


22-7816
No. _____

ORIGINAL



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Onyinye Jideani *pro se* — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

Hilton Worldwide Holdings^{US} Inc.,
(formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA)
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Onyinye Jideani

(Your Name)

2121 First Street SW, Apt. 618

(Address)

Washington DC, 20024-3589, U.S.A.

(City, State, Zip Code)

202-704-1486

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Did the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), violate exiting laws guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, and breached its duty to protect and preserve the substantive right of pro se litigant "petitioner Onyinye Jideani," when granting the respondent "Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.'s (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) renewed Motion for Summary Affirmance "and on the lower court's October 21, 2022 unlawful and unjudicial dismissal of petitioner's May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim civil action suit against the respondent, "for Want of Prosecution" (of which this petition for Writ of Certiorari is taken)," if in-fact petitioner Onyinye Jideani and pursued her civil action suit with "procedural, sufficient, and timely" filings, in the lower court "(the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division)," and as shown in the courts docket case No. 2022 CA 002012 B? (Dismissed) issued on October 25, 2022).
Want of Prosecution is defined in the Black Law dictionary, as "failure of a litigant to pursue the case." (See DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866)
- A. Did the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, erred when disregarding the lower court's failed cognizance and abuse of process, on petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 substantially justified Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim suit against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation), and when the District of Columbia Superior Court civ. act. division "under judge Robert R. Rigsby" dismissed the May 09, 2022 suit for Want of Prosecution during the first and only hearing held via WebEx webcam on October 21, 2022? (The lower court's dismissal order was issued on October 25, 2022).
All supporting evidences were submitted to the D.C. Appeals court (DCCA) "Appeal case No. 22-CV-866," appealing the lower court's unjust, unjudicial, and erroneous decision.
- B. Did the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, fail to redress the lower court's unjust error, and when the "District of Columbia Superior Court civ. action division" unlawfully dismissed the petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim suit for Want of Prosecution, fasely alleging that because petitioner Onyinye Jideani did not attend the initial conference hearing "(referred to as a status hearing) "and for good cause shown," petitioner Onyinye Jideani did not plead her case? (The lower court's dismissal order was issued on October 25, 2022).
All supporting evidence were submitted to the D.C. Appeals court (DCCA) "Appeal case No. 22-CV-866," appealing the lower court's unjust, unjudicial, and

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

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: The District of Columbia Court of Appeal's March 21, 2023 Judgment granting the respondent "Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.'s (formerly Hilton Hotel Corp)" renewed motion for Summary Affirmance, and dismissing the appeal case No. 22-CV-866.

APPENDIX B: Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's March 22, 2023 petition for rehearing DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866.

APPENDIX C: The District of Columbia Court of Appeal's April 03, 2023 Order denying petitioner Onyinye Jideani's March 22, 2023 petition for rehearing DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866.

APPENDIX D: Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's November 08, 2022 Notice to Appeal D.C. Superior Court civil action case No. 2022 CA 002012 B "Onyinye Jideani vs. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.," in D.C. Court of Appeals (DCCA) case No. 22-CV-866 "(of which this petition for Writs of *Certiorari* is taken)."

APPENDIX E: Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's December 28, 2022 "Designation of parts of the records Appellant Onyinye Jideani intends to include in the Appendix, and a Statement of the issues the Appellant intends to present for review," in DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866.

APPENDIX F: Respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.'s (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) December 20, 2022 Motion for Summary Affirmance (F1) "renewed on February 28, 2023 (F2)," in DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866; as *Appendix F1 and Appendix F2*

APPENDIX G: The District of Columbia Court of Appeal's January 05, 2023 Order denying without prejudice Appellee Hilton's December 20, 2022 Motion for Summary Affirmance, and directing Appellant Onyinye Jideani to file her Brief and Appendix, in DCCA Appeals case No. 22-CV-866.

