

No. 22-5457

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

AUG 24 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

J CHRISTOPHER WREH, I — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

ALEX GIANOTOS, BOSTEN GOLDSCHMIED & BG

INCORPORATED — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

J. CHRISTOPHER WREH, I

(Your Name)

509 SHADOW BEND DRIVE

(Address)

RICHARDSON, TX 75081

(City, State, Zip Code)

972-896-7936

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WRIT OF CERTIORARI IS TO REVIEW EXCLUSIVELY OF THE JUNE 27, 2022 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REHEARING WHICH WAS DENIED ON JUNE 29, 2022 BY THE SUPREM COURT OF TEXAS.

[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:

J. CHRISTOPHER WREH, I

VS.

ALEX GIANOTOS, BOSTEN GOLDSCHMIED & BG INCORPORATED

THE CASE IS RELATED TO MY (Wreh) case number 22-5095

After I sued Wells Fargo Bank the Bank received the Court papers (Order) then Wells Fargo bank sold my property to a third Party (Alex Gianotos, et all) then the third party is trying to throw my whole family on the streets of Richardson, Dallas County, State of Texas, USA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

APPENDIX A

DECISION

OF THE TX

SUPREME

COURT ON

JUNE 29,

2022

APPENDIX B

EMERGENC

Y MOTION

FILED BY

Wreh for

extension of

time to file

rehearing

APPENDIX C

brief

chronology of

the case

APPENDIX D

CHILDREN

UNDER 18

06/25/2022

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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.



[] 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[] is unpublished.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.

[x] 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.

NOTE**** THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT DENIED ME OF MY RIGHTS TO BE REPRESENTED. I WAS SICK AND I HAVE COVID-19 MILD SYTOMPS AS WELL.

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 JUNE 29, 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 _____.

NOTE* REHEARING WAS NOT FILED BECAUSE THE SUPREME COURT DENIED THE EXTENSION TO FILE REHEARING WHEN I WAS SERIOUSLY SICK INCLUDING MILD COVID-19 SYTOMPS**

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES I HAVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO BE HEARD IN COURT FOR JUSTICE TO BE SERVED. ESPECIALLY WHEN WELLS FARGO BANK PAY THE 162nd COURT OF TEXAS AND HAVE A TACIT AGREEMENT WITH THE COURT INCLUDING “QUID PRO QUO”—and the use of JUDICIAL ACTIVISM TO STEAL MY PROPERTY AND SELL IT.

THROUGH THIS CASE I HAVE BEEN DENIED OF MY RIGHTS TO BE REPRESENTED BY A LEGAL COUNSEL.

TEXAS SUPREME COURT THE HIGHEST COURT IN THE STATE OF TEXAS DENIED ME THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD IN THE COURT OF JUSTICE.

IT MAYBE APPALLING BUT NOT SURPRISING FOR INDIVIDUAL IKE ME DESCRIBED AS MUD PEOPLE WITH GHETTO LOANS AS DESCRIBED BY WELLS FARGO BANK AND ITS AFFILIATES.

AT THE OUTSET I HAVE NOT EVEN HAVE ANY REAL ESTATE (MORTGAGE) RELATIONSHIP WITH WELLS FARGO. I HAVE OWNED MY PROPERTY SINCE 2004. PRIOR TO THAT I WAS RENTING THE HOME UNDER THE “RENT TO BUY AGREEMENT” BEFORE I BOUGHT IT IN 2004 WITH A DIFFERENT MORTGAGE COMPANY.

I AM ASKING THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PLEASE RESTORE MY BASIC RIGHTS AS HUMAN BY GRANTING THIS MOTION OF CERTIORARI

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I have never seen any one willing to buy a car let alone a property that is in dispute. This is what happens here. The Property is in dispute with Wells Fargo bank and MY FAMILY after the 162nd Court Illegally foreclosed on my property.

Alex Gianotos, Bosten Goldschmied & BG Incorporated is the Third Party that claimed to have bought my property from Wells Fargo Bank and trying to evict My family. This is exactly why we are here. Briefly, Wells Fargo bank and Associates Paid Money to the 162nd District Court of Dallas, reach a TACIT Agreement with the Court involving used of Fraudulent rubber Stamps documents, with no mortgage delinquency documentations, with no prior rental / mortgage-business dealings relationship (Contract) with my family and with “quid pro quo” and Judicial Activism illegally foreclosed on my home and sold it to the Third Party.

