

App No \_\_\_\_\_

---

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Lori Saxon,  
Applicant

vs.

Denizen Development, L.L.C.  
Respondents

)  
) Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
)  
) DCCA. No. 23-CV-87  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

---

**EXTRAORDINARY EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR A STAY**

To The Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice for the D.C. Circuit

Lori Saxon  
Applicant  
Pro Se  
331 Plymouth Rd  
West Palm Beach, FL 33405  
[loriannsaxon@gmail.com](mailto:loriannsaxon@gmail.com)  
703-625-4343

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

The parties to the proceedings are as follows:

Applicant, Lori Saxon is the appellant in District of Columbia Court of appeals case Lori Saxon v Denizen Development, L.L.C. appellee.No 23-cv-87

Applicant, Lori Saxon is the Defendant in The DC Superior Court Landlord Tenant Branch and Denizen Development L.L.C is the Plaintiff. No. 2019-LTB-012321.

The related Proceedings are below:

Supreme Court of The United States Application (22A560) granted by The Chief Judge extending time to file until Feb. 24, 2023 entered Dec. 22, 2022

Other related cases will be entered on Petitioner's Appendix.

1. Denizen Development LLC v Lori Saxon DC Superior Court Landlord Tenant Branch, No. 2019-LTB-012321 Jan, 19, 2023 Judgment Granting Summary Judgment possession of property, Jan 27, 2023 Writ of Restitution, Feb. 13, 2023 Judgment and Financial Details non-redeemable.- after Saxon filed an appeal Feb, 2, 2023
2. Lori Saxon v Denizen Development LLC DC Court of Appeals No 23-cv-0087 Feb 17, 2023 Saxon filed an Emergency Stay denied Order Mar. 8, 2023
3. George McDermott v Denizen Development LLC No 22-cv-0658 filed Aug, 26, 2022 under DC Code 22-723
4. Lori Saxon V Denizen Development LLC DC Court of Appeals Nov, 15, 2019 Judgment not from final order
5. Denizen Development LLC v Lori Saxon US District Court for DC No. 19-cv-02836 Nov 4, 2019 Judgment, Nov 26, 2019 Denied reconsideration
6. Lori Saxon v Denizen Development LLC US Court of Appeals No 19-7151 Jun, 1, 2021 Judgment, sep, 3, 2021 Rehearing en banc denied, Nov, 3, 2021 Deny Recall the Mandate

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Parties to the Proceeding.....1

Table of Contents.....2

Appendix.....2-3

Table of Authorities.....3-5

Statutes.....5-6

Jurisdiction.....7

Constitution and Statutory Provisions Involved.....7-9

Statutory Provisions Involved.....9

Extraordinary Emergency Application for Stay & Reasons for Granting...9-22

Conclusion.....23

Certificate of Service.....24

**APPENDIX**

Appendix A

3/8/23/ DCCA order denying stay .....3-4a

Appendix B

Order For Summary Judgement DC Superior Court Landlord Tenant Branch 1/19/23  
Judge Danya Dayson.....4-14a

Appendix C

Judgment 1/20/23 Judge Danya Dayson Landlord Tenant Court .....15-16a

Appendix D

writs with Ethan Arnheim signed when LLC revoked 9/1/22-2/28/23  
When Denizen Development LLC wrote Opposition to Saxon Appeal most undated  
Writs..... 17-25a

Appendix E

1/31/23 Judge Dayson Memorializing Hearings with mandatory in person hearing March  
30, 2023.....26-27a

Appendix F

Docket in Landlord Tenant Court continually altered.....28-29a

Appendix G

Denizen Development LLC -LLC revoked from 9/1/22-/2/28/23 when attorneys wrote  
opposition to Saxon DCCA motion to stay.....30-31a

Appendix H: March 30, 2021 Letter from the DC Tax Office that Denizen Development is  
not the owner of Record on Saxon’s home at 937 N St., NW.....32a

Appendix I: Homeowners Insurance is paid by the Mortgagee on Saxons home at 937 N  
St., NW through September 2023.....32-33.a

