

SCOTUS NO: 22-6588  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
Original Jurisdiction Division

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly A. [Pro se]  
Petitioner/Appellant/Plaintiff

RESPECTFULLY

vs.

Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919, d/b/a Signature Healthcare  
of Brookwood Gardens a/k/a LP Homestead, LLC, 9333,  
BRANCH "et al"


**PETITION (MOTION) FOR REHEARING**  
**[NO OFFENSE TO ANYONE]**

**Pursuant to Scotus Rule 44: I, Petitioner, Petitions**

this court in due diligence for to request legitimate follow  
through (completion) with first formal hearing that  
remains pending, via Granting an order granting (closest  
applicable) Petition (Motion) for rehearing.

**Legal Grounds for this Petition (Motion) are as follows:**

1. This court's denial Order to petitioner's Petition for Writ of  
Mandamus (dated 3/27/23), is shown denied on **No legal  
grounds**. This Constitutes a showing



SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

of a Deviation from a legal rule (rendering invalid): Fla. R. Jud.

**Admin Rule 2.120 (C), and Fairness: Precedent Procedural  
and Substantive Due process, against the required: shown**

Facts, shown Evidence of proof to the shown claims [SCOTUS UP

**LOAD NOT SHOWN ?, r. Petition Coversheet and All Pages,**

**All lines. Appendix A All pages all lines, 133,168-191 of 300]**

and against shown applicable precedent Authority [Violations of

rendering invalid U.S. Code: 1001(a)(2)(3) false statements

or entries, 19 U.S. Code:1592 (a)(1)(Ai)(2)(c)(1) and (3)

**Penalties for Fraud and Intentional Misconduct and shown**

**Damages, 15 U.S. Code: 6604 (a)(b)(3) NO CAP], and is shown**

to thereby be An Abuse of Discretion [violation of 5 U.S. Code:

**706, Appendix A back section Pgs.126,129 of 300, 217-228 of**

**300], and unlawfully inconsistent with the Constitution, or**

**with court rules, and administrative orders entered by the**

**supreme court; unlawfully**

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

coming within the petitioner's 5TH and 14TH Amendments,

U.S. Constitutional Rights to Due Process, Procedural Due  
Process, and Substantive Law Due Process [r. Appendix A (all  
pages apply) Mid-section USCA11 11/18/22 page 4 of 58, Fla. R.  
JUD. Admin rule 2.120(c), Mid section Pgs.168-191 of 300, and  
back section Rule 14 (I)(VI) Pages 1S-25S, Petition Coversheet and  
in Petition All Pages], and are thereby Non-Legally Binding as a  
matter of Law]. For this reason, I Object to the Illegality of the  
above referenced Denial order, and the informal orders in the  
record, as a matter of Law. 2. The same is shown in the record  
that the Respondents' orders fall short of controlling and  
compelling justification, and the Respondent-Defendant's Abrupt  
Discharge of the Petitioner on unlawful actionable False  
Statements and written on the books of a Corporation (Fraud and  
breaching of Equal Employment Opportunity contract; Substantive  
Due Process, and with Intentional Misconduct, [Etc.] *info sc*


SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

violations) and are all shown to have abridged petitioner (a U.S. citizen) of her life, as a direct and proximate result my Foundation (home was foreclosed), employment, income and Good reputation for legitimate and fair rehiring], My Liberty [ my freedom, and independence was ceased], and My Property[my new vehicle was repossessed, my SUV was a forced sell, all of my other belongings were lost in unpaid storage]. These were unlawfully abridged without Due process of law or compelling or controlling justification (proper required legal procedure; legality); my claims and Respondents violations of my 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment due process Rights ["ECF" USCA11 r. pages 168-169 of 300 date filed 11/18/22?] Along with Ongoing Pain, Suffering, Mental Anguish, Undue Stress and Litigation Delay.

[In General see Cover Sheet and All pages, All Lines in Petition and in Appendix A, for reference]. 

**SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588**

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727) Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs.  
Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919, BRANCH "et al"  
Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

2. Petition was filed under 28 U.S. Code 1651(a) and 1254(1).

3. Res judicata can't legally be applied where formal adjudication remains pending. 4. **There remains no legal grounds for a Legitimate seal in this case.** 5. The respondents / respondent-Defendant filed either No response or No legitimate (legally sufficient or substantial) Objections or rebuttal responses.6.

