not presently a member of the Bar of this Court. Should a response be requested, the response will be filed by a Bar member. (Filing Instructions: Mail the original signed form to: Supreme Court, Attn: Clerk's Office, 1 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20543).

Signature _____

Date: _____

(Type or print) Name _____
☐ Mr. ☐ Ms. ☐ Mrs. ☐ Miss

Firm _____

Address _____

City & State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Email _____

A COPY OF THIS FORM MUST BE SENT TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL OR TO PETITIONER IF *PRO SE*. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE NAME(S) OF THE RECIPIENT(S) OF A COPY OF THIS FORM. NO ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OR COVER LETTER IS REQUIRED.

cc: James L. Miller, petitioner/pro se, P.O. Box #1225
Inglewood, California 90306,
appendix-C. (51) o A-(542)