No. 23-126

Supreme Court of the United States

JOE BLESSETT, PETITIONER

v.

GREG ABBOTT; KEN PAXTON; STEVEN C MCCRAW; XAVIER BECERRA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; ANTONY BLINKIN; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE; CITY OF GALVESTON; SINKIN LAW FIRM, *RESPONDENTS*

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOE BLESSETT / Pro Se
7970 Fredericksburg Rd. STE. 101-708
San Antonio, Texas, 78229
Tel.: 281-667-1174

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Joe Blessett disagrees with the U.S. 5th Appellate Circuit Court's decision to affirm the District Court Judgment. Is there a distinction between the Public and Private in applying a federal government-funded Public Service, Title IV of the Social Security Act (Act), and Private Family Law terms? Was there Suppression of protected rights and federal statutes under the color of law that injured Blessett? Are Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Xavier Becerra following U.S. Congressional legislation of the Act as the U.S. Congress intended?

1. Are rights being denied because of the lower court's erroneous view of Public and Private law?
2. Are Blessett's 5th, 10th, and 14th Amendment rights being denied because of the suppression of unopposed evidence?
3. Are Federal penalties for the Act enforced without evidence of due process under 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H)?
4. Why can't Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw come under federal jurisdiction for knowing the continued color of law injury endured by Blessett because of enforcement of Title IV-D penalties without legal standing?
5. Why was Blessett denied using Ex parte Young against state officials under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for federal jurisdiction to challenge state officials for "failure to act" to prevent continued injuries?

6. Why was Contract Clause protection from state intrusion denied for Blessett's unopposed Private agreement with Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw?
7. Why were the Federal Rules of Evidence Rules 301 for Blessett's private agreement with "Notices, Notices of Acceptance, and Certificates of Nonresponse" to Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw denied?
8. Why did the lower courts not follow the U.S. Congress requirements for Xavier Becerra, Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw to provide documentation required under 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) for due process in the 2015 default judgments for the Act?
9. Did U.S. Congress stop requiring proof available of reimbursement of Title IV-A funds under the statutory provisions of the Act?
10. Why did the lower courts ignore the relevant 2017 state court order assigning the outstanding support debt to a private entity and voiding the 2015 state court order under the operation of law transferring the outstanding support debt balance held by the public agency to a private firm?
11. Under what legal logic does a state court order made void or null under the operation of law fall under the Rooker Feldman Doctrine?
12. Did U.S. Constitution and the U.S. Congress intend for Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw to be able to show evidence of procedural

due process to enforce Title IV-D federal public services penalties?

13. Did U.S. Congress spending clauses intend for Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw to be able to show evidence of due process with documentary evidence of judicial orders for collection and enforcement under the Act?
14. Did U.S. Congress intend for Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw to be able to show evidence of an administrative hearing before the enforcement of penalties under the Act?
15. When did noncustodial parents lose their right to decline federal public service under the Act?
16. When did noncustodial parents lose their right to challenge federal agencies under the "Commerce Clause" in federal jurisdiction for the documentary evidence to enforce federal penalties (Federal Tax Offset)under the Act?
17. When did noncustodial parents lose their right to challenge the federal fiduciary actions in applying the Act and a private law firm?
18. Why did the lower courts ignore the difference between "public child support debt" under the public terms of a federal program versus "private child support debt" under private terms?
19. Why did the lower federal courts reject the due process evidence requirements for the U.S. Health and Human Services debt certification compliance under the Act?

20. Why did the lower federal courts reject the Act's spending clause provisions set by U.S. Congress to protect the United States' interest?
21. Did the lower federal courts reject the Act's spending clause provisions set by U.S. Congress to protect the United States' interest?
22. Were the federal laws of the Act followed by state and federal officials as intended by U.S. Congress?
23. When did Petitioner lose the equal right to Federal Rule Civil Rules 1 to use Rule 11(a) as a legal reason to default judgment on Sinkin Law Firm?
24. When did Petitioner lose the equal right to an administrative hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act for grievances with a 5 U.S. Code § l01 executive branch agency U.S. Health and Human Services and its officer Xavier Becerra under 5 U.S.C. § 702?
25. When did Petitioner lose the equal right to declaratory relief, with injunctive relief, as a legal judgment with relevant rights and obligations under the Declaratory Judgement Act. 28 U.S.C. §2201 in a civil action with no Legal Remedy or Adequate Remedy at Law?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONER: JOE BLESSETT, PRO SE

