

23-1070
p 23-

ORIGINAL

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED
STATES

IN RE: PALANI KARUPAIYAN, Petitioner

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus,
Prohibition or alternative to
United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit (Dkt 24-1067)

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION OR
ALTERNATIVE**

Palani Karupaiyan.
Pro se, Petitioner,
1326 W William St,
Philadelphia, PA 19132
212-470-2048(M)

FILED
JAN 23 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Petitioners' prayed over 16 reliefs which were as Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition or alternative so the questions were part of three test condition requirement of the Writs.

II. PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner(s): PALANI KARUPAIYAN;
P. P., Plaintiff Palani Karupaiyan's son;
R. P., Plaintiff Palani Karupaiyan's
daughter

Respondent(s)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
STATE OF NEW JERSEY;
TOWNSHIP OF WOODBRIDGE;
UNION OF INDIA;
OFFICER GANDHI, (5038) Individually and in his
Official Capacity as Parking Enforcement Officer of
Woodbridge;
KULLAR CONSTRUCTION;
JOE KULLAR, Individually and in his Official
Capacity as owner of Kullar Construction;
AMZA SYED

**From above respondents UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA;
STATE OF NEW JERSEY were appeared in the
Dist Court.**

III. TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| I. | Questions Presented | i |
| II. | Parties to the Proceeding | ii |
| III. | Table of Contents | iii |
| IV. | Table of Authorities..... | vi |
| V. | Petition for Writ(s) of Mandamus, Prohibition or alternative. | 1 |
| VI. | Opinion(s)/orders/Judgment(s) BELOW (from Dist Court/USCA3)..... | 1 |
| VII. | Jurisdiction..... | 1 |
| VIII. | Constitutional and Statutory Provisions involved..... | 1 |
| IX. | Statement of the Case | 2 |
| a) | Dist Court Proceeding..... | 2 |
| b) | USCA3 Proceeding | 3 |
| X. | US Supreme Court's Rule 11 | 3 |
| XI. | All Writs Act, 28 USC § 1651(a) | 3 |
| XII. | USSC's Writ against USCA/Dist Court or any Court | 4 |
| a) | Against Any Judicial authority (Including NJ authority) | 4 |
| XIII. | USSC's Rule 20.1 and Rule 20.3. | 4 |
| XIV. | Why Lower was not able to grant the Appellant's Writs/Injunction(s) reliefs | 5 |
| XV. | Petitioner's Parenting rights | 6 |
| XVI. | Petitioner should pray the declarative/ injunctive reliefs in the lower Court(s) by following. 6 | |
| XVII. | Three test Conditions for grant the Writs (of Mandamus, prohibition or any alternative)..... | 7 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| XVIII. Collegium system of recommending the Judges/Justice Appointment..... | 9 |
| XIX. Promotion of Chief Judges | 10 |
| XX. Pro se pleading standards..... | 10 |
| XXI. Reasons for Grating the Writs | 11 |
| a) Order against US and NJ..... | 11 |
| 1) Writ against United States that make amendment to the Constitution that Parental rights are Constitutional rights..... | 11 |
| 2) Order that (i)US Govt/President should not appoint the US Supreme Court Justices and Chief Justice ; (ii) Thru Collegium process 51 USCA Judges , should be appointed to US Supreme Court for 5 years, and they should retire at 70 whichever comes 1st. (iii) Most experienced USSC's Associated Justice should be promoted to Chief Justice when Chief Justice retire or vacant. (iv) Invalidate the Judge Brown appointment to US Supreme Court. | 12 |
| 3) Order that USCA Judges and NJ's Apex Court Judges should be appointed by US govt thru Collegium process by inviting nationwide applicant(s). .. | 17 |
| 4) Order that (i) Circuit level collegium should select the US Dist Court Judges by inviting nationwide application and US Govt should appoint the US Dist Judges and (ii) Circuit level collegium should select the [NJ] States trial Judges (including Municipal Judges) and [NJ] state govt should appoint these trial Judges. .. | 18 |
| b) Against INDIA for parental and inheritance /property rights..... | 18 |
| 5) Order to Union of India that US citizen kids should not be hold in India, and US citizen Kids need to return to US for their education, | |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| vacations, and holidays, parental rights and properly kids Ancestral inheritance property(s)/wealth need to transfer to the kids in USA | 18 |
| c) Against New Jersey..... | 19 |
| 6) Petitioner pray that this Court should strike down New Jersey (NJ)'s Constitution and NJ Supreme Court. | 19 |
| 7) Order that (i) Moving New Jersey Municipal Judges into New Jersey Judiciary payroll and (ii) NJ's Municipal Mayor should not appoint any Municipal Judges and NJ Govt should not Appoint any NJ's Judges including Municipal Judges (iii) Deposit traffic violations fine in New Jersey treasury. (iv) Remove the Petitioners traffic ticket to US District Court (v) By parties request Jury should be available in any trial Court including traffic ticket hearing/municipal hearing. | 21 |
| 8) NJ and it's local Govt should not tow/taken away the home less's or less fortunate, marginalised people's property(s). | 24 |
| 9) Order that Strike down N.J.S.A. 39:6B-2 : NO LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE ON MOTOR VEHICLE..... | 25 |
| 10) Order to i) NJ that NJ should standardized the NJ's Municipal Mayors and councilmen's salary..... | 27 |
| d) Against United States for Marriage Law | |
| 27 | |
| 11) Order that United States should enact United States Universal family Law | 27 |
| 12) Order to United States to Abolish the Electoral College process of selecting President of the United States and the President and Vice- | |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| President of United States should be elected by House of Representatives..... | 28 |
| e) Writ against United States for constitutional change regarding women gender violation in Article II of Constitution. | |
| 30 | |
| 13) Order to United States for the changes in Article II of US Constitution, states with word "He" to "He/She" | 30 |
| 14) Order the each appeared defendant to pay \$15 million for the Petitioners' effort, pain and suffering, expenses, litigation cost or pain and suffering by litigation..... | 33 |
| 15) Order that Elected official of United States (President, vice president, senators, House representatives) and their immediate family members should not buy or owe stocks/shares in Federal Contractors (including defense contractors) | 35 |
| f) Against Woodbridge..... | 36 |
| 16) Order the respondent Woodbridge Township should pay 295/day for TAKEN AAWAY Porsche cayenne to the plaintiff..... | 36 |
| And remand the case back to lower Court | 37 |
| XXII. Conclusion..... | 38 |