There's no other remedy to solve this legal matter for to enable me to regain clarity, & focus and maintain my already Authorized licensure and competency require -ments, etc. 7. The Evidence of Proof to petitioner's innocence, claims, and Damages are referenced herein and shown in the record, and are undeniably true. 8. The Evidence of Proof showing that the defendant is undeniably more "likely (probable) than not" liable for petitioner's shown claims and Damages, as are referenced herein and shown in the record, 9. Petitioner's life has remained in limbo x 10 years pending Required proper closure and Due relief recovery, for to move forward in life. *for se*

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

10. There remain no evidence of required "2 Patient Identifiers" shown throughout the record [; Hipaa Violation], as Resp-Def. made falsely against Petitioner. 11. This is an URGENT HIGH PRIORITY MATTER: Petitioner's life and livelihood is subject to further endangerment and homelessness as my family's housing lease is set to soon expire in the next few months, This matter requires Due Relief without further Due Delay. 12. I certify as a party unrepresented by counsel, that this petition (Motion) [and all pleadings filed] is presented in Good Faith and not for delay.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Supporting Legal Precedent Authorities and other Applicable Legal Authorities are as follows: Fla. R. Jud. Admin Rule 2.120 (C) as is approved by the United States Supreme Court,** *[Signature]*

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**holds that an Administrative order is a directive necessary to administer properly the court's affairs, but NOT inconsistent with the constitution or the court's rules and administrative orders (meaning lawful orders) entered by the Supreme Court. [r. currently not shown to be uploaded yet in SCOTUS ?, [r. "ECF" USCA11 page 133 of 300 of court issued filed 11/23/21 Appendix A front-section]. Like so as it applies in this case, The above referenced Petition denial order is shown to be inconsistent from with the Constitution or the court's rules (as is herein shown), and from with legitimate administrative orders entered by the  Supreme Court as is Explained and shown herein:**

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919, BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**In The Supreme Court's Precedent Legal Authority:**

"NAACP v. Patterson, 357 U.S. 449 (1958) See American Communications Assn. v Douds, supra, at 339 U.S. 400; Schneider v. State, 308 U.S. 147, 308 U.S. 161. Such a..."subordinating interest of the state must be compelling,"

**Like so as it applies in this case, An order denying relief (Petition for Writ of Mandamus) must be compelling, and these are shown in the record to NOT have any compelling reasons for denial. Pursuant to Pp. 357 U.S. 454-458: "denial of relief in this Federal court matter does not rest on adequate state nor Federal grounds, and this court has jurisdiction to entertain petitioner's federal claims". Although this is NOT a state court matter, This referenced legal** 

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

Authority [Fla.R.Jud.Admin. rule 2.120(c)] is an  
applicable Legitimate Federal Court Administrative  
order that was entered by the U.S. Supreme Court, The  
Highest Federal Court and The Supreme Law of the  
Land.

Pursuant to Page 357 U.S. 466 This court held "that the  
immunity from state scrutiny of membership lists which  
the association claims on behalf of its members is here so  
related to the right of the members to pursue their lawful  
private interests privately and to associate freely with  
others in so doing as to come within the protection of  
the 14TH Amendment, and we conclude that Alabama  
has fallen short of showing a controlling justification  
for the deterrent effect on the free enjoyment of the right  
to associate, which disclosure of membership lists is 

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**likely to have Accordingly, the judgement of civil contempt and the \$100,000 fine which resulted from petitioner's refusal to comply with the production order in this respect must fall". Like so as it applies in this Federal court case, the Federal Courts' Orders which are shown to have come within the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14th Amendment rights and have fallen short of showing a controlling Justification (or any justification see petition and Proof Accompanying Appendix A All pages and All lines each) in this respect must fall. This court has generally insisted that parties rely on constitutional rights which are personal to themselves [as it applies in this case to Petitioner] Tileston v. Ullman, 318 U.S.44; Robertson and Kirkham, Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court (1951 ED), : 298. [ SCOTUS UPLOAD not available]. *Page***

**SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588**

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)


Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

[“ECF” USCA11 Document 1-1 r. pages 172-191 of 300 date filed 11/18/22]. Pursuant to Page 357 U.S. 467

**For the reasons stated, the judgement of the supreme court of Alabama must be reversed, and the case remanded for proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.”**

## Reversed.

Like so as is stated and shown herein, the referenced Illegitimate judgement of the U.S. Supreme court of the United States rendered in this case dated 3/27/23, must be reversed, and the case remanded for proceedings not inconsistent with this (the 1<sup>st</sup> legitimate U.S. Supreme Court's Precedent Authority) opinion." As a matter of Law under precedent Authority. 