RESPONDENTS: GREG ABBOTT; KEN PAXTON; STEVEN C MCCRAW; XAVIER BECERRA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; ANTONY BLINKIN; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE; CITY OF GALVESTON; SINKIN LAW FIRM,

COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR THE RESPONDENTS:

1. **Counsel for Xavier Becerra and U.S. Health and Human Services:**

   Myra Farah Siddiqui

2. **Counsel for Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven C McCraw:**

   Johnathan Stone, Halle Elizabeth Daniels

3. **Counsel for the City of Galveston:**

   Trevor P. Fanning

4. **Counsel for Steven Sinkin - Sinkin Law Firm:**

   Stett M Jacoby

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented II

Parties to the proceedings VI

Table of Content VII

Table of Authorities VIII

Citations of Opinions 1

Jurisdiction 1

Constitutional provisions 2

Statutory provisions 2

Statement 3

The Constitutional issue in the civil action is the lack of publicly recorded documentation required by Congressional legislation for Title IV-D public child support services enforced on Blessett.

Reasons for granting the petition 16

1. For the Courts to claim U.S Congressional legislative standing to refute Blessett's claims in an Article 1 Section 8 Clause 9 court, there must be a public record of documentary evidence,

Abbott, Paxton, & McCraw 19

Xavier Becerra, Health and Human Service 27

Sinkin Law Firm 29

Undisputed Recorded Facts 30

Conclusion 35

APPENDIX

Appendix A – Court Of Appeals Opinion

(May 16, 2023) 2

Appendix B – U.S. District Southern District of TX Original Complaint (May 17, 2022) 7

Appendix C- Private Administrative Process for Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, and Steven McCraw.....19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Alderman v. US, 562 US 1163 - Supreme Court 2011.....22

Anniston Mg. Co. v. Davis, 301 US 337 - Supreme Court 1937 25

Barrera—Montenegro v. United States, 74 F.3d 657, 659 (5th Cir. 1996) 26

Marbury v. Madison 23, 25

Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sa4. Ass'n, 874 F.2d 274, 276 (5th Cir. 1989) 14, 29, 33

United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364 (1948) 22

Voluntary Purchasing Groups, Inc. v. Reilly, 889 F.2d 1380, 1384 (5th Cir. 1989) 26

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:

5th Amendment 5,22, 29

10th Amendment 5, 27
13th Amendment 26
14th Amendment 5. 22, 29

STATUTES:

5 U.S. Code § l01 IV
5 U.S.C. §§ 702 and 704 28
18 U.S.C. § 371 35
18 U.S.C. § 286 35
28 U.S.C. § 1254 1
28 U.S.C. § 2111 35
28 U.S.C. §2201 10
42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III) 16, 24, 33
42 U.S.C. 609 13
42 U.S.C. § 654(12) 15, 19, 20
42 U.S.C. § 652 .....16, 24
42 U.S.C. § 652(d)(2)(B). 24
42 U.S.C. § 652(k) 27
42 U.S.C. §654(16) 15, 23, 24
42 U.S.C. § 654(24) 15, 23
42 U.S.C. § 664 7
42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) 7, 13, 17, 18, 33
42 U.S.C. § 1983 .....7, 15, 21, 26, 31, 32, 33

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner JOE BLESSETT requests the issuance of a WRIT OF CERTIORARI to review the judgment of the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. District Court Southern District of Texas.

Opinions Below

The Opinion of the Courts

JOE BLESSETT vs. TEXAS, et al., USDC No. 3:22-cv-9, May 17, 2022

Joe Blessett vs. Greg Abbott; Ken Paxton; Steven C. McCraw; Xavier Becerra; United States Department of Health and Human Services; Anthony Blinkin; United States Department of State; United States; City of Galveston; Sinkin Law Firm, No. 22-40378 U.S. 5th Cir. Court May, 16,2023

JURISDICTION

The U.S. 5th Circuit Court Of Appeals Judgment was entered on May 16, 2023. This Court jurisdiction on 28 U.S.C. 1254 presentation of facts and law relating to the questions of constitutionality to review a case judgment rendered in the Court of Appeals and the federal district courts.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