IV. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 429, 433 n. 5, 113 S.Ct. 2167, 124 L.Ed.2d 391 (1993) | 6 |
| <i>Azubuko v. Royal</i> , 443 F. 3d 302 - USCA, 3rd Cir 2006..... | 6 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>Babb v. SECRETARY, DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, 992 F. 3d 1193 - Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit 2021</i> | 13, 16 |
| <i>Babb v. Wilkie, 140 S. Ct. 1168 – Sup. Ct 2020</i> | 13, 16 |
| <i>Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Holland, 346 US 379 - Supreme Court 1953</i> | 4, 7 |
| <i>Bell v. Burson, 402 US 535 - Supreme Court 1971</i> | 24 |
| <i>Bolin v. Story, 225 F. 3d 1234 – USCA-11 2000</i> | 6 |
| <i>Bontkowski v. Smith, 305 F. 3d 757 – USCA7, 2002</i> | 6 |
| <i>Bontkowskiv. Smith, 305 F.3d 757, 762 (7th Cir. 2002)</i> | 7 |
| <i>Boyadjian v. Cigna Companies, 973 F. Supp. 500 - Dist. Court, D. New Jersey 1997</i> | 34 |
| <i>Boyer v. CLEARFIELD COUNTY INDU. DEVEL. AUTHORITY, Dist. Court, WD Penn 2021</i> | 7 |
| <i>Cheney v. United States Dist. Court for DC, 542 US 367 - Supreme Court 2004</i> | 8 |
| <i>Crooker v. United States Dep't of Justice, 632 F.2d 916, 921 (1st Cir.1980)</i> | 34 |
| <i>Cunningham, 664 F.2d at 387 n. 4</i> | 34 |
| <i>De Beers Consolidated Mines v. United States, 325 US 212, 217(1945)</i> | 4, 8 |
| <i>DeBold, 735 at 1043</i> | 34 |
| <i>eBay Inc v. Mercechange llc, 547.US.388,S.Ct 2006</i> | 8 |
| <i>Erickson v. Pardus, 551 US 89 - Supreme Court 2007</i> | 10 |
| <i>Estelle, 429 U.S., at 106, 97 S.Ct 285</i> | 10 |
| <i>Ex parte Peru, 318 U.S. 578, 585, 63 S.Ct. 793, 87 L.Ed. 1014 (1943)</i> | 5 |
| <i>Hines v. D'Artois, 531 F. 2d 726, 732, and n. 10 (CA5 1976)</i> | 5 |
| <i>Hohn v. United States, 524 US 236 - Supreme Court 1998</i> | 1 |
| <i>Holt Civic Club v. City of Tuscaloosa, 439 U.S. 60, 65-66, 99 S.Ct. 383, 58 L.Ed.2d 292 (1978)</i> | 7 |
| <i>In re US, 139 S. Ct. 452</i> | 7 |
| <i>Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital v. Mercury Constr. Corp, 460 US 1 - Supreme Court 1983</i> | 5 |
| <i>Mullis v. United States Bankr. Court for the Dist. of Nev., 828 F.2d 1385 (9th Cir.1987)</i> | 6 |
| <i>Newman v. Alabama, 683 F.2d 1312 (11th Cir.1982)</i> | 6 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <u>Pa. Bureau of Correction v. US Marshals Service</u> , 474 U.S 34 - Sup Ct 1985..... | 3 |
| <u>re US</u> , 139 S. Ct. 452 | 4 |
| <u>Reno v. Flores</u> , 507 U. S. 292, 301-302 (1993) | 12 |
| <u>Roche v. Evaporated Milk Assn.</u> , 319 U. S. 21, 26 (1943) | 4 |
| <u>Rosado v. Wyman</u> , 397 U. S. 397, 403, n. 3 (1970) | 1 |
| <u>Sullivan v. Little Hunting Park, Inc.</u> , 396 U.S 229 Sup.Ct 1969..... | 19 |
| <u>Troxel v. Granville</u> , 530 U.S. 57 (2000)..... | 6, 11, 28 |
| <u>Washington v. Glucksberg</u> , 521 U. S. 702, 720 | 6 |
| <u>Washington v. Glucksberg</u> , 521 U.S. 702 (1997) | 11 |
| <u>Statutes</u> | |
| 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1)..... | 1, 2 |
| 28 U. S. C. § 1651 | 1 |
| 28 U. S. C. § 2101(e) | 3, 5 |
| 28 USC § 1651(a)..... | 3, 7 |
| 42 U.S.C § 1982..... | 19 |
| 42 U.S.C. § 1983 | 6 |
| <u>All Writs Act</u> | 1, 2, 4 |
| <u>CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT-18 U.S.C. § 228</u> | 27 |
| Child Support Recovery Act (CSRA) | 27 |
| Federal Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UFISA) .. | 27 |
| Respect for Marriage Act..... | 27 |
| <u>The Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Act, amended 2019</u> | 12, 15 |
| <u>Rules</u> | |
| <u>Rule 12(b)(6)</u> | 7 |
| <u>Rule 8(a)(3)</u> | 7 |
| <u>S.Ct. RULE 11</u> | 3 |
| S.Ct. Rule 20.1 | 4 |
| <u>S.Ct. Rule 20.3</u> | 4 |
| <u>Constitutional Provisions</u> | |
| Article II, Section 1, Clause 1: | 30 |
| Full Faith and Credit Clause | 28 |

V. PETITION FOR WRIT(S) OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION OR ALTERNATIVE.

Petitioner respectfully prays that Writ of Mandamus, Prohibition or Alternative to the opinion/judgment/ orders of US Dist Court for NJ (23-cv-20928-ES-AME) below and USCA3's Docket 24-1067

VI. OPINION(S)/ORDERS/JUDGMENT(S) BELOW (FROM DIST COURT/USCA3)

1. US Dist. Court granted 45 days extension to defendant United States , by default, on Jan 02, 2024 (ECF-14) **App.01**
Hon. Esther Salas USDJ;
Hon. ANDRÉ M. ESPINOSA, USMJ
2. With United Courts of Appeal, petitioners' Petition for writ of mandamus is pending. Docket# 24-1067

VII. JURISDICTION

In *Hohn v. United States*, 524 US 236 - Supreme Court 1998@ 258 ("*Rosado v. Wyman*, 397 U. S. 397, 403, n. 3 (1970) (a Court always has jurisdiction to determine its jurisdiction)).

Hohn @264 ("We can issue a common-law writ of Certiorari under the All Writs Act, 28 U. S. C. § 1651.)

Timely Petitioner filed 1) Notice of Petition and 2) Notice of Appeal. Both filed on Jan 05 2024. Ecf-16.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under All Writs Act, 28 U. S. C. § 1651. US Sup. Ct Rule 11 /28 U. S. C. § 2101(E)

VIII. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

14th amendment, parental rights, due process, trial by Jury.

Article II & III of US Constitution

All Writs Act, 28 U. S. C. § 1651. US Sup. Ct Rule 11 /28 U. S. C. § 2101(E)

Comparative Approaches of Supreme Courts of the World's Largest and Oldest Democracies

--By Justice Hon. Stephen Breyer of US Supreme Court, Chief Justice Hon. NV Ramana of Indian Supreme Court, and William M Treanor, Dean of Georgetown University Law Centre Dated: April 11, 2022

IX.STATEMENT OF THE CASE

a) DIST COURT PROCEEDING

On Oct 3 2023, Plaintiff filed complaint with US Dist Court of New Jersey-Newark and timely served the complaint to all captioned defendants.

The case is pending with Dist Court now.

On Jan 2 2024, by default, Dist Court granted 45 days extension to response to defendant US when the plaintiff objected.

On Jan 05 2024, plaintiff filed notice of appeal and Notice of petition for writ of mandamus with Dist Court.

On Nov 9 2024, New Jersey filed motion to dismiss. ECF.9

On Feb 16 2024, Defendant United States filed motion to dismiss. ECF. 21.

Plaintiff filed opposition to motion to dismiss by US (Feb 23 2024, ECF-23) and New Jersey (Nov 13 2923, ECF-10).