Appendix J: Related Cases.....34-35.a

Appendix K: Statutes to 15 USC 1692.....35-37a

Appendix L: DC Superior Court Order Judge Judith Bartnoff Dismissing the Case Mar. 11,  
2016.....38-39a

Appendix M :2013 Article Setting up the Judicial Foreclosure Enterprise in DC Superior  
Court with Judge Melvin Wright, Judge Judith Bartnoff and Judge Neal Kravitz...39-40a

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

DC Court of Appeals 17-cv-828, decided 10/10/18, Luis Ivan Poblete v Residential Credit  
Opportunities Trust, The Appeals court indicated that the Superior Court Abused its  
Power

Knick v Township of Scott, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019)

Lawler v National Screen Service Corp, 349 U.S. 322 (1955)

Marbury v Madison 5 US 137 (1803 Supreme Court)

Obdusky v McCarthy & Holthus L.L.P., 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019)

Rawe v Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 462 F. 3d 521, 529-30 (6th Cir.2006)

Sause v Bauer 585 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2018)

Timbs v Indiana 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019)

The Hobbs Act 18 USC 1951-1957.

Trinsey v Pagliaro DC Pa 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647 Lawyers statements are not valid under summary Judgment.

73 U.S. 1963 Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution

DC Statute of Limitations DC Code 12-301

The United States Constitution

1st amendment

4th Amendment

5th Amendment

6th Amendment

7th Amendment

8th Amendment

9th Amendment

14th Amendment

Violation of civil and constitutional rights

Emoluments Clause

## **STATUTES**

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Honest Service Fraud, 18 USC 1346.

RICO Statute

Rule 41(b)

DC Homestead Exemption

18 USC 3057 Bankruptcy Violations

Mail Fraud, 18 USC 1341

Wire Fraud, 18 USC 1343  
False Claims Act  
31 USC 3729  
Fraud and False Statements 18 USC Chapter 47 1004-1007  
and 1016, 1017, 1021, and 1028.  
UCC 1-108 & 308

Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA),  
15 U.S.C. 1692-1692p .....  
15 U.S.C. 1692(a) .....  
15 U.S.C. 1692(b)  
15 U.S.C. 1692(e) .  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(5) .  
15 15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(A))  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(B)  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(C) .  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(D)  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(E)  
15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(F)  
15 U.S.C. 1692d(1)  
15 U.S.C. 1692d(2).  
15 U.S.C. 1692e  
15 U.S.C. 1692f  
15 U.S.C. 1692g .  
15 U.S.C. 1692i  
15 U.S.C. 1692m  
15 U.S.C. 1692n  
15 U.S.C. 1692o  
28 U.S.C. 1257

**Statutes**

42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
Honest Service Fraud, 18 USC 1346.  
RICO Statute  
Rule 41(b)  
DC Homestead Exemption  
18 USC 3057 Bankruptcy Violations  
Mail Fraud, 18 USC 1341

Wire Fraud, 18 USC 1343

False Claims Act

31 USC 3729

Fraud and False Statements 18 USC Chapter 47 1004-1007  
and 1016, 1017, 1021, and 1028.

UCC 1-108 & 308

Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA),

15 U.S.C. 1692-1692p .....

15 U.S.C. 1692(a) .....

15 U.S.C. 1692(b)

15 U.S.C. 1692(e) .

15 U.S.C. 1692a(5) .

15 15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(A))

15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(B)

15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(C) .

15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(D)

15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(E)

15 U.S.C. 1692a(6)(F)

15 U.S.C. 1692d(1)

15 U.S.C. 1692d(2).

15 U.S.C. 1692e

15 U.S.C. 1692f

15 U.S.C. 1692g .

15 U.S.C. 1692i

15 U.S.C. 1692m

15 U.S.C. 1692n

15 U.S.C. 1692o

28 U.S.C. 1257

## **JURISDICTION**

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals issued an Order on March 8, 2023 case no. 23-cv-87 denying appellant Lori Saxon's Emergency Motion for A Stay..AP A 3-4 Order. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides:“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

The Fourth Amendment (Amendment IV) to the United States Constitution is part of the Bill of Rights. It prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures. In addition, it sets requirements for issuing warrants: warrants must be issued by a judge or magistrate, justified by probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and must particularly describe the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides, “nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

The Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides, “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.”