5th Amendment 10th Amendment

13th Amendment 14th Amendment

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

5 U.S. Code § l01

5 U.S.C. §§ 702 and 704

18 U.S.C. § 371

18 U.S.C. § 286

28 U.S.C. § 1254

28 U.S.C. § 2111

28 U.S.C. §2201

42 U.S.C 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III)

42 U.S.C. 609

42 U.S.C. § 654(12)

42 U.S.C. § 652

42 U.S.C. § 652(d)(2)(B).

42 U.S.C. § 652(k)

42 U.S.C. §654(16)

42 U.S.C. § 654(24)

42 U.S.C. § 664

42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H)

42 U.S.C. § 1983

Administrative Procedure Act

Title IV of the Social Security Act

STATEMENT

The Constitutional issue in the civil action is the lack of publicly recorded documentation required by Congressional legislation for Title IV-D public child support services enforced on Blessett to support the preservation of due process rights. The Court rejected the evidence provided by the Spending Clause provisions of the Act to receive funding and evidence provided under the private agreement. It rejected the present and relevant state court order in 2017 with the child support debt assigned to a private entity. No respondent has produced documentation of Blessett's acceptance of Title IV public child support public debt services. The Courts answered for the defendants in these equity matters without proof of equity. Extracting equity from Blessett under a federal program or private entity without warranty of equity is unlawful extraction of liberty, freedom, and property. It was up to the defending counsel to present the claims to the clients to submit an admission or denial under Rule 8(b) for equity and service claims enforced under the color of law, not the courts. The defendant did not admit or deny the claims. The request for a motion under Rule 12 was without merit. Only make sense if the Courts don't accept the 2017 reassignment of the debt, the omission of Blessett's Notices, Notices of Acceptance, and private contract

with Abbott Paxton, and McCraw or deny Sinkin Law Firm had a fiduciary responsibility in the transfer of Blessett's assets to secure a private child support debt. Are the people forced to accept noncompliance with federal statutes of the Act by the state agency agents that receive federal government funding, and is it okay to discard the Constitution in applying the Act? It is a federal question for federal government bodies.

Title IV-D of the Social Security Act is a federal public service for child support debt collection with federal penalties governing the application of those services and spending clause protections for the United States interest. Private agreements govern private relationships such as child-rearing, marriage, and divorce. In this civil action, the Court refuses to separate public matters governed by federal law, private matters governed by private agreements, and state Family Law. Without the noncustodial parent's voluntary consent with evidence of full disclosure to receive federal public services, the services and benefits are enforced under the color of law, and the Congressional program is not staying within the law of the land. Establishing a public service agreement for the Act with the states and federal agreement under Cooperative Federalism to share power does not give the governments the right to intrude on private agreement rights and force federal public services on private individuals. That is what has occurred in this civil action. Government public services are being forced on Blessett without his consent to receive those

services[1]. The inclusion of federal benefits and services governed by federal law with private state Family Domestic Relationships changes the private relationship to a public relationship with public liabilities and responsibilities under federal law. The two opposing objects (the legal aspect of public and private) in law cannot occupy the same space and remain Constitutionally viable without consent.

. All the documentary evidence and the evidence provided by the federal statutes of the Act presented for reviewing indicate high levels of incompetence at the federal and state level in applying the federal program or the forcing of two legal aspects fighting for the same space for intentional denial of noncustodial parents of U.S. Constitutional protected rights or to defraud[2] the United States. Yet, the lower Court has treated Blessett's private Family Law debt as a federal government Title IV services public law debt under federal administrative provisions without evidence of equitable balance. Where is the proof of the 5th, 10th, and 14th Amendment protections for Blessett before receiving federal public service penalties? The lower courts and the respondent's use of Child Support incorrectly assume that public [government] administrative debt services and private debt

---

[1] See Appellant Reply Brief, federal statute 42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III), Grants to States

[2] The protection of the United States interest under Title IV of the Social Security Act is the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Service responsibility.

agreements are the same. As a result, the lower federal courts erroneously sided with Family Law's practitioners and enforcers' erroneous use of Title IV of the Social Security Act to infringe on Blessett's rights to justice. But God bless Brett Favre for giving the people evidence of the corruption in the Title IV southern district of the United States. It is proof of the willful misappropriation of federal funds used as state slush funds instead of the intended purpose for needy families. Without evidence of Title IV-D Child Support debt services for enforcement, the state agencies cannot charge the federal government for enforcement of the public services and maintain received federal grant fund levels. It is a pecuniary incentive to increase noncustodial parents receiving public services. The Brett Favre incident helps prove the point of state agencies operating as businesses that grow their customer base to increase the variety of services they provide for the wealthy. With this level of corruption, a judicial review of the Dept. of Health and Human Services is overdue.