On Feb 26 2024, plaintiff filed MOTION To Accept Amended Updated Supplemental Response by PALANI KARUPAIYAN. (Attachments: # 1 Amended/Updated Supplemental Response to NJ 9 Motion to Dismiss)

Decision for Motion to dismiss of US and New jersey is pending now.

b) USCA3 PROCEEDING

The appeal is docketed 24-1044 with USCA3 which is pending.

On Jan 12 2024, Petitioner filed Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Prohibition or Alternative with USCA3 docket 24-1067.

The decision for Petition for Writ of Mandamus is pending with USCA3.

X.US SUPREME COURT'S RULE 11

**US SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION
UNDER S.Ct. RULE 11**

Certiorari to a United States Court of Appeals Before Judgment A petition for a writ of Certiorari to review a case pending in a United States Court of appeals, before judgment is entered in that Court, will be granted only upon a showing that the case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court. See 28 U. S. C. § 2101(e).

b) 28 U. S. C. § 2101(E).

An application to the Supreme Court for a writ of Certiorari to review a case before judgment has been rendered in the COURT OF APPEALS may be made at any time before judgment.

XI.ALL WRITS ACT, 28 USC § 1651(A)

In Pa. Bureau of Correction v. US Marshals Service,
474 US 34 - Sup Ct 1985 @43

"The All Writs Act is a residual source of authority to issue writs that are not otherwise covered by statute".

XII. USSC's WRIT AGAINST USCA/DIST COURT OR ANY COURT

Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Holland, 346 US 379 - Supreme Court 1953@383

As was pointed out in Roche v. Evaporated Milk Assn., 319 U. S. 21, 26 (1943), the "traditional use of the writ in aid of appellate jurisdiction both at common law and in the federal Courts has been to confine an inferior Court to a lawful exercise of its prescribed jurisdiction or to compel it to exercise its authority when it is its duty to do so."

.....

- a) AGAINST ANY JUDICIAL AUTHORITY (INCLUDING NJ AUTHORITY)

Holland @383 there is clear abuse of discretion or "usurpation of judicial power" of the sort held to justify the writ in De Beers Consolidated Mines v. United States, 325 US 212, 217(1945)

XIII. USSC's RULE 20.1 AND RULE 20.3.

In re US, 139 S. Ct. 452 - Supreme Court 2018 @ 453
S.Ct. Rule 20.1 (Petitioners seeking extra-ordinary writ must show "that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other Court" (emphasis added));

S.Ct. Rule 20.3 (mandamus petition must "set out with particularity why the relief sought is not available in any other Court"); see also Ex parte Peru, 318 U.S. 578, 585, 63 S.Ct. 793, 87 L.Ed.

1014 (1943) (mandamus petition "ordinarily must be made to the intermediate appellate Court").

The requirement is substituted by Moses 460 US 1 - Supreme Court 1983 @ footnote[6].

More fundamentally, a Court of appeals has no occasion to engage in extraordinary review by mandamus "in aid of [its] jurisdiction[n]," 28 U. S. C. § 1651, when it can exercise the same review by a contemporaneous ordinary appeal. See, e. g., Hines v. D'Artois, 531 F. 2d 726, 732, and n. 10 (CA5 1976)

Also the above Substitute the Test-1 of 3 tests requirement of grating most of the writs in US Supreme Court.

XIV.WHY LOWER WAS NOT ABLE TO GRANT THE APPELLANT'S WRITS/INJUNCTION(S) RELIEFS

- a) This petition with this Court is under S.Ct. RULE 11 & 28 USC § 2101(e). So petitioner(s) was not able to pray the reliefs in lower Courts.
- b) With USCA, parallel an appeal and a petition for mandamus is docketed. As per the Moses footnote[6], USCA3 could not able to grant the injunctive reliefs along with appeal. In Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital v. Mercury Constr. Corp., 460 US 1 - Supreme Court 1983 @footnote[6].

More fundamentally, a Court of appeals has no occasion to engage in extraordinary review by mandamus "in aid of [its] jurisdiction[n]," 28 U. S. C. § 1651, when it can exercise the same review by a contemporaneous ordinary appeal. See, e. g., Hines v. D'Artois, 531 F. 2d 726, 732, and n. 10 (CA5 1976).

XV. PETITIONER'S PARENTING RIGHTS

Petitioners' Parenting Rights were in 14th Amendment of Constitution, Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000) and Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U. S. 702, 720.

XVI. PETITIONER SHOULD PRAY THE DECLARATIVE/INJUNCTIVE RELIEFS IN THE LOWER COURT(S) BY FOLLOWING.

In Bolin v. Story, 225 F. 3d 1234 – USCA-11 2000 @ 1243

"In order to receive declaratory or injunctive relief, plaintiffs must establish that there was a violation, that there is a serious risk of continuing irreparable injury if the relief is not granted, and the absence of an adequate remedy at law". See Newman v. Alabama, 683 F.2d 1312 (11th Cir.1982).

In Azubuko v. Royal, 443 F. 3d 302 - USCA, 3rd Cir 2006 @ 304

Injunctive relief shall be granted when a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable." 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Bolin v. Story, 225 F. 3d 1234 – USCA-11 2000(explaining that the amendment applies to both state and federal Judges); see also Mullis v. United States Bankr. Court for the Dist. of Nev., 828 F.2d 1385 (9th Cir.1987); Antoine v. Byers &Anderson, Inc., 508 U.S. 429, 433 n. 5, 113 S.Ct. 2167, 124 L.Ed.2d 391 (1993) (noting that the rules regarding judicial immunity do not distinguish between lawsuits brought against state officials and those brought against federal officials).

In Bontkowski v. Smith, 305 F. 3d 757 – USCA7, 2002@762 "can be interpreted as a request for the imposition of such a trust, a form of equitable relief and

thus a cousin to an injunction. Rule 54(c), which provides that a prevailing party may obtain any relief to which he's entitled even if he "has not demanded such relief in [his] pleadings." See Holt Civic Club v. City of Tuscaloosa, 439 U.S. 60, 65-66, 99 S.Ct. 383, 58 L.Ed.2d 292 (1978);

In Boyer v. CLEARFIELD COUNTY INDU. DEVEL. AUTHORITY, Dist. Court, WD Penn 2021

"Thus a prayer for an accounting, like a request for injunctive relief, is not a cause of action or a claim upon which relief can be granted. Rather, it is a request for another form of equitable relief, i.e., a "demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks" under Rule 8(a)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. D****As such, it too is not the proper subject of a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. D***Global Arena, LLC, 2016 WL 7156396, at *2; see also Bontkowskiv. Smith, 305 F.3d 757, 762 (7th Cir. 2002).

Petitioners prays this Court any and all benefit of above ruling.