APPENDIX H: Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's February 11, 2023 "50-page" Brief "with Appendix," in DCCA Appeal case No. 22-CV-866; Processed and filed in the D.C. Court of Appeal's court docket by the Clerk on February 13, 2023 "as redacted." (*Only the Brief is submitted with this petition for Writs of Certiorari*).

APPENDIX I: The District of Columbia Court of Appeal's (DCCA), November 08, 2022 Appeal case No. 22-CV-866 court docket view, "captioned Onyinye Jideani vs. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc."

APPENDIX J: The District of Columbia Superior Court "(lower court)" civil action case No. 2022 CA 002012 B's August 23, 2022 Order sua sponte rescheduling the initial conference/scheduling hearing, to review pending motions filed by plaintiff Onyinye Jideani.

APPENDIX K: The District of Columbia Superior Court "(lower court)" civil action case No. 2022 CA 002012 B's October 25, 2022 "Order Under Rule 41(b)," dismissing civil action case No. 2022 CA 002012 B "captioned Onyinye Jideani vs. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.," without prejudice for Want of Prosecution, during the rescheduled October 21, 2022 initial conference/scheduling.

APPENDIX L: The District of Columbia Superior Court "(lower court)" civil action case No. 2022 CA 002012 B "court docket view," for civil action suit "captioned Onyinye Jideani vs. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation)."

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

- A. **Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim civil action suit against the Respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) in the District of Columbia Superior Court, case No. 2022 CA 2012 B under judge Robert Rigsby.....pg. 11-17**
- B. **Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's November 08, 2022 Notice, appealing the dismissal of the May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim civil action suit in the District of Columbia Superior Court, at the District Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), appeal case No. 22-CV-866.....pg. 13**
- C. **The June 08, 2021 "Interpleader" suit "case No. 2021 CA 001861 B under judge Robert R. Rigsby in D.C. Superior Court civ. act. division," to dispute attorney lien with regards to petitioner Onyinye Jideani's November 14, 2019 automobile accident suit case No. 2019 007542 V," "and when judge Robert R. Rigsby subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to bias and prejudicial misconduct".....pg. 11**

STATUTES AND RULES

Federal Status:

- A. **42 U.S. Code § 1981: Equal Rights Under the Law.....pg. 2,18**
- B. **42 U.S. Code § 1985: Depriving Persons of Rights and Privileges.....pg. 2,18**
- C. **28 U.S. Code § 2072: Rules of Procedure and Evidence; Power to Prescribe.....pg. 18,19**
- D. **28 U.S. Code § 2106: Judiciary and Judicial Procedure: Determination....pg. 18,19**
- E. **28 U.S. Code § 453: Oaths of Justices and Judges.....pg. 11**
- F. **28 U.S. Code § 144: Bias or Prejudice of a Judge.....pg. 11**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

The District of Columbia Statute:

- G. Code of the District of Columbia: District of Columbia Human Right Law:
DC Code §2-1401.01 – 2-1404.04: The Human Rights Act of
1977, Title 2, Chapter 14; Unit A, Part D: Public Accommodation,
Subchapter II.....pg.14-17
- H. Code of the District of Columbia: District of Columbia Human Right Law:
DC Code §2-1401.01 – 2-1404.04: The Human Rights Act
of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14; Subchapter III.
Procedure: DC Code §2-1403.16: Private Cause
of Action in any court of competent jurisdiction for damages and such other
remedies as may be appropriate.....pg. 14-17
- I. District of Columbia Code § 13-423: Personal Jurisdiction Based Upon
Conduct: Code of Judicial.....pg. 14-17

Rule of Civil Procedure under the Federal and DC Superior Court:

- A. Rule 41(b): Want of Prosecution.....pg. 2

OTHER

- A. Black Law Dictionary: *Want of Prosecution*.....pg. 2
- B. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., 2021 Annual Report on
Form 10-K to the United States Security and Exchange Commission.