The Lower court and the government Respondents used Rooker Feldman without indicating how Blessett is asking the Court to reject the relevant 2017 state court judicial order assigning the equity rights to a private entity. Both opinions are too vague and inconclusive to dismiss with prejudice and threaten sanctions to impede Blessett's court access. The Lower court and the government Respondents want to claim immunity without dismantling the evidence that

created presumptions denying their immunity. There is no proof of a valid Title IV Child Support debt for enforcement against Blessett for the state to receive federal administrative reimbursement for public services provided and maintain the federal grant disbursement level. There is proof that Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw could not prove legitimate standing to enforce penalties or certify a debt under the Act. The lower courts miss the point, which is the distinction between public child support debt services under Title IV enforcement and private child support debt assigned to a private entity to collect. It is not a minor error of law in distinguishing between public and private law or debt.

The state agencies are incentivized to create public child support debt under the federal program. It is why U.S. Congress required Secretary to enforce the federal program documentation to prove the due process for default orders under 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) and to protect the United States monetary interest. (Fraud protection for the government against the contracted agencies. Which is a criminal case for the United States to pursue.) Where are these documents to refute Blessett 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims? How do federal notes from Blessett flow from Texas to Washington D.C. for Federal Tax Offset[3] under federal statute 42 U.S.C. § 664 without "Congresses power to lay and collect taxes for the Act under the

[3] Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

Commerce Clause and the Act's Spending Clause" protection? It is interstate commerce the noncustodial parents are engaged in under the Act. That information alone gives noncustodial parents Constitutional rights to challenge federal agencies' enforcement of federal penalties directly. Where are the documents to protect the United States monetary interest from illegal local subdivision reimbursements for services rendered under the Act? Why is the science of law for public law and private law disregarded in Family Law in this civil action? Family Law is private law, and Title IV for child support is public law to provide federal program services. There are no harmless errors when it comes to preserving U.S. Constitution. It is time to stop government abuses in Private Family Law.

Civil and Criminal law requires evidence of hearing or agreed settlement to identify the truth, preserve faith in the Rules of Law, and preserve the U.S. Constitution. To do equity, you must show equity. Equity requires agreed terms and documented evidence of transactions to determine the validity for the protection, faith, and preservation of protected uniform commerce. Blessett's complaint and evidence show the government Respondents failed to preserve the confidence entrusted to government servants. The Respondents did not submit any Title IV documentary evidence to show their interest in honoring their obligation to the Rules of Law, Uniform Commerce, and the Constitution. Blessett only wished to enjoy the

2017 state court orders assigning the debt to a private entity Sinkin Law Firm and has repeatedly asked to enjoy his 1999 Final Divorce Decree orders. There is no conclusive evidence in Blessett's complaint that points to the rejection of the 2017 state court orders. Nor is there definitive wording in the law regarding how Blessett's complaint can reject a null or voided judgment.

Blessett entered the civil action against Abbott Paxton and McCraw with a complaint signed under oath by a firsthand witness as a Pro Se litigant Joe Blessett, documentary evidence, and settlement. Blessett's private administrative action had contractual terms to settle the matter by responding with documents for standing to enforce federal penalties under Title IV-D evidence or legal action with monetary penalties for failure to respond in a reasonable time against Antony Blinken, Abbott Paxton, and McCraw. Under the terms of the Certificate of Nonresponse, the respondents were notified that failure to respond is acceptance of the terms of the agreement. Antony Blinken returned an answer in a reasonable time, and Abbott, Ken Paxton, and McCraw acquiesced to the accusations and terms of a private contract. Accordingly, Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw are not immune Ex parte Young for their failure to respond to Blessett's private process, "failure to act" after being notified, and their admission through tacit conduct. When Blessett performed his private administrative and discovery process, the

setting of the monetary penalty at ($100, 000.00) one hundred thousand dollars per day. With an expectation that public servants honor their oath to the people. Blessett expected Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw to respond within a reasonable time, just as Antony Blinken did. It is an enforceable contract publicly recorded in federal courts with Constitutional protections.

