

No. 22-6946

ORIGINAL

*RES*  
In the Supreme Court of the United States

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN RE CLEMENT MOSSERI, PETITIONER  
\_\_\_\_\_



MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION BEFORE CHIEF  
JUDGE JOHN GLOVER ROBERTS JR. AND THE COURT.  
AND MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF AN ATTORNEY

In Re: The District Court for The Southern District of New York  
The Second Circuit Court of Appeals  
and The United States of America et al.  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
  
\_\_\_\_\_

Clement Mosseri, Pro se  
7 West 21<sup>st</sup> Street #1708  
New York, New York 10010  
954 993-2625

This Motion is presented to Chief Judge Roberts as it affects the chief Judge and in addition All the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States since it will affecting them as well.

The Civil, State, Federal District and Appellate courts conspired with the attorneys representing respondent to violate Petitioners civil rights and deprive petitioner of any standing under the Constitution and laws of this nation in the courts in order to effect a taking of property under color of law and discriminate against petitioner because he does not have attorney representation.

Additionally this court failed to review the Federal Tort Claim sent to DOJ on November 14, 2022, checking it would have enforced my claims and putting them in the proper perspective.

*"the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void; and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."* Chief John Justice Marshall in Marbury v. Madison 1803

Rehearing the issues raised in the Writ, judicial immunity that is repugnant to the Constitution must be voided when there are judicial protections available that are not repugnant to the Constitution.

Respondent's attorneys continue to violate Petitioner civil rights in the lower court in conjunction with the Judge because Petitioner is not represented and they deny basic human rights and civil rights required under the Constitution and the law.

A requirement to legal representation of an IFP litigant of civil cases that have merit is required and not discretionary. The Civil, State, Federal District and Appellate courts consistently ignored an unrepresented litigants civil and Constitutional rights and the rule of law.

No representation does not mean a litigant has no rights in the courts of law.

An assignment of a right to an attorney for an IFP litigant in civil cases that have merit restores the checks and balance that are presently denied in judicial decisions.

Petitioner is aware of the reasons why the Writ was denied, this court has an interest in the outcome. It is required that representation be issued now as the court's decision does not reflect the issues raised in this Writ, the Constitution or the rule of law because litigant is unrepresented.

It is prudent for this Court to Grant this Motion, hear the Writ and decide the questions raised, as I will soon request the Executive branch, members of Congress, that give my communications a high priority, for them to decide these issues and additionally include the people of the United States for their unbiased decision. It will hurt this court beyond redemption.

Appearance for failing to correct a rule because the Court has an interest in keeping that is repugnant to the Constitutional will weakening the courts and the governments standing, beyond redemption with the people and my superior.

It is clear that aa proper review was ignored.

It is therefore requested that you ensure due diligence is made look at all new arguments and reconsider the denial of the Writ of Certiorari, No.22-6946, And appoint an attorney to represent Petitioner so that there is no further discrimination.

Respectfully resubmitted,  
Dated June 11th, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clement Mosseri', written over a horizontal dashed line.

Clement Mosseri, Pro se  
7 West 21<sup>st</sup> Street #1708  
New York, New York 10010  
954 993-2625

No. 22-6946

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

IN RE CLEMENT MOSSERI, PETITIONER

---

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION BEFORE CHIEF  
JUDGE JOHN GLOVER ROBERTS JR. AND THE COURT.  
AND MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF AN ATTORNEY

In Re: The District Court for The Southern District of New York  
The Second Circuit Court of Appeals  
and The United States of America et al.

CERTIFICATION OF CLEMENT MOSSERI

Petitioner Clement Mosseri, certifies that the Petition for a rehearing is  
presented in good faith and in the interest of the court, and not for delay, and that  
it is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2.



Clement Mosseri, Pro se  
7 West 21<sup>st</sup> Street #1708  
New York, New York 10010  
954 993-2625