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 A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at The District of Columbia Court of Appeals; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the The District of Columbia Superior Court Civ Act court appears at Appendix K to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at This District of Columbia Court of Appeals; 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 _____.

☐ 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 March 21, 2023
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
March 22, 2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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).

2.

pg. 9 of 20

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Federal Status:

- 42 U.S. Code § 1981: Equal Rights Under the Law
- 42 U.S. Code 1985: Depriving Persons of Rights and Privileges
- 28 U.S. Code § 2072: Rules of Procedure and Evidence; Power to Prescribe 28
- U.S. Code 2106: Judiciary and Judicial Procedure: Determination
- 28 U.S. Code 453: Oaths of Justices and Judges
- 28 U.S. Code 144: Bias or Prejudice of a Judge

The District of Columbia Statute:

- Code of the District of Columbia:

District of Columbia Human Right Law: DC Code §2-1401.01 – 2-1404.04:

The Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14;

Unit A, Part D: Public Accommodation, Subchapter II

- District of Columbia Human Right Law: DC Code §2-1401.01 – 2-1404.04:

The Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14;

Subchapter III. Procedure: DC Code §2-1403.16:

Private Cause of Action in any court of competent jurisdiction for damages and such other remedies as may be appropriate

- District of Columbia Code § 13-423: Personal Jurisdiction Based Upon Conduct

- Code of Judicial Conduct: Code 2.2; Code 2.3; Code 2.5; Code 2.6; and Code 2.11

Rule of Civil Procedure under the Federal and DC Superior Court:

- Rule 41(b): *Want of Prosecution*

Other Sources:

- Black's Law Dictionary: Want of Prosecution Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., 2021 Annual Report on Form 10-K to the United States Security and Exchange Commission

3.

pg. 10 of 20

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- (1). On May 09, 2022, petitioner Onyinye Jideani commenced a substantially justified cognizable claim of Unlawful Discriminatory Practice civil action suit against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. "(formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation)," for an incident that occurred at one of its brand hotel in Washington DC on May 25, 2021, in the District of Columbia Superior Court Civil Action Division "civil action case No. 2022 CA2012 B;" The District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division inferior judge assigned to preside over the suit was grab-bag judge "Robert R. Rigsby;" Additionally, judge Rigsby was also the civil action inferior judge who presided over another one of petitioner Onyinye Jideani's civil action suit in 2021 for "Interpleader" on a 2019 automobile-accident injury civil action suit settlement dispute for lien amount between the petitioner Onyinye Jideani and the rouge attorney she hired to represent her in such 2019 personal injury matter "(case No. 2019 CA 001861 B in the DC Superior Court civil action division)," and where judge Rigsby subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to bias and prejudicial misconduct; (The 2019 "initial" automobile-accident injury civil action suit "case No. 2019 CA 007542 V" in D.C. Sup. Crt. civ. act. div., was under inferior/grab-bag judge Heidi Pasichow who refused to rule on such "attorney lien" dispute after granting the attorney's motion to withdraw as Onyinye Jideani's attorney, thereby initiating the 2021 Interpleader case);
- (2). Moreover, the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division branch clerks, unlawfully misclassified the May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice suit "(case No. 2022 CA2012 B and captioned Onyinye Jideani vs. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation))," as one for a Declaratory Judgment claim suit, as appose to an unlawful discriminatory practice claim suit, "unlawfully denying its legal and jurisdictional substantial merits, as a claim warranted on an existing District of Columbia statute "on the District of Columbia Human Rights Law (DC Code § 2-1402.31 and § 2-1403.16(a))," and judicable in the District of Columbia Superior Court ("as a municipal district court of competent jurisdiction in the District of Columbia");"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- (3). Furthermore, during the May 09, 2022 civil action legal proceeding in D.C. Superior Court civil action division, judge Robert R. Rigsby engaged in unlawful and unjudicial conduct that reflected adversely on his honesty, impartiality, temperament, and fitness to serve as a judge when he (a.) violated procedural judicial enforcement of the law "by abuse of process and with abusive tactics," (b.) failed to recuse himself pursuant to a timely and sufficient affidavit for prejudicial misconduct filed by petitioner Onyinye Jideani (filed in the D.C. Sup., Crt. court docket on 06/06/2022), (c.) failed to administer his judicial responsibilities which reflected adversely on his ability and fitness to serve as a judge when he issued an 08/23/2022 order rescheduling the August 26, 2022 initial conference hearing "(referred to as a status hearing)" for the sole purposes of addressing motions filed in the court docket, however he never ruled on any of the motions filed "particularly on petitioner Onyinye Jideani's 05/17/2022 motion(s) for a court order for the civil action branch clerks to appropriately classify this case as an unlawful discriminatory practice claim suit pursuant to DC Code §2-1403.16: Private cause of action, "as appose to the inappropriate classification of "Declaratory Judgment" as it was so inaccurately misclassified by the DC Superior Court civil action branch clerks in attempt to deny its "adjudicative and jurisdictional fact" substantial merits," and (d.) unlawfully dismissed the 05/09/2022 civil action suit during the first and only hearing held on October 21, 2022 "(initial conference hearing referred to as a status hearing)," and in a retaliatory manner; (written dismissal order was issued on 10/25/2022).
- (4). Moreover, during the May 09, 2022 civil action legal proceeding in D.C. Superior Court, judge Robert R. Rigsby, engaged in unlawful and unjudicial practice "violating procedural judicial enforcement of the law through abuse of process and with abusive tactics," and unlawfully dismissed the suit without prejudice for Want of Prosecution "in a retaliatory manner," and during the first ever hearing held on October 21, 2022; "*Want of Prosecution is defined*

