

No. 22-623

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

James W. Hall

:Petitioner

-v.-

G.M.S. Management Co., Inc. et al

Respondents

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of
Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

James W. Hall
Pro-Se of Record
P.O. Box 1123 State Route 8
Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio 44223
330-329-9323 Pro-Se for Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|------------------------------|------|
| STATEMENT | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| PETITION FOR REHEARING | 1 |
| CONCLUSION | 4 |
| CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL..... | 5 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Cases | Page |
|---|------|
| <i>Constitutional Rights 43 US Code §104</i>2 | |
| <i>Nixon Doctrine Refusal to Obey a Subpoena</i> §3914-23 Fifth Circuit CH 9 | 2 |
| <i>(Frivolous) Ruling of the Circuit Court Judges</i> <i>(Lied) in their decision on this lack of concern silly</i> <i>Seriousness</i>2 | |
| <i>Constitution Bill Rights</i> 28 US Code §1654 Appearing Personally.....1 | |

I, James W. Hall Petitioner Pro-se hereby certify that this petition for rehearing is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2 and present in good path and for delay. Certificate of Advocate (44.2)

TIMELY PETITION FOR REHEARING RULE 44.2

Petitioner James W. Hall respectfully request rehearing of the Courts order dated March 6, 2023 denied the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case - it is unusual for this Court to grant rehearing and grant plenary review, but it is not unheard of for this court to grant rehearing and then grant certiorari vacate the judgment below, and remind. This petition is filed pursuant to Rule 44 of the rules of the Supreme Court of the United States. That would be the appropriate disposition in this case sincerely move for rehearsal of the denial.

A. James W. Hall's Certiorari petition presented the following questions

i and ii

1. Whether the circuit Judges of the United States is above the Law to answer to why the Lower Court not obeying and these Judges to a (Subpoena) and missing documents to this case. This is disobedience to a subpoena 43 US Code §104. In Petitioner James W. Hall filed 3 times in the United States Court for these papers but the Judges refused to release them so I could Pro-Se due-process.

2. Whether the sixth circuit Court of Appeals (Deprived) Petitioner of his constitution right of the fourteenth amendment 1868.

3. Whether the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit did deprived petitioner James W. Hall of his constitution Bill of Rights 28 US Code §1654 in any court represent my self.

4. Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall was (Deprived) of a Conference Call Hearing like before with the three Judges out of the Circuit Court in Canton, Ohio. Order from the Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice O'Conner but Judges McKeague, White and Readler Circuit did not want Petitioner James W. Hall to read and asked about the July 29-2019 no hearing was held with Petitioner James W. Hall being in this Barberton Municipal Court.

5. Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall in my brief. I stated there was no papers filed in the Barberton Municipal Court charging Petitioner of moving out the Apartment on the same day of this so call trial July 29-2019 Petitioner James W. Hall filed a Subpoena, on Barberton Municipal Court for document which the Court never mailed to (Petitioner) I ask the Supreme Court of the United States to review my (briefs).

1. Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall on the Judges of the Circuit Court (Deprived) Petitioner James W. Hall of his first and fourteenth amendment freedom of speech and due process these Judges are not about the law and in the Ninth District Appellate Court never had any documents from the Lower Court filed to proof or a (Moot) Trial.

2. Nixon doctrine refusal to obey a (Subpoena) 39-14-23 Fifth Circuit CH9 Discovery Order 94 S CT 3090 418 US 683,41 Led 2d 1039

3. Frivolous Ruling is a shortcut for trying to derail a case when petitioner putting on the Judges right wrong doing to keep a petitioner from filing a lawsuit for (Obstruction Justice) that is why these 3 Judge did not want me (Petitioner) to at my oral argument to be on transcript and recorded. This is discrimination when I have did it before I request now to this Supreme Court of the United States.

4. Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall Constitutional Rights violated 28 US Code §1654 to due process in any court to represent myself as a pro-se was (Deprived) by these 3 judges I want justice.

4. Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall the Sixth Circuit Court stated that petitioner never stated a claim. State for relief can be granted Petitioner did do so in my briefs. Petitioner never had my day in Court on this case in common pleas court never had my day in United States District Court of Judge Patricia A. Gaughan.

Petitioner James W. Hall mailed certified letters to this Judge Patricia A. Gaughan for (Motion) for a Hearing in this matter she the Judge would never reply back.

In common plea court Judge Mary Rowland never reply back also.

Now comes Petitioner James W. Hall to the Supreme Court of the United States request and respect to the Court to respect all people if they are judge. Lawyer, policemen even if they are doing wrong but not to except there action cause anything to cause me the same you got good people and bad, we vote a person into office to do the world of some good but sometimes it does not work.

Now the defendant in this case gave up the rights waiver because 3 they could not answer my briefs.

Conclusion

The court should grant the petition for rehearing. Vacate the order denying Certiorari and enter an order that grants the petition for certiorari