The Sixth Amendment (Amendment VI) to the United States Constitution sets forth rights related to criminal prosecutions. It was ratified in 1791 as part of the United States Bill of Rights. The Supreme Court has applied the protections of this amendment to the



states through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Sixth Amendment grants criminal defendants the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury

The Seventh Amendment (Amendment VII) to the United States Constitution is part of the Bill of Rights. This amendment codifies the right to a jury trial in certain civil cases and inhibits courts from overturning a jury's findings of fact.

The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution protects against imposing excessive bail, excessive fines, or cruel and unusual punishments. This amendment was adopted on December 15, 1791, along with the rest of the United States Bill of Rights

The Ninth Amendment to the United States Constitution addresses rights, retained by the people, that are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution. It is part of the Bill of Rights

Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides in pertinent part, “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

2 U.S.C. § 1983 provides: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State, . . . subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws,

shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

### **STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

The relevant provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), 15 U.S.C. 1692-1692p, are reproduced in the appendix to this petition (App.23a), Fraud.

### **Extraordinary Emergency Application for A Stay and Reasons for Granting:**

To The Honorable John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of The United States Supreme Court and DC Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, from Case 23-CV-87 .Pursuant to Rule 23 , Rule 22 and Rule 33.2 of the Rules of this Court, Pro Se Applicant/Petitioner, Lori Saxon hereby respectfully requests an Extraordinary Emergency Application for a Stay from the proceedings of The DC Court of Appeals, No.23-cv-87 and DC Superior Court , Landlord Tenant Branch, 2019-LTB-012321 Orders, Judgments, Writs of Possession, Eviction Notices, Lori Saxon, Applicant is to be evicted from her home of almost 23 years on March 15, 2023 as the DC Court of Appeals did not grant her emergency Stay. Lori Saxon prays this court will grant this emergency stay so that a non redeemable judgment will take place on March 15, 2023 by the United States Marshals..App A-F p 3-29

Lori Saxon is not a renter or a tenant. Lori Saxon and her family will suffer irreparable harm if she loses her home to illegal seizure on March 15, 2023.

Applicant was granted an extension of time from the related case, Lori Saxon V Ameritas Life Insurance Corporation 22A560 for Writ of Certiorari.The papers were just

returned to Lori Saxon to correct the pleading and she has 60 days from March 3, 2023 to correct the filing which Lori Saxon will be doing.

Per The Supreme Court *Sause v Bauer* 6/28/18, 585 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2018) protects Pro Se Litigants under the 1st & 4th Amendments.

- a. Pleadings filed by unrepresented litigants shall not be held to the same standard as lawyers and/or attorneys at law (distinct definitions); and whose motions,
- b. pleadings and all papers may only be judged by their substance and not their form. *See: Haines v. Kerner; Platsky v. CIA; Anastasoff v. United States* (emphasis in bold):

*Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519-421. Unrepresented litigants are **held to less stringent pleading standards** than admitted or licensed bar attorneys. **Regardless of the deficiencies** in their pleadings, unrepresented **litigants are entitled to the opportunity to submit evidence** in support of their claims.

*Platsky v. C.I.A.*, 953 f.2d. 25. **Court errs** if court dismisses the unrepresented litigant **without instruction of how pleadings are deficient** and how to repair pleadings.

*Anastasoff v. United States*, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000). Litigants' [substantive] constitutional [guaranteed] rights [not confused with privileges] are violated when courts depart from precedent where parties are similarly situated.

Pro Se Petitioner believes she will prevail in the Supreme Court if just granted this emergency stay.

There has been a blatant disregard and conflict with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the lower courts and many legal errors in Applicant-/Petitioner's case. The lower Court's decision appears not just erroneous but outlandishly so.

The lower Court's decision is so far outside the norm of judicial decision making that it requires further review from this court.