XVII. THREE TEST CONDITIONS FOR GRANT THE WRITS (OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION OR ANY ALTERNATIVE)

Test-1: No other adequate means [exist] to attain the relief [the party] desires (In re US, 139 S. Ct. 452)
Or it (injunction) is necessary or appropriate in aid of our jurisdiction (28 USC § 1651(a))

Or "the party seeking issuance of the writ must have no other adequate means to attain the relief [it] desires";

Test-2: the party's right to [relief] issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable (In re US, 139 S. Ct. 452)

Or Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Holland, 346 US 379 - Sup.Ct 1953

clear abuse of discretion or "usurpation of judicial power" of the sort held to justify the writ in De Beers Consolidated Mines v. United States, 325 US 212, 217(1945)

Or Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. v. Sebelius, 568 US 1401 – Sup.Ct 2012

whatever the ultimate merits of the applicants' claims, their entitlement to relief is not "indisputably clear"

Or the Petitioner must demonstrate that the "right to issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable." Cheney, 542 U.S. at 380-81, 124 S.Ct. 2576

Or Cheney v. United States Dist. Court for DC, 542 US 367-Sup.Ct 2004
Defendant owes him a clear nondiscretionary duty

Test-3: a question of first impression is raised.

Or

"the issuing Court, must be satisfied that the writ is appropriate under the circumstances (In re US, 139 S. Ct. 452.)

Or

that the permanent injunction being sought would not hurt public interest (eBay Inc v. Mercexchange llc, 547.US.388,S.Ct 2006)

i.e when there is need of public interest or nation interest, permanent injunction prayer should be granted.

In the USSC, test-1 is not required to grant the Writs.

XVIII. COLLEGIUM¹ SYSTEM OF RECOMMENDING THE JUDGES/JUSTICE APPOINTMENT.

a) Collegium process is used selecting the Indian Supreme Court Justices and States' High²[Apex] Court Judges and Govt of India appoint these Justice/Judges.

This collegium has Chief Justice of India, with four Justices of Supreme Court as members.

Selecting parameters³ are 1) Seniority 2) Merit 3) Integrity 4) diversity such as gender, religion, caste/community/race/ethnicity and marginalized.

In the past, early 1990s one of the senior lawyer of Supreme Court of India, Mr Pushan, criticized that to become Justice of Indian Supreme Court, you should know the law minister than you should know the law which bring the collegium process of selecting the Supreme Court and High Court Justices/Judges.

b) In Washington DC, Judges of Court of Appeals and Trial Court Judges were recommended by Judicial Nomination commission

The District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC) screens all judicial applicants and recommends three nominees. The President of US

¹ Collegium System and Judicial Nomination commission are interchangeable which recommends the set of judges/justice to govt to appoint.

² Article 124(2) [Indian Constitution] states that every judge of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal after consultation with such number of the judges of Supreme Court and of the High Courts (in states)

³ CJI Chandrachud interview with Press Trust of India (PTI)/India Today. Collegium related content at minutes 33 to 47.



<https://youtu.be/Vv-mElxTHA4?si=mlXrKbEvpe7Mhar1>

appoints one of the nominees, and the Senate confirms the appointment.

- c) There are 20 states in United States have Judicial Nominating Commissions/ Assisted Commission which similar or subset of Collegium process for appointing States' Supreme Court Justices.
- d) Circuit level collegium should select the State's trial Judges by inviting nationwide applicant without violating US Citizenship and State govt should appoint these Trial Judges (including Municipal Judges).
- e) Circuit level collegium should select the US District Court Judges by inviting nationwide applicant (without violating US Citizenship) and US govt should appoint these US Dist Court Judges.

XIX.PROMOTION OF CHIEF JUDGES

Any of USCA's chief Judge retire or vacant, most experienced USCA's Judge from all Circuits should be promoted to fill the USCA's chief Judge's vacancy. Same process when Dist Court chief Judge retire or vacant. Always promotion comes with Transfer to other place which bring diversified experience.

XX.PRO SE PLEADING STANDARDS

Erickson v. Pardus, 551 US 89 - Supreme Court 2007 @ 2200

A document filed pro se is "to be liberally construed," Estelle, 429 U.S., at 106, 97 S.Ct. 285, and "a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.

XXI. REASONS FOR GRATING THE WRITS

a) ORDER AGAINST US AND NJ

1) Writ against United States that make amendment to the Constitution that Parental rights are Constitutional rights

Test-2

Plaintiff requested multiple times to govt of United States/Dept. of States to deny that kids' passport(s) and my kids should not go to India because the kids should be injured /endangered /kidnapped /abducted which was denied. When the kid went to India, the kids were seriously injured, endangered in India and their life is threatened. Since Aug 2015 to today I'm separated from my kids illegally. Kids' education, health, well beings, day to day parent-child relationship, cultural relationship, religious relationship and theirs' day to day care need were violated.

Test-3.

It is violation of US. In *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702 (1997), @ 720

"that the Constitution, and specifically the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, protects the fundamental right of parents to direct the care, upbringing, and education of their children".

In *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)

"The United States Supreme Court has recognized the right of parents to be an active and integral part of their children's lives as "perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by [the Supreme] Court."

In *Troxel* @ 65

The Fourteenth Amendment provides that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." We have long recognized

*that the Amendment's Due Process Clause, like its Fifth Amendment counterpart, "guarantees more than fair process." Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U. S. 702, 719 (1997). The Clause also includes a substantive component that "provides heightened protection against government interference with certain fundamental rights and liberty interests." *Id.*, at 720; see also Reno v. Flores, 507 U. S. 292, 301-302 (1993).*

For Any and all reasons stated above, petitioners pray this Court to order the United States to make amendment to US constitution to make amendment for parental rights.

- 2) Order that (i)US Govt/President should not appoint the US Supreme Court Justices and Chief Justice**
- (ii) Thru Collegium process 51⁴ USCA Judges should be appointed to US Supreme Court for 5 years, and they should retire at 70 whichever comes 1st. (iii) Most experienced⁵ USSC's Associated Justice should be promoted to Chief Justice when Chief Justice retire or vacant. (iv) Invalidate the Judge Brown appointment to US Supreme Court.**

Test-2.

When this case (or related case) was at Sub-Judice, President Biden nominated Judge Brown for US Supreme Court because he promised in the election campaign that he should appoint a black women

⁴ India has 34 states so Supreme Court of India has 34 Justices by *The Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Act, amended 2019.* Unites States has 50 states with Washington DC which bring 51 Justices to US Supreme Court.

⁵ Who took the oath first. First in First out.

Justice to US Supreme Court if he win the election.
Now Judge Brown is appointed to Supreme Court.

Racial based promising itself wrong/incorrect where/when Justice System or US Supreme Court needs unbiased decision maker.

If US President should have promised in his election that he should appoint all black women Justices to entire US Supreme Court, no one in the civilized society accept the biased promise where unbiased decision need to be taken.

US President and US govt appointing Judge Brown Jackson to US Supreme Court is violating racial, age, and gender discrimination as in (i) Babb v. Wilkie, 140 S. Ct. 1168 – Sup. Ct 2020 and (ii) Babb v. SECRETARY, DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, 992 F. 3d 1193 - Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit 2021 (iii) Article II Section 3 [he /President shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed]

US Supreme Court (Constitutional guardian) cannot take racial, age and gender based discriminative decision which applicable to US Govt and President (Constitutional leader) when they makes (public) decisions.

When these petitioner(s) were injured in Little Rock, Arkansas, I filed Petition and its reconsideration with US Supreme Court which was denied because not enough resource (Justices) available with US Supreme Court which violation of 1st amendment, petition to Court clauses. Nowhere in the constitution said Justice can be denied(because of not enough Justice)

Also Constitution does not specify/require qualifications for US Supreme Court Justices such as age, Education, profession, or citizenship.

