

22-6921

ORIGINAL

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED  
FEB 17 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In re Oscar Marquez

Petitioner

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Oscar Marquez 23487-180

Appearing In Propria Persona

United States Prison - Marion

Communication Management Unit

Post Office Box # 1000

Marion Illinois, 62959

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Is the failure of a District Court and a United States Court of Appeals to order instant dismissal of the immediate case for lack of Article III Standing a sufficient type of extraordinary circumstance to compel correction by Mandamus?
2. What gives the lower Courts of the Territories the authority to dismiss their duty to establish Article III Standing?
3. Is Petitioner correct in claiming that His Due Process was negated?

RELIEF SOUGHT

Petitioner is entitled to immediate relief and petitions this Honorable Supreme Court for this Great Writ directed to the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Portland Division, Magistrate Youlee Yim You, Judge Michael W. Mosman, Judge Marco A. Hernandez of the District Court, The United States court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Circuit Judge Bridget S. Bade, Circuit Judge Gabriel P. Sanchez, and Northern District of Illinois Judge Joan Humphrey Lefkow commanding these respondents to immediately dismiss the action against Petitioner for absence of Article III Standing.

UNAVAILABILITY OF RELIEF IN OTHER COURTS

The Courts have failed to make a finding of facts showing proof of the basis of their Jurisdiction, even when challenged by Petitioner (See attached copy of Transcripts, Appendix D; Copy of Briefs on Appeal, Appendix F). The lower Courts refuse to act in their duty to dismiss the case in clear absence of all Jurisdiction, therefore, no other court can grant relief sought.

UNSUITABILITY OF ANY OTHER FORM OF RELIEF

To establish a Case or Controversy a Party must have Standing to sue which must be determined as of the date of the filing of the complaint. In the immediate case, the person who filed a complaint against Petitioner, was not a Proper Party to commence a Federal Prosecution.

Because no Article III Standing could be established, no other form of relief is suitable except dismissal of the action filed against Petitioner.

LIST OF PARTIES IN COURTS BELOW

1. Oscar Marquez [Petitioner]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

2. Circuit Judge Bridget S. Bade [Respondent One]

3. Circuit Judge Gabriel P. Sanchez [Respondent Two]

4. Northern District of Illinois Judge Joan Humphrey  
Lefkow [Respondent Three]

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

5. Magistrate Youlee Yim You [Respondent Four]

6. Judge Michael W. Mosman [Respondent Five]

7. Judge Marco A. Hernandez [Respondent Six]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
RELIEF SOUGHT	ii
UNAVAILABILITY OF RELIEF IN OTHER COURTS	ii
UNSUITABILITY OF ANY OTHER FORM OF RELIEF	ii
LIST OF PARTIES IN COURTS BELOW	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	vii
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	01
CITATION OF LOWER COURT DECISIONS	01
CONTROLLING PROVISIONS, STATUTES, RULES	01
THE LAW	
I. A Court's Jurisdiction Is Limited To Cases Or Controversies	02
II. Standing Determines A Court's Jurisdiction	02
III. The Courts Have A Duty To Determine Standing Exists	02
IV. The Party Invoking The Power Of The Court Must Show Standing	03
V. Satisfying The Requirement Of Article III Standing	03
VI. Standing Is Found Only At The Time The Action Began	03
VII. Standing Implies Subject-Matter Jurisdiction Which Without, The Court Must Dismiss	04
VIII. Only The United States Attorney Can Prosecute	04
IX. Only The Proper Party Can File A Complaint	05
X. A Task Force Officer's Appointment Is Limited To Four (4) Years Max	05