Applicant, Petitioner has suffered irreparable harm and the Orders/  
Judgments violate petitioner's constitutional rights.

Applicant,/ Petitioner has suffered a miscarriage of justice and a denial of  
her due process rights.

Pro Se appellant has had her 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8, 9th, 10th and 14th  
Amendment Constitutional rights violated by all courts.42 USC 1983.

A stay will not cause prejudice to Respondents,who have denied Saxon a jury  
trial, discovery, mediation, joinder of all parties, counterclaim, or proof of service.

Denizen Development LLC had their LLC revoked September 1, 2022 and  
appears to have refiled, only after Saxon filed her court ordered, March 10, 2023  
Supplemental Opposition to Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Enter my Property.  
Plaintiffs received Saxon's Motion on March 10, 2023 and on March 13, 2023,  
altered the Courts Docket, yet again and changed the date of the Writ of  
Restitution and Judgment and non-redeemable Judgment and eviction date to  
March 15, 2023, without Saxon ever being served or mailed the information to her  
Florida address on file.

Denizen Development LLC has had their LLC Status revoked and their alleged  
Attorneys with Offit Kurman had no jurisdiction or authority to go forward with  
this theft since September 1, 2022. The Respondents never proved Jurisdiction or  
authority previously, either. Denizen Development, LLC or Ethan Arnheim not  
only do not have a valid LLC nor does Denizen have a license to rent a property  
under DC Code 42.3502.05 2022. App F-J p 28-35.

As this court is well aware, when a Corporation or LLC registers with the state

as a legal business that business usually has certain tax and reporting obligations. The obligations have deadlines by which the state expects to be paid. If a Corporation or LLC fails to fulfill any of its required business obligations the state will send a deficiency notice to the business. The deficiency notice will specify exactly the nature of the deficiencies and what must be done to remedy them.

The state will give the Corporation or LLC some time, usually sixty days, to remedy the deficiencies. If the Corporation or LLC fails to remedy the deficiencies within the specified time legally conduct business and may be breaking the law if it does conduct business. Appellees, Denizen Development LLC and their attorneys with Offit Kurmon have been deliberately, with criminal intent, have filing false motions, obtaining fraudulent judgments, Orders, decrees and writs against pro se appellant, and making false statements in open court. Respondents have participated in a criminal process to deprive appellant of her rights. Respondents staged an event to obtain 2 vacant property signs palace on appellees home which appellee had removed through the Vacant property division of the DC Government. Respondents claim they were entered into an expensive tax class when all the while Respondents were most likely entered in the tax status as Respondents had a REVOKED LLC,

The most common reasons that a Corporation or LLC might be Administratively Dissolved is failure to file an Annual or Biennial Report on time or failure to maintain a Registered Agent or Registered Office in the state and or pay taxes.

A situation like this has exposed the owners of the Corporation or LLC to personal liability, and your company or LLC loses its status, you also lose the legal

protections afforded by that status, exposing shareholders or LLC members to personal liability.

An LLC will not protect a member from liability for his or her own negligent or otherwise wrongful acts that cause injury to another, such as assault or fraud, as appellees have done, with malicious intent to appellant.

Applicant is entitled to restitution for the wrongful acts committed against Applicant through their wrongful conduct. Respondents were not in good standing to bring a lawsuit in court against applicant. Respondents have a defective ability as a corporation and cannot continue a lawsuit against the applicant. Respondents have no jurisdiction.

Respondents have been proceeding with criminal intent with deliberately falsified documents.

Respondents lacked standing as appellees are not a corporate entity.

“Where a corporation is administratively revoked, all they can do is wind up their affairs – that’s what the statute says – and any causes of action that accrued during the period of revocation may not be brought[,] [e]ven after the corporation is reinstated.”

“[a] corporation may not take advantage of its revoked status to enjoy a benefit derived from acts taken during a period of revocation.”

Either way, the effect is the same; and once an LLC has been canceled, it ceases to exist as a legal entity and **cannot sue or be sued**.