When chief Justice retire or vacant, one of the most experienced (by oath taken) associates Justice

should be promoted to Chief Justice. By this promotion, women should become chief Justice which never happened over 200 years of Independence.

Test-3.

Now Judge Brown is appointed by President Biden's Racial based promising of Election campaign.

Also politician/US govt appointing Justice in the US Supreme Court violated the title vii, age, race, and Gender discrimination, , *Babb v. Wilkie, 140 S. Ct. 1168 - Supreme Court 2020* and

Babb v. SECRETARY, DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, 992 F. 3d 1193 - Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit 2021, equal employment opportunities, *EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW* which was welcome message of US Supreme Court's front of the building.

In session dated Apr 11, 2022 **Comparative Approaches of Supreme Courts of the World's Largest and Oldest Democracies** with Hon. Justice Stephen Breyer of US Supreme Court, Hon. Chief Justice NV Ramana of Indian Supreme Court, and William M Treanor, Dean of Georgetown University Law Centre, Justice Breyer said below:

"Breyer recalled being impressed by a clinic he saw in Ahmedabad, Gujarat on a visit to India more than two decades ago. It offered women the chance to present problems they were experiencing to a panel of three experts: a lawyer, a psychologist and a social worker"

"Those three women who hear the problem will try to figure out how to help them. It might be going to the police, it might not be. It might be bringing a law case, it might not be." Breyer added that he kept a photo of that scene on his office wall for years, and often described the model to visitors"

He [Justice Breyer] really appreciated the system.
In same above session Justice Ramana said that

Collegium process to appoint Judges most democratic.

On judicial appointments, CJI Ramana said that although the government is a key stakeholder, when the collegium reiterates its decision to appoint a candidate, the government has no choice but to comply with it.

'Cannot get more democratic than this [Collegium process].

Supreme Court of India has 34 Justices including CJI. (by The Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Act, amended 2019)

.....

The PIL (Public Interest Litigation) jurisdiction is an innovation of the Indian judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court. It is mainly meant for the marginalised people who cannot approach the Court through advocates to expose their cause. The idea is to promote access to Justice.

US Govt and President that to make Constitutional changes that age, citizenship need to US Supreme Court Justice as the age, citizenship requirement of US president. Educational/Professional qualification requirement should match Admission to the Bar of the Federal Court

Nowhere in the constitution states that this Petitioners Justice could be denied because of not enough Justices in the US Supreme Court.

Any and all reasons stated above, petitioners pray this Court for

i) US Govt should not appoint Chief Justice and Justice to US Supreme Court which need to be thru collegium process and US Supreme Court should invalidate the Hon. Justice Brown's appointment by US President/Govt.

ii) Thru Collegium process, without violating age, race, gender, Babb v. Wilkie, 140 S. Ct. 1168 – Sup. Ct 2020 and Babb v. SECRETARY, DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, 992 F. 3d 1193 - Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit 2021 promote 51 most experience/expertise USCA Judge to US Supreme Court for 5 years, and they should retire at 70 whichever comes 1st. Every subject matter expert should be given equal opportunity to serve the noble jobs/duty.

iii) When Chief Justice of US Supreme Court retire, the most experience associate Justice of US Supreme to be promoted as Chief Justice of US Supreme Court. Recently in the Supreme Court of India, Hon. Chief Justice Uday Lalit served 70 days only and cleared 10,000 dockets. Because of this promotion unavailable, over 200 years no women were Chief Justice of USSC.

iv) Same common Collegium process should be available to promote US Dist Court Judges to US Court of Appeal Judges based on experience/expertise without violating Age, Race, Gender, 140 S. Ct. 1168 and 992 F. 3d 1193. Same common Collegium process should assist appoint US Dist Court Judges.

3) Same Common Collegium process should be available select the [NJ]States' Apex Court Judges by inviting nationwide trial Judges (without violating US Citizenship) and US Govt should these Judges to States' Apex Court.

By Supremacy clause, All the States' democracy [smaller umbrella] is under US democracy, the bigger umbrella, so to have one US level⁶ Collegium should

⁶ Article 124(2) [Indian Constitution] states that every judge of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal after consultation with such number of the judges of Supreme Court and of the High Courts (in states)

select State apex Court Judges and US govt to appoint the selected Judges to State' Apex Court.

This Court should invalidate the Justice Brown Appointment which violated violating Age, Race, Gender, 140 S. Ct. 1168 and 992 F. 3d 1193 and Article II Section 3. This appointment is pure racial discrimination, unlawful, unconstitutional.

3) Order that USCA Judges and NJ's Apex Court Judges should be appointed by US govt thru Collegium process by inviting nationwide applicant(s).

Test-2: Washington DC, Apex Court's Judges were appointed by US Govt thru collegium process. Collegium of appointing Judges is true democracy.

Test-3: Otherwise, when US citizenship is violated, Supremacy clause is violated. The same collegium which select the Supreme Court Justices should select the USCA Judges from US district Court by inviting nationwide (without violating US citizenship) and US Govt should appoint the USCA Judges.

The above collegium should select [NJ] Apex Court Judges by inviting nationwide application of trial Judge (at least, sister states, neighbor states) and US Govt should appoint the State's apex Court Judges. Washington DC apex Court Judges are appointed this way, so no US citizen is injured. This option should be available to every US citizen. The biggest democracy India, this method happening.

4) Order that (i) Circuit level collegium should select the US Dist Court Judges by inviting nationwide application and US Govt should appoint the US Dist Judges and (ii) Circuit level collegium should select the [NJ] States trial Judges (including Municipal Judges) and [NJ] state govt should appoint these trial Judges.

Test2 and Test-3: US citizen reside Washington DC has these option. In the democratic way, Judges were independent decision maker who should not depend the politician. These method remove the corruption in the democracy. Collegium process of appointing Judges were democracy. US citizen of Washington DC has this option.

Inviting application for judicial decision maker beyond the boundary state which avoid US citizenship violation and remove the local politician connection.

b) AGAINST INDIA FOR PARENTAL AND INHERITANCE /PROPERTY RIGHTS

5) Order to Union of India that US citizen kids should not be hold in India, and US citizen Kids need to return to US for their education, vacations, and holidays, parental rights and properly kids Ancestral inheritance property(s)/wealth need to transfer to the kids in USA

Test-2.

Union of India have habit of holding US citizen kids India for the reasons that Kids admitted in Indian school or going to school in India.

Petitioner requested Indian consulate/embassy that do not issue visa/travel document to kids to go India because of injury, endangerment of children in India, endangerment of abduction of children, which was denied. When the kids went to India, they were

endangered and injured in India. No medical attentions were given to kids injuries/endangered.

Petitioners' father in law, brother in law tried to abduction my children for the purpose of refusing/deny to provide in heritance to the children, to do corruption against Govt of India by abducting to India.

The same reasons, as my relatives, multiple times, India also hold the US citizen children in India, refused to return the children back to US. Also deny the US Court orders to return the US citizen kids to USA.

In India, by law, children inherit the parents/fore-parents inheritance (Heir) automatically, without will.