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**[see front sect. Appendix A orders pages 1-10 and all  
Supporting information referenced].**

**Wherefore, on Petition (Motion) for Rehearing as  
specified herein, Petitioner Petitions this court for  
(relief sought) to grant an order granting Petition  
(Motion) for Rehearing for to allow a Plain, Clear,  
Discretionary error [the 3/27/23 Order and see  
Appendix A back section Pg. 2S], that seriously affects  
the fairness, Integrity, and Public reputation of judicial  
proceedings, to be corrected, and for to be Consistent  
with the Constitution, and with the Court's rules as is  
required by Fla. R. Jud. Admin Rule 2.120 (C), and / or  
allow any other accepted and Lawful reasonable relief  
in this Civil Federal Court Action.** *App. sect.*

SCOTUS NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919, BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH MADE IN GOOD FAITH**

**IN COMPLIANCE WITH 28 U.S.C : 1746 I, ATTEST  
TRUTHFULLY, UNDER PENALTIES FOR PERJURY (IF SO  
FOUND/EXPLANATION WILL BE PROVIDED) THAT I'M  
AAOX3 COMPETENT U.S. CITIZEN. LPN IN THE STATE OF  
FLORIDA. THE INFORMATION SHOWN, PROVEN, AND FILED  
HEREIN THIS RECORD IS COMPLETED AS BEST AS  
REASONABLY POSSIBLE, (AGAINST DISCREPANCIES), AND  
ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND GOOD  
FAITH BELIEF, AND THIS AFFIDAVIT MAY REQUIRE  
COPYING AND PAGINATION TODAY, AND HERE  
AFTER \_\_\_\_\_, AND SHALL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE.**

X  
Bev- Pro Se

13 of 14

FOR AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IN AN INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY:	
STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF <u>Miami Dade</u>	
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this <u>17</u> day of <u>December</u> , <u>2022</u> , by <u>Beverly ANN JENKINS</u> (name of person acknowledging).	
 <b>(NOTARY SEAL)</b>	RAISA HERNANDEZ RODRIGUEZ MY COMMISSION #HH186322 EXPIRES: DEC 19, 2025 Bonded through 1st State Insurance
 Signature of Notary Public	
Personally Known _____ OR Produced Identification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Type of Identification Produced <u>Driver's license</u>	

SCOTUS APPEAL NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman

**Certification of a party unrepresented by counsel**

I, Petitioner, certify that This Petition (pursuant to SCOTUS Rule 44) is presented in good faith and not for delay.

This page is provided as early as sufficient notice was received and is for petitions filed in general up to current, followed by Certificate of Service and Certificate of Compliance sheets.

**[ Initials or signatures herein, are not Authorized for Infringing on petitioner's life (including family's lives), liberty, Rights or Location, nor against any removal of petitioner from out of the U.S.A].**

x  Ms. Jenkins, Beverly A.

Homestead, Fl.

SCOTUS NO. 22-6588

Appeal No. 22-90019 (22-12727)

Case No. 22-20241-Civ-Scola-Goodman  
Ms. Jenkins, Beverly vs. Signature Healthcare, LLC, 7919,  
BRANCH "et al"

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** [REDACTED]

I CERTIFY THAT ON THIS 14-18<sup>th</sup> Day of April, 2023,

I SENT THIS DOCUMENT BY U.S. MAIL COURTESY  
COPY TO THE FOLLOWING:

**Mrs. Flynnne Dowdy/ Mr. Mark Peters:@wallerlaw.com**  
**511 Union St. suite 2700 Nashville, TN, 37219**

**U.S. Court of Appeals 11<sup>th</sup> Cir., Atlanta, GA.**

**Solicitor General of the United States Rm 5614, Dept.  
of Justice 950 pennsylvania Ave., Washington D.C.  
20530-0001. The U.S. District Court for the Southern  
District of Florida, Miami, Fl.**

 **Ms. Jenkins, Beverly A.**

**Homestead, Fl.**

**PH:xxx xxx-xxxx**