All of Respondents' pleadings, filings and Judges Orders, Judgments and writs must be stricken from the record from September 1, 2022 to present as Denizen Development LLC Corporation has been revoked since September 1, 2022. Alleged have Respondents lost their corporate status.. All the filings by the alleged attorneys from Offitt Kurman are null and void as they have filed under false pretenses of a REVOKED LLC. see AP D p 17-25. All actions are void since September 1, 2022.

Judge Danya Dayson has an admitted conflict of interest with the law firm Offit Kurman who claim to represent Respondents , as she has a family member retaining the same law firm

Judge Dayson has shown extreme bias toward applicant and applicant has been discriminated against under color of law and under 42 USC 1983. Alleged respondents and the lower court have participated in a criminal process to deprive the applicant of her due process rights.

apF p 28-29 This appears to be a Star Chamber ex parte Judgment issued in retaliation by the court for Applicants opposition motion filed on 2/10/23 specifying the Revoked LLC status of Respondents Denizen Development LLC. On February 13, 2023, the court issued a writ of restitution, a Notice and this judgment that applicant is not able to get a copy of. Applicant is being deprived of her due process rights and prays this court will issue a stay to the proceedings of the lower court.

Applicant asserts that "Under the circumstances presented here, it would be fundamentally unfair and a clear due process violation to permit this prosecution to go forward."

Pro Se Applicant did not consent to illegal hearings & orders, especially when the LLC had been revoked.

Lori Saxon had a chapter 7 Bankruptcy discharged in 2008. Numerous foreclosure mills and debt collectors have tried to foreclose on Lori Saxon's home since 2010, violating the FDCPA, Homestead Laws in the District of Columbia, and Lori Saxon's right to Due Process. In 2013, The DC and US Government officials, DC Superior Court Judges, Attorneys, and Court Insiders set up The Judicial Foreclosure Working Group to Take Saxon's home through Judicial Foreclosure. Lori Saxon's home was auctioned off on November 2, 2017. A settlement occurred in February, 2019 while cases were still under appeal and in DC Superior Court. The accounting of the sale was not reported and ratified by the Judge in DC Superior Court until 2 years after the alleged settlement, in 2019. No loans were paid off, or was Ameritas Life Insurance Corporation even mentioned in the accounting. Lori Saxon's homeowners insurance is being paid by another debt collector through September, 2023, as were the taxes, until the courts were made aware of the taxes and then the alleged buyer started paying the taxes in around 2020 and the records were altered. The Insurance is still current through September 2023. Lori Saxon's home is valued at over \$2.2 million. In Ameritas Accounting, they received a little over \$1 million for the home. The title is spoiled with so many debt collectors re-recording the deed.



Judicial Foreclosures do not occur in The District of Columbia since The Supreme Court's unanimous Opinion -Obdusky v McCarthy & Holthus, LLP 586 US 2019.

In 2019, before the court's ratification of the accounting, another case was created in DC Superior Court- Landlord Tenant Court. Lori Saxon Appealed. The Landlord Tenant Court, Denizen Development, LLC, as the alleged purchaser who has had the LLC revoked since September 1, 2022 and just obtained a writ of possession and is having Lori Saxon removed from her home of 23 years, on March 15, 2023 by United States Marshals. Lori Saxon was never served the filing.

Lori Saxon's due process rights were knowingly violated with malicious intent and purpose by agents of the alleged Debt collectors -respondents agents and officers in all courts within the District of Columbia. Lori Saxon's fundamental guaranteed rights to Due Process and 42 USC 1983 and 1st, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th 9th, and 14th amendments have been violated.

On 2/2/23, Applicant filed her notice of appeal in the DC Court of Appeals, but the Case summary page lists UnknownOccupants as the Applicant. This caused the DC Court of Appeals 5 days until the court could locate the applicant's appeal to put on the docket on 2/7/23.

Applicant asserts that under 28 USC 1447, a certified copy of the order of remand shall be mailed by the clerk to the clerk of the [State court](#). The [State court may](#) there upon proceed with such case. Applicant asserts that this never occurred from the Federal District Court App J p35-37 related cases, and the docket was altered on March 2, 2022 two times as there were no entries of the remand and no docket entries on

11/2/21 and then after the 3/1/22 hearing with Judge Dayson on March 1, 2022 the docket was altered on 3/2/22 to show the remand on 11/2/21. The docket was altered by court insiders to reflect that the case was reopened from District Court 4 months after .