This is where the trouble starts. Let me Quote one of our civil rights leaders of his times:

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr, a well know civil right pioneer once said: “INJUSTICE ANYWHERE IS A THREAT TO JUSTICE EVERYWHERE”

Prior to Wells Fargo Bank and Associates Foreclosing on my home, I have never had a mortgage and / or rental relationship with Wells Fargo Bank. In essence I have no Business Dealings in any form of Communication(s) with Wells Fargo Bank, N. A. Shockingly, because of the money paid by Wells Fargo Bank to the 162nd District Court of Dallas, I received a Foreclosure Notice from the Court. I eventually filed a Civil Complaint against Wells Fargo bank in the 162nd District Court of Dallas for My property. Which end up in the US District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit which is already at the SCOTUS (case no. 22-5095) and I have never had the opportunity in the justice system to present my side of the equations. Through this case my constitutional Rights has been Denied. Please see Appendix C for brief original Details.

We are here because, the Texas Supreme Court, the Fifth Appeals Court Dallas, Districts and other trial courts involves in this case erroneous failed to: 1) Grant my Family our Constitutional Rights for a due process of law, Rights to be heard by Impartial Justice System...Rights to be legally represented in courts; 2) Apply the U S District COURT DOMINANT JURISDICTION RULE—Court of Appeals Texas, San Antonio. Kenneth Richard GRIFFITH Appellant V. Martha Hightower GRIFFITH, Appellee No. 04-10-00174-CV

The first filed rule and the dominant jurisdiction rule certainly and clearly apply to the

instant eviction case as a requisite inherent interrelationship exists.

Not only is the federal case first filed (SCOTUS CASE No. 22-5095), it is also pleaded and answered which confirms the rule.

The eviction action by Wells Fargo was the subject of the motions for injunction filed in the federal case and these injunctions are pending and have not been denied. Note; also the First Review I presented to the Supreme Court Of Texas and The Original Brief That Was Presented to the 5th Appeals Court, Dallas District.

3) Apply :

Quoting THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS 15-0631 IN RE J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT, INC., RELATOR on Petition for a Writ of Mandamus the Court said: “The general common law rule in Texas is that the court in which suit is first filed acquires dominant jurisdiction to the exclusion of other coordinate courts.” *Curtis v. Gibbs*, 511 S.W.2d 263, 267 (Tex. 1974).

As a result, when two suits are inherently interrelated, “a plea in abatement in the second action must be granted.” *Wyatt v. Shaw Plumbing Co.*, 760 S.W.2d 245, 247 (Tex. 1988).

This first filed rule flows from “principles of comity, convenience, and the necessity for an orderly procedure in the trial of contested issues.” *Wyatt v. Shaw Plumbing Co.*, 760 S.W.2d 245, 247 (Tex. 1988) The default rule thus tilts the playing field in favor of according dominant jurisdiction to the court in which suit is first filed.

Further, the only reason that the parties are not identical is because of the underhanded, deceptive, inequitable and possibly fraudulent conduct of Wells Fargo and its failure to disclose the sale to the Defendant herein or to the U.S. District Court. The Plaintiff in the federal action also proceeded with due diligence.

If the Court were to ignore the legal standards required, the Defendant is entitled to file a Mandamus Action under *In re Prudential Insurance Co. of America*, 148 S.W.3d 124 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding).

As such, this court may not take any action contrary to this motion in any case as mandamus is to “spare private parties and the public the time and money utterly wasted enduring eventual reversal of improperly conducted proceedings.” 50 *Id.* at 135–36.

ALSO SEE: IN RE PUIG, 351 S.W.3d 301 (Tex. 2011) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam).

~~I am very much concern that the Decision of the Supreme Court of Texas in denying my Request for Extension of time to file rehearing was based on the 1857 Dred Scott decision and the Jim Crow era laws.~~

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TO THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

COMES NOW the PLAINTIFF J. Christopher wre, 1, to MOVE the Honorable JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to grant the motion of CERTIORARI for the reasons stated herein. To be CLEARED my Motion of Certiorari and my such for justices are not FRIVOLOUS and THEY ARE IN GOOD FAITH.

Moreover, at the outset I have NO COMMUNICATIONS AND OR / RELATIONSHIP ON THE LINE OF MORTGAGE with Wells Fargo and Associates that sold my Property to A third party (Alex Gianotos, Boston Goldschmied & BG Incorporated). I HAVE NEVER EVER BEEN A MORTGAGE / TENANT CLIENT FOR WELLS FARGO BANK AND ASSOCIATES. I am concerned that Wells Fargo Bank and Associates PAID the 162nd District Court of Dallas in a tacit agreement and Scheme to Fraudulently take my property and sell it.