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

as failure of a litigant to pursue the case;” Therefore, “unlawfully and delusively abridging on petitioner Onyinye Jideani’s substantive right to litigate her “adjudicative, jurisdictional, and material fact,” cognizable claim of unlawful discriminatory practice against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holding Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) during the May 09, 2022 suit in D.C. Superior Court civ. act. div.,” Thereby subjecting petitioner Onyinye Jideani to further continual legal Injury;

- (5). Petitioner Onyinye Jideani filed a Notice of Appeal on November 08, 2022, appealing District of Columbia civ. act. div., judge Rigsby’s October 25, 2022 order dismissing the May 09, 2022 Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim suit “for Want of Prosecution,” at the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), “DCCA appeal case No. 22-CV-866;”

And on the grounds that, “the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division’s unconstitutional, unlawful, and unjudicial actions, does not only abridge petitioner Onyinye Jideani’s substantive rights “(to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property),” but challenges the District of Columbia Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14,” in its intent to secure an end to discrimination, and of which is one of several state and federal statute enacted to combat discrimination, and distinguishable in its own variable rights and purpose of implementation to give further force to the basic rights guaranteed by the constitution.”

- (6). However, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), further subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to continual injuries by violating exiting laws guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution when it breached its duty to protect and preserve the substantive right of pro se litigant “petitioner Onyinye Jideani,” in granting the respondent “Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.’s (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) February 28, 2023 renewed Motion for Summary

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Affirmance" "on the lower court's unlawful and unjudicial dismissal of the civil action suit for Want of Prosecution," even though the District of Columbia Court of Appeal was aware that petitioner Onyinye Jideani "did" plead and pursued her civil action suit with "procedural, sufficient, and timely" filings, in the lower court "(the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division)," and as shown in the lower court "courts docket;" Want of Prosecution is defined in the Black Law dictionary, as "failure of a litigant to pursue the case."