The lower Courts are expected to accept the "Notices, Notices Of Acceptance, Certificates of Nonresponse as documentary evidence against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw's, applying the evidence and fact under Rule 52. The U.S. and Texas Constitutions require Public servants to respond to the needs of their Oath of Office and, respect the Rules of Law and the Constitution not to be held accountable as private individuals. No other firsthand witness affidavits, recorded depositions, or personal verbal rebuttal to opposing Blessett's affidavits are recorded with the Federal District Court. In courts of law, how does unopposed documentary evidence lose to silence? For credibility, a witness must perceive or describe the actions accurately under oath and be available for cross-examination. Blessett's documentary evidence is admissible under the local federal court rule, Federal Rules of Evidence, and no objection was raised by the defense. Why was Rule 52(a)(2) for civil proceedings, declaratory relief under the Declaratory Judgement Act. 28 U.S.C. §2201, with injunctive relief, and as a legal judgment with relevant rights and obligations

ignored and denied? Why did the Court ignore Blessett's "Contract Clause" protections for the private agreements? Why did the courts ignore Blessett's protected rights to use the Federal Rules of Evidence and the Court's obligation under Rule 52(a)(5) to allow Blessett's challenges to the defendant's defense?

Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw did not present any documents of Blessett's voluntary acceptance or judicial enforcement of public services and penalties Under Title IV of the Social Security Act. Blessett signed an affidavit and complaint as a Pro Se litigant under the federal penalty of perjury, creating a rebuttal presumption. Texas notarized under penalties of perjury documentary evidence in the court record of ongoing Title IV penalties creates a rebuttal presumption. In the last relevant "state court judgment of 2017, the custodial parent assigned Sinkin Law Firm, a private firm with the fiduciary duty to collect and enforce the outstanding child support debt."[4] Why is the public debt collection agency still enforcing Title IV penalties on private debts assigned to a private entity?

The District Court's opinion and Appellee's defense make a clear error in U.S. Congress intent under Part D 42 U.S.C. 654 state plan. *[The federal statute requires states to, as part of their child-support plans, provide for notice of proceedings where support*

[4] As Noted in the Appellant Reply Brief and Sinkin Law Firm District Court response

obligations might be modified. But Blessett has not alleged facts that his obligations have been modified. In fact, as Texas points out in its briefing, his obligations were not modified. Dkt. 82 at 3] in the Federal Courts Opinion Documents presented show admissible evidence of noncompliance with Part D by the state's admission declared in the prior request for injunction relief. Evidence provided by law Blessett's July 23, 1999, state court support order fell under Texas Family Code 160.637(a)(2), not the federal provisions of Part D, and the order was not modified under 42 U.S.C 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III). Nor has admissible evidence been presented to oppose Blessett's claim. Therefore, it is a verified admission as a matter of record that the state agency and its state actors never had the rights under 42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III)[5] to enforce Title IV against

---

[5] **42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III), Grants to States**
In the case of a noncustodial parent who becomes enrolled in the project on or after November 29, 1999, the noncustodial parent is in compliance with the terms of an oral or written personal responsibility contract entered into among the noncustodial parent, the entity, and (unless the entity demonstrates to the Secretary that the entity is not capable of coordinating with such agency) the agency responsible for administering the State plan under part D, which was developed taking into account the employment and child support status of the noncustodial parent, which was entered into not later than 30 (or, at the option of the entity, not later than 90) days after the noncustodial parent was enrolled in the project, and which, at a minimum, includes the following: **(aa)**A commitment by the noncustodial parent to cooperate, at the earliest opportunity, in the establishment of the paternity of the minor child, ***through voluntary acknowledgement or other procedures,*** and in the

Blessett. The District Court's opinion is verified proof that federal and state Title IV enforcement actions from 1999 to 2015 were performed without modifying the original support order under the color of law before the 2015 default judgment[6] and continued after the 2017 reassignment of the debt to a private entity. It is admissible evidence of incompetence and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services inaction in enforcing spending clause penalties to correct state agencies under federal statute 42 U.S.C. 609. HHS inaction is an action under the color of legal authority.