Appellant has been denied a jury trial denied all her constitutional rights and to a jury trial with malicious willful intent The Court acting without jurisdiction & authority

The Docket was being tampered & destroyed before applicant's eyes The Docket has been repeatedly tampered with and the case has reopened after the hearing to cover up the lower court's misconduct. It is a felony Federal Offense to tamper with the docket.

The dockets have been altered continually and the court transcripts are altered This is a federal crime by alleged appellee's and their attorneys for falsification of court records and corporation laws under the UCC Code. Respondents have committed Mail & Wire fraud 18 USC 1341 & 1343 and have intentionally committed fraud against the Appellant to enter her home when they did not even have a client to represent. Fraud and False statements to the court and government 18 USC 1001. Destruction , alteration or falsification of records and statements- 18 USC 1001, 18 USC 1519 This case should be stayed until the appeal is complete in the DC Court of Appeals.

The court transcripts have been altered and have hundreds of deletions. Under 28 USC 753 A & B, a spoiled transcript makes everything null and void. See DC Court of Appeals case 22-cv-0658 George E. McDermott v Denizen Development.

The respondents have no reason to enter applicant's property.

These court proceedings must be stayed as the case is on appeal with the DC Court of appeals since 2/2/23. The case summary from Landlord Tenant Court was sent to

the DC Court of Appeals naming unknown occupants as the Appellant exhibit 5. It took the DC Court of appeals until February 7, 2023 to locate applicantt's' appeal- more falsification of court records by the respondents and the lower court. Also on the docket there are 3 returned mails from Appellants home stating no such number, and unable to forward.Applicant has reported this to the US Postal Inspectors as it is very peculiar that 3 pieces of mail would be returned to this court after the January 20, 2023 hearing and applicant has never had mail returned to anyone as there is always plenty of mail at Applicants home. Alleged respondents have participated in falsification and destruction of court documents.

Alleged respondents have discriminated against applicant for age, religion, sex, political party and intimidation.

Respondents have committed federal fraud and wire fraud schemes engaged in deception to the courts and applicant. The object of their fraud was money and property and appellants property rights and violating Supreme Court unanimous opinion-ruling of on search and seizure -

Timbs v Indiana 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019).

Respondents and their insiders have violated 25 CFR 11.420 Tampering with records Respondents have a total disregard of Applicant's constitutional rights and civil rights.

This case is also on appeal since August 26, 2022, as respondents are well aware. at DC Court of Appeals 22-cv-0658 George McDermott v Denizen Development, and Lori A. Saxon v Ameritas Life Insurance Corporation Application No. 22A560 In The Supreme Court of the United States. and is the case that this case stems from.- Ameritas Life Insurance v Lori Saxon.

The lower courts are violating rules of professional conduct & rules standard of responsibility.

The lower court made a serious Legal error to proceed with No jurisdiction Appellant asserts the Double jeopardy rule.

— ***What the law states:*** “any justice, judge or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”

Can a state Law go against the Constitution?

This appeals court found that in DC Court of Appeals Case 17-cv-828 Luis Ivan Poblete appellant vs Residential Credit Opportunities trust appellee (from LTB-7612-17 that the Superior Court had abused their power in Appellants removal case, just like the courts have in this Lori Saxon’s appeal and removal.

Applicant asserts there are Homestead laws in the District of Columbia and that her home falls under the Homestead.

Petitioner’s 2008 chapter 7 Bankruptcy under District of Columbia Code? Specifically DC Code The “Homestead Exemption” provides that a DC Residents home is

“free and exempt” from “attachment, levy or seizure and sale on execution or decree from any court in the District of Columbia...” in its entirety.\*

The courts and alleged respondents continue to violate applicants constitutional rights and under 42 usc 1983 civil rights.

The courts failed to provide applicant with honest services as she was sent unsigned, unverifiable per curiam orders that are not in conformity with the US Constitution or common law There is no evidence any judge signed the Order or Judgment. The Orders are constitutionally deficient.