- (7). The District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), further subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to continual injuries when it erred to redress the lower courts failed cognizance and abuse of process on petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 substantially justified Unlawful Discriminatory Practice claim suit against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation), because petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 complaint commencing the civil action suit in the lower court, provided sufficient substantive "facts" of unlawful discriminatory practice that respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc, (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to at one of its brand hotel on March 25, 2021, and that is plausible on its face, in violation of an exiting District of Columbia Law "the District of Columbia Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14, Unit A "DC Code §2-1402.31: Public Accommodation," and pursuant to "DC Code §2-1403.16: Private cause of action in a court of competent jurisdiction; —All of petitioner Onyinye Jideani's legal filings in this case, have been supported with factual evidence and material facts, as laid forth in court proceedings that have occurred in DC Court of Appeals and in the lower court at DC Superior Court civil action division.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- (8). Petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 unlawful discriminatory practice claim civil action suit against respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) in the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division, "and appealed in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA) on November 08, 2022 'on the lower court's October 25, 2022 dismissal order for Want of Prosecution,'" is a substantially justified case on the merits for adjudicative facts, jurisdictional fact, and material facts with direct evidence, and constitutionally warranted by an existing law on the District of Columbia Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14, Unit A: Part D "DC Code §2-1402.31: Public Accommodation," and pursuant to "DC Code §2-1403.16: Private cause of action in a court of competent jurisdiction," because:

—The factual substantive details of the discriminatory actions that the respondent subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to on March 25, 2021 "and that petitioner Onyinye Jideani precisely narrated on her May 09, 2022 complaint commencing the civil action suit in the lower court with direct evidence," "of which is plausible on it's face, is as follows:

- i. Petitioner Onyinye Jideani was refused hotel stay accommodation at the Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel located at 1475 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington DC 20005 "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," by termination of petitioner Onyinye Jideani's hotel stay on May 25, 2021 "just a week short into her two weeks stay from May 17 - 31, 2021," at such hotel; And where petitioner Onyinye Jideani was specifically informed by Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," that due to petitioner Onyinye Jideani's inquiry on the unusual split charge method on her credit-card by the hotel, Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel felt it necessary

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Onyinye Jideani's hotel stay charge, as confirmation that her hotel-stay accommodation has been terminated. Such upscale Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," was occupied by mainly persons of white race at the time;

- ii. Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel located at 1475 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington DC 20005 "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," would not have taken such unjustified, unlawful, aggressive, and unwarranted action against a paying customer in what it considered as Hilton Worldwide Holding Inc.'s "upscale and all-suites" hospitality brand hotel, if it was not due to petitioner Onyinye Jideani's race and other relative protected class under DCHR Act; And of which such Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel was occupied by mainly persons of white race at the time;
- iii. Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," had no legal justification "(or even a warranted cause relative to a breach of the hotel's accommodation policy)," to terminate petitioner Onyinye Jideani's stay at such public accommodation on May 25, 2021, and therefore Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)" subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani's to discrimination on the basis of Appellant's race "as a black female minority in such public accommodation, "(and othr relative protected class under DCHR ACT of which such hotel perceive petitioner Onyinye Jideani to be, in an inferiority manner)," in violation of the District of Columbia Human Rights Act of 1977 (DCHR), Title 2, Chapter 14. "Petitioner Onyinye Jideani Inquiring about the hotel's policy on credit-card billing, is not a legal justification nor a breach of the hotel's accommodation policy;"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- iv. History has accounted for "under race discrimination," of similar unlawful discriminatory practice against minority people of different races and backgrounds in similar public accommodation places consider as upscale, and for mainly persons of white race, hence the enactment of the Human Right Act of 1977 in the federal District of Columbia;
- v. At all times mentioned herein and as laid forth in petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2021 complaint, respondent violated petitioner Onyinye Jideani's "Human Rights" under the District of Columbia Human Rights Act of 1977, Title 2, Chapter 14, Unit A: Part D "DC Code § 2-1402.31," for directly denying petitioner Onyinye Jideani hotel accommodation at the Homewood Suites by Hilton hotel "(a Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., brand company)," "(and a place of public accommodation as defined under the DCHR Act)," based on petitioner Onyinye Jideani's race "(and any other applicable protected class in such provision);"
- vi. As a direct result of respondent's unlawful actions on May 25, 2021, petitioner Onyinye Jideani's Human Rights were violated, therefore petitioner Onyinye Jideani is entitled to relief under Title 2, Chapter 14, of the DC Human Right Act of 1977 "DC Code § 2-1403.16(a)," and any other statute or federal provision of law enacted to combat such unlawful discriminatory practice; Such unlawful discriminatory practice and humiliating injury that the respondent subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to on May 25, 2021 violated state and federal statutes, violated petitioner Onyinye Jideani's fundamental