Blessett had charged Sinkin Law Firm with failing to fulfill its fiduciary duties to present copies of the legal documents required to prove the financial accounting for transferring Blessett's assets for child support debt. Sinkin Law Firm did not have an

---

establishment of a child support order. **(bb)**A commitment by the noncustodial parent to cooperate in the payment of child support for the minor child, which may include a ***modification of an existing support order*** to take into account the ability of the noncustodial parent to pay such support and the participation of such parent in the project.

[6] Default judgment for Title IV collection and enforcement require compliance with 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) for federal enforcement under the Constitution. The State may do as it pleases as a sovereign and maintain immunity from federal jurisdiction against its citizens. A federal agency must comply with U.S. Congressional legislation for the Act as written to maintain immunity in federal jurisdiction. A state must follow the federal statutes of the Act to continue receiving federal grants.

Attorney on the record with the Clerk of the Court on February 10, 2022, the due date to answer the complaint. Therefore, Sinkin law firm made its first record appearance before the Court on February 23, 2022[7].

Sinkin Law Firm's default is under the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 (a) guidance. Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sav. Ass'n, 874 F.2d 274, 276 (5th Cir. 1989) ruling addresses the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(a) for an attorney of the record letters and documents before the due date. The lower U.S. 5th Circuit Court offered no opposition to overcome set federal rule 11(a). In its own opinion, in "Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sav, the 5th Cir. court's opinion states that American and its counsel should comply with Rule 11 in whatever documents it may file."

Just as it was the U.S. 5th Appellate Courts decision to use Sun Bank of Ocala, Plaintiff, v. Pelican Homestead and Savings Association, Defendant And third-Party Plaintiff-appellee, v. American First Mortgage Funding Corp., Third Party defendant-appellant, 874 F.2d 274 (5th Cir. 1988) for not defaulting Sinkin Law Firm. When Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sav. Ass'n judicial The Court's opinion supports Blessett's argument in the appellate Court and district court against Sinkin Law

[7] See Blessett's written objection in District Court and Appellant Brief

Firm. The judicial opinion clearly states in the very last lines of the opinion that "American and its counsel should, of course, comply with Rule 11 in whatever documents it may file." Blessett is not asking for much. Blessett is asking for equal civil adherence to the Federal Civil Rules of Procedure, to the federal laws of the Act, private agreement protections for his Certificates of Nonresponse, and preservation of the U.S. Constitution. Blessett's body is retrained under the Act without proof of an injured party. How is this Constitutionally viable?

The people expect United States public government bodies to follow federal laws and the U.S. Constitution. If 42 U.S.C. § 654(12) says, notices are to be given. If the 42 U.S.C. §§ 654(16) and (24) say the state Title IV-D agencies must have a system to save all documents for easy retrieval, there were no impediments to prevent the public servant from following the law and Constitution. When Blessett sent Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw a Private Notice to produce a copy of the 42 U.S.C. § 654(12) notice, the public servants are expected to follow public law. After receiving notice from Blessett expressing the law and private penalties for their failure, Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw failed to act. Blessett had every expectation of the federal Court upholding the federal laws as written against Abbott, Paxton and McCraw. Blessett's § 1983 claims are valid against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw, supported by the Notices, Acceptance of Notices, and Certificates of Nonresponse

as documentary evidence. There is no good opposing argument in the District Court against the Certificates of Nonresponse. Blessett's private agreement with Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw has Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution protections (Contract Clause) prohibiting state intrusion.

The People, U.S. Congress, and President Biden entrusted Xavier Becerra to protect the United States' interest under 42 U.S.C. § 652 of the Act. The Brett Favre incident with the Mississippi Department of Human Services (MDHS) is evidence of a state agency using Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for projects benefitting the wealthy. These are funds dedicated to people experiencing poverty under Title IV-A of the Act. It is evidence of the wealthy stealing from the poor. Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw know that the average noncustodial parents are too poor to maintain a legal battle in federal courts against them. Now they wish to block Blessett's access to the Federal Court. How is this not repugnant to the U.S. Constitution and against federal law?

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. For the Courts to claim U.S Congressional legislative standing to refute Blessett's claims in an Article 1 Section 8 Clause 9 court, there must be a public record of documentary evidence of an administrative or judicial order for Title IV-D

collection and enforcement in compliance with the federal legislation.