Test-3

India and my relatives (in India)'s wrong doings violates 42 USC § 1982 and Hindu Succession Act, 1956 and its amended (2005), parental rights as in 14th amendment, *Glucksberg, Troxel*,

In *Sullivan v. Little Hunting Park, Inc.*, 396 US 229 Sup.Ct 1969 @237

"Section 1982 [42 U.S.C § 1982] covers the right "to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property."

For any and all reasons stated above, petitioners prays this Court for their prayer to be granted.

c) AGAINST NEW JERSEY

6) Petitioner pray that this Court should strike down New Jersey (NJ)'s Constitution and NJ Supreme Court.

Test-2: New Jersey is state and not a nation or country to have constitution. US citizen reside Washington DC does not have local constitution. US constitution gives enough constitutional protections/ rights the US Citizen who are Washington DC residents or any US citizen who reside in any US's states.

NJ Supreme Court is not needed when the federal Courts have 3-tier Courts under US Supreme Court.

Test-3: Local States having local constitution give opportunities to get separated from United States.

See. YesCalifornia.org. Yes California National Divorce starts in California. **CALEXIT 3.1.** These separation is supported by Russian Govt.

For specific local need, Local govt has right to create a Local law so the Local constitution is unwanted.

In India, only one state, Jammu Kashmir had local constitution and always wanted to get separated from India. Recently Govt India and Indian Supreme Court removed the Special status to Jammu-Kashmir state.

US Citizen in Washington DC has 2-tier Courts under US Supreme Court so quickly access the US Supreme Court to get Justice which should be available to any US citizen who reside in any US states.

Now NJ State's Supreme Court review Certiorari as well US constitutional rights and further petitioner to file a Certiorari with US Supreme Court. These methods delay the Justice which against US Constitutional rights/protection. This petitioner's many constitution rights including 14th amendment parents' rights violated and delayed over 8 years now by NJ Supreme Court. NJ Supreme Court denied the Certiorari review with judicial defect of its own and delayed the Justice. Without need of NJ Supreme Court, petitioner should have reached the US Supreme Court very quick as US citizen reside in Washington DC.

Due to NJ govt appointment and some NJ SC Judges violated Petitioners' constitutional rights, either they should be removed or invalidated.

Above stated reason(s). This Court completely strike down and close NJ Supreme Court and Strike

down NJ's local Constitution. **N.B:** States, in India, does not have State's Supreme Court.

**7) Order that (i) Moving New Jersey Municipal Judges into New Jersey Judiciary payroll and (ii) NJ's Municipal Mayor should not appoint any Municipal Judges and NJ Govt should not Appoint any NJ's Judges including Municipal Judges
(iii) Deposit traffic violations fine in New Jersey treasury. (iv) Remove the Petitioners traffic ticket to US District Court
(v) By parties request Jury should be available in any trial Court including traffic ticket hearing/municipal hearing.**

Test-2

NJ Municipal Judges are appointed by Municipal Mayor who are relative/friend to Mayors for the purpose of generating revenue for municipality by Municipal Judges who were writing traffic ticket orders.

By the revenue generated by Municipal Judges, they were paid by Municipal govt.

For the benefit of Municipal Mayor, municipal police is ordered to write more tickets to generate more money for the personal gain/benefit of Municipal Mayor and Municipal Judges.

See Fenton, LA generate 92% of revenue thru traffic ticket and Mayor himself municipal Judge, which violate US Supreme Court ruling.



1https://www.fox8live.com/2023/11/16/this-louisiana-town-runs-largely-traffic-fines-if-you-fight-your-ticket-mayor-is-your-judge/



US Citizens /Petitioner is entitled to file claim/ counter claim against the false charges of Municipal govt which is constitutional rights. Also these matter need to be heard by Jury which is constitutional rights.

NJ Municipal Court charges, additional appearance fees when any citizen/this petitioner contest the false traffic ticket.

Test-3

Municipal Judges are appointed by NJ Municipal Mayor when parties entitled to hear by democratically appointed Judges.

Judge should be disinterested person of money from the order he signs which is failing in the Municipal Court function, municipal Judges appointment by Mayor from theirs' list of friends/relatives, Municipal Judges sign order to generate money and Judges paid from the money generated.

Municipal Judges were encouraged by Municipality and its mayor to Write traffic ticket orders to generate revenue. So the Mayor and municipal Judges were beneficiary of the money generated.

Citizens, Residents were biased, prejudiced/injured, constitutional rights were violated, by the municipal Judges appointed by Municipal

Mayor and by Municipal Writing orders to the benefit of Municipal Mayor and Municipal Judges (together).

Citizens/Petitioner is entitled to file claim/counter claim against the false charges and those claims should be heard/tried together which is constitutional rights. so these Woodbridge traffic ticket docket to be moved to Dist Court.

NJ Municipality also charges, additional appearance fee when any citizen contest the traffic ticket which violate the fair Justice, petition to Court clause of 1st amendment, due process guaranteed in the constitution.

The hidden truth is that NJ governor to get the political/election support from the Municipal mayor, NJ govt allow the Municipal govt to charge the traffic ticket, Municipal mayor is benefited and so the Mayor support the NJ governor in Election.

To this petitioner or any citizen the municipal Court issued arrest warrant for the false charge without jury hearing. Municipal Court dispute, claims, counter claims should heard by Jury which is constitutional rights. In this case, the Municipal govt issue arrest warrant without jury trial for Municipal wrong doing against the petitioner is violation of constitutional rights.

For any and all reason stated above the petition pray this Court

i) Move all the NJ municipal Judges to NJ judiciary payroll and deposit all the traffic violation fines in NJ treasury.

ii) Municipal Govt should not appoint Municipal Judges and NJ govt should not appoint the trial Judges including Municipal Judges thru collegium process without violating US citizenship.

iii) Jury should be available in all NJ trial Courts including Municipal Court on demand of

parties and without Jury hearing local Court should not issue arrest warrant.

iv) Remove the Woodbridge charges against the petitioner to US Dist Court. (All claims against all parties need to put together and heard)

v) Municipal Court should not charge appearance fee

vi) vehicle should not be towed without due process. Taking car or driving license out of citizen cause livelihood problem. See

Bell v. Burson, 402 US 535 - Supreme Court 1971
 @539 Once licenses are issued, as in petitioner's case, their continued possession may become essential in the pursuit of a livelihood. Jan 14, 15 2024, petitioner walked to USPS to send the Brief to US Supreme Court, spine injury pain, back pain elevated.

vii) Order that Woodbridge twp should bring the car to 1326 W William St, Philadelphia, PA 19132. Car out of Petitioner by illegal, predatory towing. Petitioner has no income to tow the car now.

8) NJ and it's local Govt should not tow/taken away the home less's or less fortunate, marginalised people's property(s).

Test-2

When petitioner is homeless, NJ dmv/mvc refused to register my vehicle because car registration has stop order which is not petitioner's fault and Woodbridge taken away without notifying petitioner and without jury hearing. Woodbridge charging \$1445 for towing. When petitioner requested the Woodbridge to provide the itemized billing/invoice for \$1445 for towing which was denied.

In fact petitioner called and waited for local tow service which ready to tow for \$45. The same matter was posted on car's window and windshield.

Test-3 Local govt taking away petitioner sleeping property/mobile home violate the due process and jury trial, excessive fine instead of local govt to help the less fortunate poor.