and human right, and caused petitioner Onyinye Jideani great inconvenience, expense, and emotional distress; And therefore in addition to the relief set-forth under the DC Human Right law, petitioner Onyinye Jideani is also seeking relief under tort law; Hence a total judgement against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holding's Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) "(for relief sought and believed to be)" in the amount of "Fifteen Million Dollars (\$15,000,000.00)" in compensatory damages and/or an amount to be determined at trial, plus costs of suit, pre- and post- judgment interest, and other and further penalties, civil penalties, and relief as this court deems just and proper.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The United States Supreme Court should grant petitioner Onyinye Jideani's Writs of Certiorari, because the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), has entered a decision that has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, and or sanctioned such a departure by the lower court "the District of Columbia Superior Court Civil Action Division," as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power, as:

(1.) The District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), subjected petitioner Onyinye Jideani to continual injury, and further abridged on her substantive rights when it erred to redress the District of Columbia Superior Court's failed cognizance and abuse of process, on petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 substantially justified "Unlawful Discriminatory Practice" claim suit against the respondent Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc. (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation), thereby depriving pro se litigant Onyinye Jideani the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the protection of persons and property;

(2.) The District of Columbia Court of Appeal's erroneous act, sanctioning the the District of Columbia Superior Court's immoral and unlawful violation of the law "and that of petitioner Onyinye Jideani's legal right to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings," by granting the respondent's renewed motion for summary affirmance on the lower court's unlawful and unjudicial dismissal of suit for Want of Prosecution, is an unconstitutional defect disrupting the status quo and obstructing the administration of justice; And a failure of the judiciary system in enforcing the law, "which has deemed the District of Columbia Court of Appeal and the District of Columbia Superior Court fraudulent and incompetent;

(3.) The District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA), breached its duty to redress the defect of the lower court "and to protect and preserve the substantive right of pro se litigant "petitioner Onyinye Jideani," when granting the respondent "Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc.'s (formerly Hilton Hotel Corporation) Renewed Motion for Summary Affirmance" "and on the lower court's unlawful and unjudicial dismissal of petitioner Onyinye Jideani's May 09, 2022 civil action suit for Want of Prosecution during the first and only hearing held on October 21, 2022;"

5.

pg. 19 of 20


And where the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, had substantial knowledge and material facts that petitioner Onyinye Jideani "did" plead and pursued her civil action suit with "procedural, sufficient, and timely" filings, in the lower court "(the District of Columbia Superior Court civil action division)," and as shown in the courts docket for the May 09, 2022 legal proceedings; And therefore the District of Columbia Superior Court erred and engaged in abuse of process when dismissing the suit for Want of Prosecution on an October 25, 2022 order;

WHEREFORE, pursuant to 28 U.S. Code 2106, the Supreme Court Should certify and affirm all necessary remedial status to redress the defect, injury, and injustice caused to the petitioner Onyinye Jideani, "to preserve the status quo, protect the substantive rights of *pro se* litigants, and uphold the full capacity of the administration of justice.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


Onyinye Jideani, Petitioner in pro se

Date: June 13, 2023

6.

Pg. 20 of 20