

No. 22-6517

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

William F. Kaetz — *Petitioner*

vs.

Freda L. Wolfson, Judge, United District Court for the District of New  
jersey, et. al. — *Respondents*

---


On Petition for A Writ of Certiorari To  
To the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit  
Consolidated Cases No. 22-1456 and Case No. 22-1476

PETITION FOR REHEARING

---

William F. Kaetz  
437 Abbott Road  
Paramus, NJ., 07652  
201-753-1063  
*Pro se Petitioner*

Dated: 3/11/2023



## CONTENTS

PETITION JURISDICTION .....	3
PETITION FOR REHEARING .....	3
Other Substantial Grounds Not Previously Presented .....	3
Intervening Circumstances of a Substantial or Controlling Effect .....	5
CONCLUSION .....	6
CERTIFICATION .....	6

### Rules

Supreme Court Rule 39.8 .....	4
Supreme Court Rule 44.1 .....	4
Supreme Court Rule 44.2 .....	7

### Exhibits

Exhibit A .....	Writ of Certiorari denied
Exhibit B .....	Certificate of Compliance
Exhibit C .....	Certificate of Service
Exhibit D .....	6 Months of Petitioner's Bank Statements
Exhibit E .....	Petitioner's Criminal Case Documents
Exhibit F .....	Petitioner's Habeas Corpus Motion Docket Sheet
Exhibit G .....	Petitioner's Civil Lawsuit Docket Sheet
Exhibit H .....	Petitioner's Home Detention Memorandum

## **PETITION JURISDICTION**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.1 of this Court, the petitioner respectfully petitions for rehearing of this case before a full nine-member Court.

A Writ of Certiorari was docketed on January 11, 2023, and was denied on March 6, 2023, this denial of the writ is attached hereto Exhibit A.

The denial was caused by the claim “the motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* was denied... See Rule 39.8.”

## **PETITION FOR REHEARING**

The restricted grounds specified for a petition for rehearing (1) intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect and (2) other substantial grounds not previously presented, are presented herein in good faith and not for delay.

### **Other Substantial Grounds Not Previously Presented**

1. The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* was denied under rule 39.8.
2. Rule 39.8 is used for claims of fraud.
3. There is no evidence of fraud.

4. New evidence attached hereto in appendix prove petitioner did not submit false claims.

a. Exhibit D has 6 months of petitioner's bank statements that prove petitioner's income was less than claimed in original *in forma pauperis* Motion. All petitioner's bank account statements within 6 months of petitioner's *in forma pauperis* motion totals to an average of a monthly income of \$1207.47, not \$3600 as projected in the *in forma pauperis* motion. It is poverty level.

b. Exhibits E, F, G and H proves the claim of false imprisonment is true.

- i. Exhibits E is petitioner's criminal case documents that include the Plea Agreement, Judgement, and BOP calculations without home detention calculated as imprisonment.
- ii. Exhibit F is petitioner's Habeas Corpus motion docket sheet challenging the implementation of the Plea Agreement.
- iii. Exhibit G is petitioner's civil lawsuit docket sheet suing the government for false imprisonment.

- iv. Exhibit H is a small memorandum about home detention proving the false implementation of home detention that caused the false imprisonment.

### **Intervening Circumstances of a Substantial or Controlling Effect**

5. The intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect are the ongoing government provocation censoring citizens and censoring evidence that is now being exposed by congressional investigation committees that include the government censoring citizens proven by the Twitter Files, the Covid-19 cover-ups, the fraud of the January 6 insurrection cover-ups, the false imprisonment of January 6 petitioners, and the political imprisonment of citizens.
6. I, the petitioner, is a victim of the “weaponization of government” that censored my first amendment rights and provoked me to do something about it, and I was criminalized for upholding the Constitution.
7. Petitioner’s cases are all about enforcing the Constitution.


## CONCLUSION

For the reasons and evidence set forth in this Petition, William F. Kaetz respectfully requests this Honorable Court grant rehearing and his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

## CERTIFICATION

I, William F. Kaetz, petitioner, with my signature below, swear under penalty of perjury all statements herein are true. I hereby certify that this petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay, and that it is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.2.

Respectfully Submitted...

Date: 3/11/2023 By: 

William F. Kaetz, *Plaintiff*  
437 Abbott Road  
Paramus NJ, 07652  
201-753-1063  
kaetzbill@gmail.com

No. 22-6517

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

William F. Kaetz — *Petitioner*

vs.


Freda L. Wolfson, Judge, United District Court for the District of New  
jersey, et. al. — *Respondents*

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*  
TO FILE A PETITION FOR REHEARING**

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached Petition for Rehearing without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Petitioner has previously filed leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the above captioned case No. 22-6517. Petitioner has added more evidence in support of his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Petitioner move for a rehearing of his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully,

Dated: 3/11/2023 Signature



William F. Kaetz  
*Petitioner*  
437 Abbott Road  
Paramus, NJ., 07652  
201-753-1063  
Pro se Petitioner

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**