Petitioner suffered from sleeping on the roadside, covid attached, **finger is disfigured** because the local govt taking away my property. Still the lungs are not cleared which situs inversus totalis ill formed lungs.

The NJ municipal including Woodbridge twp have towing contract with The towing companies who are relative/friend /sponsored the election expense to the Township mayor. To share the predatory towing money between towing agency and Mayor, these predatory towing is happening. See. The local Govt towing fee is \$1445 and local private towing fee is \$45.

Local Govt towing the car or take away property is violating **Due process**, when the car is waiting for local tow man to tow for \$45.

Petitioner/ hominess's car is sleeping place which is equal to MOBILE home property. Without jury hearing the Woodbridge taken away the petitioner's property.

For any and all reasons stated, petitioners pray this Court for their above prayer to be granted.

**9) Order that Strike down N.J.S.A. 39:6B-2 :
NO LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE ON
MOTOR VEHICLE**

Test-2: N.J.S.A. 39:6B-2 provides that any owner or registrant of a motor vehicle required to carry insurance under 39:6B-1 who operates or causes to be operated a motor vehicle upon any public road or highway in the State without such insurance is in violation of the statute. It also provides that any driver who operates a motor vehicle who knows or should

know from the circumstances that it is uninsured is in violation.

NJ MVC penalties

A first time violation of NJSA 39:6B-2 – Driving Without Liability Insurance includes a fine between \$300 and \$1,000.00, community service, DMV surcharges of \$250 for three years, and a mandatory license suspension of one year. There are also Court costs and fees that are required to be paid in addition to the penalties listed above.

A second offense carries with it a fine of up to \$5000.00, a mandatory jail sentence of 14 days, 30 days community service, and a license suspension for two years. The license is not automatically returned after that date and the violator must make application to the Director of the Division of Motor Vehicles for reinstatement.

Test-3: Elected democratic Local govt cannot force/compel the petitioner or any US citizen to sign car insurance contract and charge penalty when petitioner unable to sign insurance contract with capitalist owned Private insurance companies. When the petitioner's job(only source of income) is outsourced by capitalist, local govt did not take any effort to stop outsource or bring back the job. Twice Petitioner injured in car accident and still suffering, claims were denied for the benefit of local Judge fraud trial, local politician, and capitalist insurance companies. See Nat. Fedn. of Indep. Business v. Sebelius, 567 US 519 - Supreme Court 2012@ 2573-2574

(The most straightforward reading of the individual mandate is that it commands individuals to purchase insurance. But, for the reasons explained, the Commerce Clause does not give Congress that power).

The shared responsibility or shared liability is attached to Gas tax. The more drive, more gas

consumed who should contributed/ share more responsibility/more liability. Mobile parked in one place for 4 months, no need to share liability. Shared responsibility/liability should be thru Gas consumed, otherwise Private insurance, local elected govt official, local municipal/trial Judges connected to be in corruption circle.

**10) Order to i) NJ that NJ should
standardized the NJ's Municipal Mayors and
councilmen's salary.**

Test-2: NJ municipal Mayor and Councilmen raise their salary themselves which violation of 27th amendment.

Test-3: NJ Assembly men/women salary is standard thru entire NJ. This year alone Jersey City mayor increased his salary \$50k. It is corrupt practices and violation of 27th amendment of US Constitution and injury to US citizen who locally reside.

d) AGAINST UNITED STATES FOR MARRIAGE LAW

**11) Order that United States should enact
United States Universal family Law**

Test-2: When Entire United States, The family and relationship between family numbers, Every State have different family law. India, biggest democracy of the world has family act/marriage act through India when every state has different demography/diversity. Based on marriage law, family properties are attached to inheritance.

Test-3: Child Support Recovery Act (CSRA) , CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT-18 U.S.C. § 228 ,Federal Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UFISA) , Respect for Marriage Act is there for unconventionally married people. Because majority people married in traditional way the United States

should not ignore the traditional marriage of US citizen. We are US citizen and family belong to the United State. Parental rights are under 14th amend of Constitution by , Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000) and Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U. S. 702, 720. The States in United States have different family law to do the different level of corruption. My son PP, born from Little Rock, Arkansas where family law available and my daughter born from Edison, NJ where no family law. Which states family law applicable and why should choose? Why the petitioner is not able to choose? Family relationship is not shopping between states. Respect for Marriage Act has protection under Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Without family law, NJ killed my children childhood over 8 years.

12) Order to United States to Abolish the Electoral College process of selecting President of the United States and the President and Vice-President of United States should be elected by House of Representatives.

Test-2: Electoral College process of selecting President and Vice President of the United States is not true democratic way.

Test-3: House of Representative were democratically elected by US Citizen. House of Representative were truly democratic representative of US Citizen who, individually, should elect/select the President and Vice President of US.

The Electoral College process, (Winner-take-all) of selecting president /vice president is equal to elected by State's governor.

This slavery time practice which is not abolished after slavery abolished.

The Electoral College framed from Slavery time and slave owner(s). Electoral College causing gerrymandering dispute which comes to USSC very often.

The winner-take-all manner of allocating a state's electors generally decreases the importance of minor parties which is not true democracy.

See **The Two-Party Duopoly, Seventeen ways America is less Democratic.**



Figure 2
<https://secondratedemocracy.com/the-two-party-duopoly/>

President Bill Clinton⁷ and President Donald Trump⁸ did not like Electoral College process.

Petitioner pray this Court to abolish the Electoral College of Electing the President/Vice President of United States and House of Representative should select the President and Vice President of United States.

⁷ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/videos/2023-09-27/president-bill-clinton-supports-abolishing-the-electoral-college>

⁸ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2016/live-updates/general-election/real-time-updates-on-the-2016-election-voting-and-race-results/trump-in-2012-the-electoral-college-is-a-disaster-for-a-democracy/>

e) WRIT AGAINST UNITED STATES FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE REGARDING WOMEN GENDER VIOLATION IN ARTICLE II OF CONSTITUTION.

13) Order to United States for the changes in Article II of US Constitution⁹, states with word “He” to “He/She”

Test-2. The following in the Article II of US Constitution¹⁰, states with word “He” that only man can be the US president.

Article II, Section 1, Clause 1:

The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows

Article II, Section 1, Clause 7:

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Article II, Section 1, Clause 8:

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, Section 2, Clause 1:

⁹ CONSTITUTION ANNOTATED - Analysis and Interpretation of the US Constitution <https://constitution.congress.gov/>

¹⁰ CONSTITUTION ANNOTATED - Analysis and Interpretation of the US Constitution <https://constitution.congress.gov/>

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2:

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

Article II, Section 3:

He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall Judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Test-3

Because of above in the US constitution,

- 1) Over the 200 years of history, Women never been president of United President.
- 2) The above violates the women rights in 14th amendment.

The US constitution was written at the time of Written in 1787, ratified in 1788, and in operation since 1789¹¹ which is the time of Slavery was active until 1865¹². The US Constitution was written by Slave owner(s) who were men.