Details of the Tacit Agreement and Scheme will be presented when my motion for certiorari is granted.

Let us not forget that this case is not only about my family but about spreading impartial justice across the spectrum. IF WELLS FARGO BANK AND ITS ASSOCIATES ARE NOT STOP NOW, THEY ARE GOING TO CONTINUE TAKING MORE HOMES OWN BY Black people, MUD PEOPLE (GHETTOS LOANS) AND THE FINANCIALLY DISADVANTAGE USING THEIR MONEY BAGS with no accountability.

Petitioner files this certiorari in support of petition, Petitioner shows the following:

1. That the Petitioner Prays that Moving Forward That all documents previously presented and to be presented for this case including REHEARING be put before the HONORABLE JUSTICES of the SUPREME COURT. so, Help me oh God.
2. As a Pauperis and Pro Se Petitioner is overwhelmed and need time and legal representation.
3. The Petitioner relies on the following facts as reasonable explanation for the requested extension of time. The petitioner intends to provide more Details of the case that might have been missed in the review including Discovery and more information from the trial courts.
4. I planned to provide Details to the court that might have Missed or were not provided. I WILL BE SPILLING THE BEANS WITH additional information WHICH REQUIRES MORE TIME AS Pro Se Pauperis (Appellant). An Appellant, who does not have law Education and at a serious Financial Disadvantage but Fighting to Keep A roof over the Family Heads. I have planned to get Additional Information from the Trial Courts to provide you with in debt issues of this case.
5. Petitioner is involved in two cases which are similar / inherent that should actually be pleaded one at a time. This is due to the result of the with the fraudulent tricks by Wells Fargo and associates to take my property. As I am preparing this Certiorari for this case ,I am also making preparation for the similar case (SCOTUS No. 22-5095). This was intentionally done by Wells Fargo and Associates not only to Distract me but also Overwhelmed me so that I can missed reporting deadlines in other courts. In addition to preparing a Petition for Certiorari in this case Petitioner must also devote time to the Following additional matters:
 - A. Preparation OF Motions and Briefs to be submitted. It is not fair to me to be overwhelmed by the Actions of the Defendants but that exactly what Wells Fargo bank and Associates want to happen to me. Their (Appellee) Deliberate Intention is for me to missed deadlines for Court

fillings so that my case will be denied. Wells Fargo Bank and Associates have been polling many unfair and fraudulent tricks (Creation of False Banks Accounts, Falsifications of Mortgages Modifications, etc.) on many people, organizations and Governments to defraud them.

6. Denying This motion will not only put my family in the streets of Richardson, Dallas County, Texas but additional complications of stress and trauma of seeking employment, searching for basic necessities (food, shelters, etc.) and couple with more health problems. My family do not have any money now. We do not have an alternative place to live, other than the streets if we are evicted from our home of two decades plus years. I am seeking employment now. I am earnestly, seriously and desperately asking you, your honors to accept my request for a Certiorari
7. I am very concern, that Denying this motion will cause emotional decimation of my family life as human. We are already suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome cause by harassment of telephones' calls and other physical harassments will increase against MY FAMILY. AS I AM WRITING THIS MOTION STRANGE VEHICLES AND PEOPLE ARE MOVING AROUND MY PROPERTY DAILY.
8. Granting the motion will Provide me the opportunity as a step toward justice in this case. I certainly believed with supportive evidence and documentations that the Property at 509 Shadow Bend Drive, Richardson, Texas where I am currently and have been living for more than twenty (20) years with my family belongs to me and had every intention of making my case. I understand this is the case of David and Goliath. As a Christian (a Catholic), I will honestly and truthful present The Facts to the Court. WHICH INCLUDE THINGS THAT ARE SAID IN THE TRIAL COURTS BUT THAT MENTIONED EARLIER.
9. Denying this motion is going to cause irreparable harm to my entire family and generations. Seeking JUSTICE, I have never lost hope in my struggle. I am SERIOUSLY asking and ENCOURAGING YOU, MY HONOR to Grant my request for Motion of Certiorari

10. The Petitioner pray that the first file rule stated should be applicable across the spectrum.

11. I pray that my Motion for Certiorari be granted and my case be put back on the docket.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

J. CHRISTOPHER WREH, I

Date: AUGUST 13, 2022