

No. \_\_\_\_\_

22-7446

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

\_\_\_\_\_  
R.J. Kulick

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

VS.

Ruth Stubba: et al.,

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

USCA-9, Case #22-56092

\_\_\_\_\_  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

R.J. Kulick in Pro Per

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Your Name)

38122 Village 38


\_\_\_\_\_  
(Address)

Camarillo, CA 93012

\_\_\_\_\_  
(City, State, Zip Code)

310-474-1848

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)



### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. The USDC & USCA-9 denied Kulick's right to Due Process by NOT Addressing Clause "(5) Filing Of Magistrate Judge's Report And Recommendations Before This Court Dismisses This Case For Any Reasons"?
2. The Contract Is Invalid since Kulick did NOT have an Attorney at Law under the Rule of Law of the U.S. Constitution To Advise Whether or NOT this Contract valid or NOT?
3. Under the Rule of Law, the U.S. Consitution has been violated by National Security which sets it aside until that cured because National Security trumps when any part of this U.S. Constitution has been breached as to DUE Process & NOT having an Attorney at Law for "Advise". This renders NO trust, faith or confidence in this U.S. Constitution when its get this "trumps" as a result of National Security in the Prevailing, factual circumstance(s) that currently exist?
4. Kulick is NOT equal to be mandated by any Rules of any Court to be on the same level as an Attorney at Law, being in Pro Per stattus, that NOT fair. The U.S. Constitution assures that anyone must be "equal" & treated to "fair", Which Kulick have been Denied by USDC & UsCA-9 by their determinations against Kulick?
5. Opinion(s) decide one way or other what litiagte prevails, however those "opinion(s) are NOT permanent-being subject to change. Which whether or NOT exists, will or will NOT have somekind of re-consideration in this case matter before this Court?
6. See page 5, will this Court provide a federal decision that will protect seniors that join & live-in condominiums & other common-interest developments from corrupt Board of Dtrs. & their legal vendors & their insurance reps., et al?

## LIST OF PARTIES

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

[X] 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:

See page # (ii, a.): Exhibit A

## Inter- RELATED CASES

Please note: A lot, request~~ed~~ this Court review ALL Supreme Court Cases which Kulick has submitted that are listed in this Court's computer file. Since, each & every case has grown legs, this why "Inter-Related"

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A    USDC, Case# 2:22-cv-06742-MEMF-AS

APPENDIX B    USCA-9, Case# 22-56092

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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 B to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ (?) Unconstitutional, can be published, it's now public record

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

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☒ (?) Unconstitutional, can be published, it's now public record

☐ 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

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

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 3-21-23.

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

[X] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: 3-21-23, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix NO "copy" for 4, "dismissed, for lack of jurisdiction."

[ ] 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).

Also, in turn DENIED Kulick's DUE Process right(s) & a lot more!!!  
See Forma Pauperis, item #11 in support of foregoing.

Also, see Four Motions dated 11-7-22 & Exhibit A, Three Pages & 10-25-22 Notice Of Document Discrepancies & Proof Of Service dated 11-7-22

**[ ] 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

1. See USDC's Clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) in Denying DUE PROCESS.
2. 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 & Declaration of Independence dated 7-4-1776 & Articles: Sect. 1, Sect. 8 & Articles in addition as Article (1), Article (X) & Article (IX) & Article (XIV) & under Common Law- "based on custom, traditional usage and precedent, rather than codified written laws".
3. And, arguments in U.S. Supreme Court, Case #'s 18-6907/18-6383 brought by Kulick, also including #18-6743, also "direct bearing" in #21-6216.
4. Also, Articles (VII) & (VIII) & include in (XIV) Section 1. for being paramount in this case matter from other features of that Article, & Charter of United Nations & related U.S. gov't regulatory agency(s)'s enforcement federal statutes... where applicable.
5. Kulick DENIED "equality & fairness being in Pro Per status by ALL Rules of Courts, to be on same level as an attorney at law, an absorb & unreasonable mandate that does NOT make logical sense. Especially, Kulick's "abilities" as attested to by his penalty of perjury statement- well documented in this case matter!!! That on its face renders the Rule of Law in Ref: the U.S. Constitution a questionable, worthless/meaningless words on paper.
6. The tyranny of Kings has been replaced by the tyranny of lawyers as some have made an excellent case for. The Client/Attorney contracts are a conflict of interest in favor of attorneys, as some have made an excellent case for. After-all the U.S. Constitution is also the supreme "contract" that established the USA as a nation. That kind of "contract" must be an equal & fair basis to be a valid, binding document ALL must obey, no one above the law(s) it states, otherwise-truth, confidence & faith in it can NOT exist. Law & Order of any just society, the cornerstone this foundation must stand-on. Which, the "greater good" a goal worth striving for our nation's way of life/to have staying power for the next generations to come. (a promised dream of an experiment in motion in the nature of its citizens)/
7. As stated in above item #6, our entire judicial system to be meaningful, must have its Justices assured that when they make their "opinion(s)", they will be with that "truth, confidence & faith", a reality NOT just based on an ideology of their mind set. Along with NO doubt(s) as how they themselves feel, free from that "mind set" of "ideology".
8. The pattern of "violations" in this case is on-going & until they STOP, NO Statute of Limitations can apply, that's the law here.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

That's implicit in USDC's Complaint filed 9-19-22 in  
Clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) upon which this case matter as  
addressed in pages: (i), (ii.a.) Exhibit A, (ii) in "INTER-  
Related Cases, (iii), **ARE THE** "Reasons For Granting  
The Petition.



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Reason is for this Court to provide a federal decision that will protect senior citizens that join & live-in condominiums & other common-interest developments, from corrupt Board of Directors & their legal vendors & their insurance representative & their General managers, et al. See Exhibit B, which provides the basic "reasons" why this kind of "federal decision" needed on a nationwide scope & scale. Which will give the State's DOJ enforcement powers to "protect". In CA, its DOJ has NO "enforcement power". CA passed the Davis-Stirling Act in 1985 (Legislature), civil code, the act became sections 1350 through 1378. But, effective 1-1-14, those sections of that code were repealed & replaced with a new Part 5, starting with section 4000. Because of Assembly Bill 805, Common Interest Development Reorganization Rules & Regulations. But, still "NO enforcement" given CA's DOJ. This is why "Reasons For Granting The Petition".

### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R.J. Kulick *W* Petitioner in Pro Per

---

Date: 4-28-23