A rubber stamp or typed names are not a validated signature. An unsigned order is non conforming with the United States Constitution and rule of law.

Alleged Respondents committed federal fraud and wire fraud schemes engaged in deception to the courts and applicant. The object of their fraud was money and property and appellants property rights.

Applicant did not consent to the illegal hearings of the lower court & orders and Abuse of judicial authority under color of law.

Applicant asserts this is clear and convincing evidence that alleged respondents and Denizen Development LLC, and the lower court officers and intermediaries have tried to steal Applicants home through forged documents and unsigned, unverifiable per curiam orders denying appellant equitable relief.

Respondents committed federal fraud and wire fraud schemes engaged in deception to the courts and applicant. The object of their fraud was money and property

and appellants property rights and violating The Supreme Court's unanimous opinion-ruling of on search and seizure -

Timbs v Indiana 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019).

Pro Se Applicant has had her 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8, 9th, 10th and 14th Amendment Constitutional rights violated by all courts.42 USC 1983.

As this court is fully aware, alleged respondents and their agents are involved in securities fraud and are the sale of fraudulent securities in the sale of a title they don't even have under 15 USC 77 and 15 USC 78.

Applicants due process and violation of her constitutional rights have been violated by Respondents and Applicant is protected by the following Supreme court opinions/rulings that Respondents have violated:

Respondents have violated:

Knick v Township of Scott, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019)

Obdusky v McCarthy & Holthus L.L.P., 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019), The Supreme Court ruled that Judicial Foreclosures were illegal.

FDCPA 15 USC 1692,

Timbs v Indiana 586 U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ (2019)

Millbrook v United States 569 US 50 (2013)

DC Court of Appeals Case 17-cv-828 Luis Ivan Poblete appellant vs Residential Credit Opportunities trust appellee

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Applicant requests that this Court enter judgment against Appellees.

Pro Se Applicant Saxon prays this court will Grant her emergency stay and knowing that the lower court lacks jurisdiction and authority. This entire case in the lower courts should be dismissed with prejudice for the bad faith on behalf of the respondents and on the lower court, Applicant should be able to keep her home of 22.5 years as she is the owner and any and for such other and further relief as this court may deem appropriate as The lower courts, insiders and alleged respondents have violated pro se applicants civil and constitutional rights under 42 USC 1983.

Applicant prays that this court will grant her emergency stay so that the appeal can proceed without applicant and her family being thrown out of her home of 22.5 years, and to stay all further proceedings from the lower court, the writ of restitution, Judgments and Orders and everything purposely being withheld from the courts docket.

Applicant is demonstrating good cause shown for these exceptional circumstances sufficient to override strong public policy special circumstances preventing injustice to applicant. The appeal must be stayed and or Denizen's case dismissed with prejudice and the judgments reexamined because they were obtained by fraud and grant any and all relief it deems appropriate.

Applicant prays that this court will grant this extraordinary motion and for such other and further relief as this court may deem appropriate.

Applicant declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

## CONCLUSION

This petition for an Extraordinary Emergency Stay should be granted.

Dated March 10, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/S/

Lori A. Saxon

331 Plymouth Rd.  
West Palm Beach, FL 33405  
703-625-4343  
[LoriAnnSaxon@Gmail.com](mailto:LoriAnnSaxon@Gmail.com)



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lori Saxon hereby certify that on this 10th day of March 2023, a copy of the foregoing application was mailed USPS mail to the following respondents::

Stephen O. Hessler DC Bar 230102  
Ian G. Thomas DC Bar 1021680  
Jung K. Kim DC Bar 230228  
Jennifer Friend Kelly DC Bar 1048862  
Tracy Buck DC Bar 1021540

% Offit Kurman  
1325 G St NW Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted on 3/10/23

/S/

Lori Saxon

331 Plymouth Rd.  
West Palm Beach, FL 33405  
March 10, 2023  
703-625-4343  
[loriannsaxon@gmail.com](mailto:loriannsaxon@gmail.com)