2. For the defense to claim standing for Title IV-D enforcement, the terms of Title IV-D agreement must be in the private Family law Divorce Decree or recorded documentary evidence of 42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III) modification of the original support order or relevant state court order for enforcement of Title IV-D penalties or documentary evidence of administrative hearing.
3. The defense must be able to show the public record of documentary evidence of Title IV-D administrative hearing with dates, times, and parties in attendance.
4. To claim a default judgment for Title IV-D collection, there must be 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) proof of process services on the public record for the judgment to comply with U.S Congressional legislation under the Act. A state body or agent cannot do what it wants in the performance of the Act. The Act's Spending Clauses and Supremacy Clause require Title IV agencies and agents to submit to federal government supremacy in federal matters concerning the Act.

The points made above must be done to comply with the Act's federal statutes, for the state officials, state agents, and employees to abide by the U.S. Constitution, and for the compliance with public law for Joe Blessett's or any noncustodial parent's private rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and Bill of

Rights. Since federal; penalties under the Act were enforced against Blessett, the accused must be able to prove standing to enforce federal penalties under the Act. The evidence provided by federal law alone should have shifted the burden of proof on the accused.

There is no documentary evidence of a judicial order under the federal laws of the Act to continue enforcing federal penalties in 2023. Title IV of the Social Security Act is the government's federal program offering public services without a Remedy at Law for noncustodial parents. The U.S. Constitution and Federal statutes require full disclosure of the terms of the Act's program under Part D, with evidence of full disclosure recorded by the contracted state agencies. Private persons have the Constitutional right to decline public services that state and federal governments provide. There is no documentary evidence that Blessett accepted public services under the Act. The argument for Rooker Feldman Doctrine for state court child support debt orders is made null and irrelevant under the new state court order in 2017 assignment of the child support debt to a private entity. How can the respondents logically use the Rooker Feldman Doctrine as a legal defense against required Congressional documentary evidence requirement 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) of the Act for the 2015 default judgment? How is a request for Congressionally required document before judgment under federal law a Rooker Feldman attack on a state judgment? Blessett can't ask the courts to reject null

court orders before the relevant 2017 private child support debt order. The Courts discarded individuals' powers to limit government.

Abbott, Paxton, & McCraw

There is a Constitutional due process problem with federal public services enforcement under the color of law by a paid state government agency. The injured parties do not know the individual agent or agents responsible for the injuries to assign blame. It is why U.S. Congress wrote federal statute 42 U.S.C. 654(12) notice of the results of an administrative or judicial hearing. Because the lower Court has repeatedly denied discovery, Blessett was forced to directly confront Abbott, Paxton, and Mc Craw with a private notice under a private administrative process to discover the facts. Blessett presented the Court with documentary evidence of state officials' "failure to act" and agreed on private terms. Abbott as governor and the person responsible for signing and agreeing to the 42 U.S.C. 654 Title IV-D state plan with the federal government, had the power to request a copy of 42 U.S.C. 654(12) notice from Texas designated agency, asking the agency to stop the enforcement of the penalties and decertify debt under the Act.

As the state attorney general and designated head of the state Title IV-D child support division, Paxton had the power to request a copy of 42 U.S.C. 654(12) notice from the agency's agents and employees and request the agency stop enforcing the penalties

under the Act. McCraw, as the designated head of the Texas Public Safety Department, had the power to request a copy of 42 U.S.C. 654(12) notice from the Title IV-D child support agency's agents or employees or present Blessett with a copy of a judicial order for the 2014 suspension of state license or stop the illegal enforcement. Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw only have the power to accept the term of a private agreement in their unofficial private capacity. Under the same conditions to which noncustodial parents consent for Title IV-D services with full disclosure and notice of the events, an agreement has been made with Abbott, Paxton, and Mc Craw. They all were responsible under the U.S. Constitution to prevent continued injuries from the Act's performance under the color of law. They were given the opportunity to protect their rights and the evidence presented for the preservation of their rights. The same opportunities have not been extended to Blessett or evidence presented to refute the presumption created by Blessett's documentary evidence. " Abbott, Paxton, and Mc Craw failed to act" in their official capacity when they should have.

Under U.S. Congressional control and the federal statutes of the Act, the federal and contracted state agencies must be able to retrieve[8] documentary evidence notice and results of an administrative or judicial hearing. Blessett has never received the 42

[8]42 U.S.C. §654(24) A State plan for child and spousal support must have in effect an automated data processing and information retrieval system.

