No. 22-7428 ORIGINAL

FILED
APR 26 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

James Jamison — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

stuart lipperman associates, vs.
Roxanna Jimenez — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals Sixth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

James Jamison
(Your Name)

2823 Preston st
(Address)

Cincinnati, ohio 45206
(City, State, Zip Code)

513 387-9505
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Under the Fair Debt Collection practice Act

Can a Collection agency request your driver license to be Suspended, Can a Collection agency have your driver license Suspended Can a Collection agency threaten to have your driver license suspended if you Fail to pay a debt, Does a Collection agency has anything to Do with the B.m.v and Can a Collection agency tell the B.m.v What to do Can a Collection agency share a debt to a third party such as the B.m.v According to the evidence that was submitted with my appeal a Collection agency can not do that a Collection agency will illegally be doing something can not be legally done by a Collection agency

LIST OF PARTIES

[✓] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[ ] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

n/A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES | PAGE NUMBER

n/A

See the evidence that support the petitioner claim that's attach to his brief of Appeal

STATUTES AND RULES

15 U.S.C 1692, Fair Debt Collection Practice Act

OTHER

n/A

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[✓] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[ ] is unpublished.

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the ______________________________ court appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[ ] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[✓] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 01-26-2023.

[✓] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: ________________, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix ______.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including ____________ (date) on ____________ (date) in Application No. __A______.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was ____________. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix ______.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: ________________, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix ______.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including ____________ (date) on ____________ (date) in Application No. __A______.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

15 U.S.C 1692

Fair Debt Collection Practice Act

a Collection agency can not request to have some one drivers license suspended over a debt, a Collection agency Can not threaten to have some one driver license suspended over a debt a Collection agency has nothing to do with the B.m.v a Collection agency Can not Share a debt to a third party in this Case was the B.m.v a Collection agency Can not do things that Can not legally be done by a Collection agency

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

See Attachment

memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction and why the Supreme Court should here the plaintiff Case as the plaintiff has Jurisdiction in this Court and is appealing the 6th Circuit united states Court of appeal decision.

The plaintiff states in this Case the defendants Violated the Fair debt Collection Practice Act. on november 8, 2020 the plaintiff was involved in a auto accident the plaintiff Failed to show his insurance information because he stated he was not at Fault as to the auto accident the person that was involved in the auto accident had Geico insurance Geico insurance then paid for the person Car damage of 6,388.61 as Geico insurance at First only went by the police crash report as Geico insurance sent the 6,388.61 debt to a Collection agency Called Stuart lippman and associates Stuart lippman and associates then sent the plaintiff a letter the plaintiff responded to the letter the plaintiff told roxanna Jimenez that he was not at Fault and was disputing the debt and the Car accident the plaintiff was intouch with the claim adjuster from Geico insurance the plaintiff told the claim adjuster that the police Crash report was wrong and did not happen that way the claim adjuster ask the plaintiff did he have any picture of his Car the plaintiff said yes and sent the Claim adjuster multiple photo's of all the Cars that Was involved in the accident a few days later the claim adjuster From Geico insurance Contacted the plaintiff and told the plaintiff that he is reversing the decision and that the plaintiff is not liable For the Car accident or responsible to pay the 6,38861 and that the person who was driving the 2013 toyota prius Was 100% liable For the accident the plaintiff states that the damage was already done by Geico insurance because Geico insurance had already Sent the 6,38861 to the Collection agency Stuart lippman and associates the plaintiff States when he received the letter From stuart lippman and associates he Called the number back that was on the letter the plaintiff Came in Contact with defendant Roxanna Jimenez as she stated this is attempt to Collect a debt From Geico insurance the amount of 6,38861 the plaintiff immediately told Jimenez that he is disputing the debt and the Car accident because he was not at Fault of the Car accident Jimenez told and threatin the plaintiff that if he don't pay the debt of 6,38861 she was going going to have his driver license Suspended the plaintiff Came in Contact with Jimenez again days later Jimenez told the plaintiff that this is a attempt to Collect a debt as Jimenez again told the plaintiff the amount of debt which was 6,388,61 the plaintiff again told Jimenez that he was disputing the debt and the Car accident because the Plaintiff told Jimenez again that he was not at Fault as to the Car accident Jimenez again threatin the plaintiff driver license and told the plaintiff if he don't pay the 6,388.61 debt she was going to submit document to the BMV to have the plaintiff driver license suspended and on december 7, 2020 defendant Roxanna Jimenez Carried out her threat she submitted documents to the B.m.v to have the plaintiff and his sister martina Jamison driver license suspended the B.m.v sent a notice to the plaintiff and his sister martina Jamison telling them the day that when they driver license will be suspended as the plaintiff appeal the Bmv Suspension as the plaintiff and his sister martina Jamison suspension was lifted because Geico insurance determined that the plaintiff was not at Fault of the Car accident and removed the debt. Here is where the defendants Stuart lippman and associates and Roxanna Jimenez violated the Fair debt Collection Practice act the (FDCPA) States that a Collection agencies Can not request to have Some one driving license suspended it also states that a Collection agencies Can not threatin to have some one driving license Suspended a Collection agency has nothing to do with the b.m.v and Can not tell the Bm.v what to do it is a violation of the Fair debt Collection Practice Act For a Collection agency to do things that legally Can't be done the plaintiff states in this Case Roxanna Jimenez threatin to have the plaintiff driving license suspended if he didn't pay the 6,388.61

