

22-5682
No.

FILED
MAY 20 2022

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SARASOTA COUNTY, FLA.
ORIGINIAL

Jonathan F. Ramos — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs

Valmont Industries RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals For The Eighth Circuit 21-3401
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jonathan Ramos

(Your Name)

3542 23RD ST. APT. #413
(Address)

(Address)

Columbus, NE 68601

(City, State, Zip Code)

(713) 574-8934

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

AUG - 2 2022

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED
Valmont - Breham, Texas

(American Sign Language)
Very good provided ASL interpreter year 2014-2015

Valmont Columbus, Nebraska: year 2015 reject ASL interpreter. But 2016 only few while reject on the floor interpreter Denial. Not same Texas was on the floor ASL interpreter.

Question is why Valmont employer allow ASL interpreter on floor in Breham, Texas but why not Valmont Columbus, Nebraska reject?

Texas more clear understand policy but columbus, Nebraska new policy clear-No! evidence email by Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Nebraska has email Sent to Human Resources on June 16, 2015 - why HR ignore? for sake? After, I kept asked many time HR/manager - they reject.

Point is Judges failure review on this evidence harassment/terminate, Americans Disability Acts Law?

LIST OF PARTIES

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

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

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Ramos VS. Valmont 8:18-CV-00313	ALL
21-3401	ALL
National Association of the Deaf vs. Trump No. 20CV2107, 2020 WL 4452083	
Ramos VS. Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. 8:20CV375	

STATUTES AND RULES

20CV2107, 2020 WL 4452083

OTHER

N/A

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I, Am Plaintiff against employer Valmont and Defendant for the deprivation of rights guaranteed under federal law - 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1333.

Please review at 8:18-cv-313, I files evidence. On May 20 or around, I visit columbus, NE Valmont and I saw policy was different than Texas Valmont. So, I request ASL interpreter May and June but nothing do it. Even, they got email from Nebraska VR Vocational Rehabilitation but Defendant hide email for ASL interpreter name, phone #, cost. I request to bring "On the floor"! For example: Texas Valmont full interpreter but Valmont reject interpreter on the floor to limited. After, I got form the warning write up for break time but I got permit by supervisor toward Leaderman. supervisor gone for religion, I was terminated of employee but I told witness saw not fair the co-worker ASL interpreter on the floor but Defendant reject. I need ASL interpreter because my english limited/read - see National Association of The Deaf VS. Trump, No. 20CV2107, 2020 WL 4452083: 

"ASL is a complete and complex language distinct from English, with its own vocabulary and rules for grammar and syntax—it is not simply English in hand signals. ASL has no written component. For several reasons, including early language deprivation, many deaf people have a very limited ability to read and write in English."

I told Valmont in Texas, they understand but Columbus Valmont deprivation my rights by request ASL interpreter on the floor because of different policy.

I moved from Texas 06/01/2015, too stressing, new life, ~~the~~ single hardship of Nebraska to try my best English but some reject, few have access. Today new employers reject ASL interpreter—still 2022! please be justice... Thanks.

Valmont's lawyer John Smith in settlement was block as no pay ASL interpreter, only you. wrongful.

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

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

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

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

reported at Dismissal; 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 B to the petition and is

reported at Dismissal; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

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

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

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

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

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 02/25/22

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 _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

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

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA),
42 U.S.C. 12112 et seq. and the Nebraska Fair Employment
Practices Act (FEPA), NEb. Rev. 48-1104 et. seq.

Valmont Industries the Defendants for acts
in violation of Plaintiff's rights as guaranteed under
Laws.

U.S. Constitution - First Amendment by violation Valmont.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TO overturning Federal court case: 8:18cv313.
And be action bawsited Valmont by broke law on
Americans disabilities of Acts, etc.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan F. Ramos /JF.R

Date: 09/16/2022