“Of the 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention, about 25¹³ owned slaves. Many of the framers harbored moral qualms about slavery. Some, including Benjamin Franklin (a former slaveholder) and Alexander Hamilton (who was born in a slave colony in the British West Indies) became members of anti-slavery societies”



<https://www.crf-usa.org/black-history-month/the-constitution-and-slavery>

- 3) After abolishing the slavery in 1865, or after 14th amend the US constitution was not revisited to

¹¹ <https://www.senate.gov/about/origins-foundations/senate-and-constitution/constitution.htm>

¹² 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Abolition of Slavery (1865)
<https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/13th-amendment#:~:text=Passed%20by%20Congress%20on%20January,slavery%20in%20the%20United%20States.>

¹³ <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-resources/teaching-resource/historical-context-constitution-and-slavery#:~:text=Of%20the%2055%20delegates%20to,members%20of%20anti%20slavery%20societies.>

enforce the women right to be President of United States.

- 4) Nikki Haley is a candidate in the 2024 Republican Party presidential primaries for president of the United States in the 2024 U.S. presidential election. She announced her campaign in February 2023
- 5) Marianne Williamson, is a candidate in the 2024 Republican Party presidential primaries for president of the United States in the 2024 U.S. presidential election
- 6) My daughter Roshna, Minor want to focus to become President of United States.
Any and all reasons stated above, Plaintiff /petitioner prays this Court for order/ Writ to United State to change the Constitution as above needed.

14) Order the each appeared defendant to pay \$15 million for the Petitioners' effort, pain and suffering, expenses, litigation cost or pain and suffering by litigation.

Test-2. Because of this case, two winters, without petitioner with car to survive and the litigation is going on, extended by the obstruction of Justice by the defendant(s). Lot of effort to draft the pleading. Lot of painful effort to draft with spine injuries. Because I dedicated time to draft the pleading I was not able to physical activity to bring down the blood sugar went up. Now both leg, foot are numbing. Im afraid kidney should be permanent damage. Due to Situs inversus the born defect, adapting body parts is not possible either.

Test-3. The defendant hired someone to attempted murder the Petitioner. The attack to the Petitioner was deadly, injured the spine. With the pain

in the spine, Petitioner drafted all pleading. Pray USSC to order them \$15 million dollar each defendant should pay for the time and effort, pain and suffering. In the painful situation, appointing attorney also denied. Or this prayer should be paid in pain and suffering. When I tried to find attorney and unable to find since Im poor and not able to pay down payment to the attorney. Lower Court denied pro bono attorney as well. Also I have claim against the NJ Supreme Court violation of freedom of information act.

Boydjian v. Cigna Companies, 973 F. Supp. 500
- Dist. Court, D. New Jersey 1997@504

Although plaintiff may not recover attorneys' fees, he may recover litigation costs reasonably incurred. See Cunningham, 664 F.2d at 387 n. 4; Carter, 780 F.2d at 1482; DeBold, 735 at 1043 (citing Crooker v. United States Dep't of Justice, 632 F.2d 916, 921 (1st Cir.1980)) ("[A] pro se litigant who substantially prevailed certainly is entitled to 'litigation costs reasonably incurred' A pro se litigant is made whole thereby, serving as a small incentive to pursue litigation if no attorney may be found to represent the litigant.")

The First Circuit has reached the opposite conclusion in Crooker v. Department of Justice, supra, holding that "in actions where the complainant represents himself, sometimes as a hindrance instead of an aid to the judicial process, an award of fees does nothing more than subsidize the litigant for his own time and personal effort.

15) Order that Elected official of United States (President, vice president, senators, House representatives) and their immediate family members should not buy or owe stocks/shares in Federal Contractors (including defense contractors)

Test:-2 : Elected official of United States (President, vice president, senators, House representatives) and their immediate family members buy or owe stocks/shares in Federal Contractors (including defense contractors).

Test:3 Elected official of United States and their immediate family members buy/owe stock/share in Federal Contractors (including defense contractors) which allow them benefit financial gain which violated the 27th amendment of Constitution. Any of the USSC's Justice hold share in any corporate, they recuse when that corporate's dispute is heard.

The Due Process clauses of the United States Constitution require Judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations: Where the Judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome.

The above same applicable to elected official as well.

Politician Nancy Pelosi buy stock/share from Microsoft and in days US govt gave \$22 billion dollars contract to Microsoft which raise the Microsoft's stock 11%.



<https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/pelosi-husband-bought-microsoft-shares-options>

The above Pelosi's action violates the 27th amended. There are 2000 other stocks were available to invest for Pelosi(s).

f) AGAINST WOODBRIDGE

16) Order the respondent Woodbridge Township should pay 295/day for TAKEN AAWAY Porsche cayenne to the plaintiff.

Test-2.

Petitioner's home evicted and unable to secure/lease a apartment yet due to disability and unemployment, suffering from financial hardship. In this hardship situation, cayenne is sleeping place for the petitioner.

When the petitioner was waiting for local towing man to tow the car for \$45, respondents Woodbridge towed the car/sleeping property by violating due process and deceptive business practice and predatory towing. These illegal towing, Woodbridge charging \$1445. When the petitioner asked Woodbridge to provide itemized invoice for \$1445, which was denied because of deceptive, predatory towing. Woodbridge profiled that Porsche owner should be ready to pay \$1445 for towing when Woodbridge should illegally harasses petitioner.

Test-3.

Without car, so many days Petitioner slept on the road side bench which was seen by Woodbridge police. In the Summer time, so many days the temperature was over 90. When car not available to petitioner Corona attached disfigured the finger. From Corona, till today the lungs are not clear. Situs inversus lungs.

Porsche cayenne rental cost \$295/day from Porsche USA. See below.



Imagine a situation to anyone whose car is stopped middle of the way to home, picking taxi to home, and continues use the taxi for every day to day need. See

petitioner situation when he is poor, unable to hire taxi either. Walked day after day, month after months, now more than year which 450 days.

For printing paper for the petition to US Supreme Court, I walked 6 miles on way to Walmart to buy printing paper and on the way back I need to walk on rain and cross the highway. Someone with mercy stopped the car at middle of the highway for me to help crossing the highway while rain. Otherwise deadly killing situation should happened. Im diabetic, and situs inversus totalis. Being home evicted, homeless, this car is sleeping place/property. Anyone imagine the situation of sleeping on the road side bench when the temperature is over 90 degrees and corona attacked situation.

When One day without car is unacceptable suffering to anyone, day by day suffering's magnitudes is higher after higher. Jan 14,15 2024 petitioner walked with brief to USPS for a mile, spine injury pain elevated.

The petitioner car is towed by the towing agency is relative/friend to the Mayor so they local govt do the predatory towing for the personal gain of the mayor and towing agency

Petitioner pray this Court order the Woodbridge to pay \$295/per day. When the case end, parties will calculate the no of days. If anyone say to Bill Gates that they will be paid \$295 and walk to home and they will not accept these amount because \$295 is not worth living without Porsche. So this Court should grant this prayer.

And remand the case back to lower Court.

XXII. CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs/Petitioner(s) Palani Karupaiyan pray(s) the US Supreme Court for the Petition for Writ(s) of Mandamus, Prohibition or alternative should be granted.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: Jan 16 2024.

Palani Karupaiyan, Pro se, Petitioner
1326 W William St,
Philadelphia, PA 19132
212-470-2048(m)
palanikay@gmail.com

*P. Karupaiyan
Jan 23, 2024*