debt on December 7, 2020 Roxanna Jimenez requested to the Bmv to have the plaintiff and his Sister martina Jamison driver license Suspended it's also a Vioation of the Fair debt Collection Practice Act to Share a debt to a third Party Roxanna Jimenez Shared a debt to the Bmv of the plaintiff of 6,388.61 the plaintiff states that when he told Jimenez that he was disputing the debt and the Car accident Jimenez Suppose to have Stop the debt Collection process but Jimenez DID not the plaintiff states that he Submitted multiple documents of evidence that telling the defendants how they violated the F.D.C.P.A but the district Court and the appeal Courts ignore the plaintiff documents of evidence that was Submitted and Supported the plaintiff claim how the defendants violated the FDCPA the defendants stuart lippman and associates and Roxanna Jimenez violated the FDCPA For what they did the plaintiff ask this Court to look at the documents that he Submitted with his brief the documents will clearly tell how the defendants violated the FDCPA the district Court and the appeal Court should have never denied the plaintiff Civil Suit as the district Court and the appeal Court Kept relying and saying that FDCPA and that Subrogation debt is not a qualifying debt under the FDCPA the plaintiff states that this Civil Suit does not have nothing to do with a debt or a Subrogation debt this

Was based on what the defendants did to violate the FDCPA and the plaintiff Submitted multiple documents of evidence that will Support the plaintiff claims how the defendants violated the FDCPA as the district Court or the appeal Court never stated or mention the plaintiff evidence on how the defendants violated the FDCPA as the plaintiff Stated how the defendants violated the FDCPA. As the Appeal Court stated that the plaintiff Failed to state a claim for relief based on Jimenez alleged threats to notify the BMV her alleged direction to the BMV to Suspend his and his Sisters license the plaintiff relief was money damages For what the defendants did to violate the FDCPA the plaintiff states that the defendants clearly violated the FDCPA For what they did to have violate the FDCPA as the plaintiff Submitted multiple documents that will Support his FDCPA claim against the defendants the plaintiff ask this Court to hear the plaintiff Case

Respectfully Submitted

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

the Respondants simply violated the
15 U.S.C 1692 Fair Debt Collection practice
Act. The respondants threaten to have the
Petitioner Driver license suspended if he DiD
not pay a debt for a motor Vehicle accident
the respondant on December 7, 2020 requested
to have the petitioner and his sister martina
Jamison drivers License suspended the
respondants told the B.m.v to suspend the
Petitioner and his sister martina Jamison
Driver License According to the evidence that
the petitioner submitted in his brief of his appeal
the respondants simply violated the Fair debt
Collection practice Act because the respondant
illegal DiD thing that can not be done by a Collection
agency as the petitioner did not mention a
Collection agency Can not share a debt to a
third party the respondant shared the
petitioner debt to the B.m.V this is all a
violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practice
act the petitioner petition of a writ should
be granted

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: april 25, 2023