U.S.C. 654(12) notice of the results of an administrative or judicial hearing. Joe Blessett as a firsthand witness, knows and states he has never consented to Title IV public services or attended a judicial hearing for the public services. The fact that Title IV penalties are being enforced with Blessett's 42 U.S. Code § 1983 claims, documentary evidence of notices addressing the § 1983 claims, the rule of law, stare decisis, a federal statute, laws of equity, and the burden placed on a government official for action under the color of legal authority is enough to require the accused to present evidence to rebut the presumption. The lower courts have denied Blessett's complaints as true, denying the Discovery process and dismissing the civil action under Rule 12b(1) and (6). The Courts ignored documentary evidence of an unanswered private "Notices to Abbott, Paxton, and Mc Craw with documentary evidence of Notice of Acceptance," all with reasonable time and opportunity to cure any defects and respond with evidence to enforce the Act's penalties against JOSEPH C BLESSETT. The last step, in accordance with commerce and due process protections for Abbott, Paxton, and Mc Craw, and the U.S. Constitution, is to present the "Certificate of Nonresponse, Notice of Acceptance, and Notice," the supporting evidential documents for judicial enforcement. Blessett's Certificate of Nonresponse is a documented enforceable contract. Rule 52(a)(1) for actions tried on the facts without a jury or with an advisory jury, the

Court must find the facts specially and state its conclusions of law separately. The lower courts erroneously omitted the "Certificate of Nonresponse, Notice of Acceptance and Notice" in their findings. It is evidence that shows the 5th and 14th Amendment deprivation of life, liberty, and property under the color of legal authority. The lower Court's findings were never conclusive in finding evidence to support Blessett's acceptance of public service or public debt claims under the Act. The Court's conclusions are "clearly erroneous" when evidence supports Blessett's private debt claims. Blessett's private contract as documentary evidence will leave a definite and firm opinion that a mistake has been committed. A judicial review of findings of lower courts does not have the statutory or constitutional limitations on administrative agencies or by a jury, and this Court may reverse findings of fact by a trial court where "clearly erroneous." quoting United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364 (1948)[9]

The lower courts have moved away from accepted judicial proceedings in evaluating the respondents' compliance with federal statutes as written in the legislation for the Act. The legislature's powers are defined and limited, and those limits may not be

[9] Under Rule 52(a) of the Rules of Civil Procedure, a finding of fact by the trial court is "clearly erroneous" when, although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.

mistaken or forgotten. It is why the Constitution is written. Under Alderman v. US, 2011,[10] the courts must accept that the federal legislation is Constitutionally correct as written or challenge it to make its defense argument for dismissal valid. Blessett's certified documented prima facie evidence and facts overcame FRCP 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) defense. Blessett's protected rights grant him immunity from participating in legislated federal public service programs. Blessett's certified Certificate of Nonresponse is documented prima facie evidence that Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw know they are acting under the color of law with knowledge of the ongoing enforcement of federal penalties under the Act. The spending clause provisions include due process safeguards to preserve the expectation the Constitution creates by making promises on which individuals rely. Under federal spending clause provisions 42 U.S.C. §654(16), 654 § (24), the Title IV agency is to have a system for automated data processing and information retrieval.

---

[10] This Court has consistently recognized that the Constitution imposes real limits on federal power. See Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452, 457, 111 S.Ct. 2395, 115 L.Ed.2d 410 (1991); Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 176, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803) (opinion for the Court by Marshall, C.J.) ("The powers of the legislature are defined, and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written"). It follows from the enumeration of specific powers that there are boundaries to what the Federal Government may do. See, e.g., Gibbons v. Ogden, 9 Wheat. 1, 195, 6 L.Ed. 23 (1824), Alderman v. US, 562 US 1163 - Supreme Court 2011

Paxton should have no problems retrieving documents on Blessett Title IV-D enforcement. Under federal spending clause provisions 42 U.S.C. 652(d)(2)(B). Under 42 U.S.C. §654(16), if there is a failure substantially to comply with criteria, requirements, and other undertakings, prescribed by the advance automated data processing planning document. Under 42 U.S.C. § 652, the Secretary has the power to suspend the approval of the 42 U.S.C. 654 state plan until there are no longer any such failures to comply with the state plan. The federal provisions of the Act and the U.S. Constitution do not allow the Secretary, Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw, to enforce federal penalties without evidence of Blessett's commitment to child support debt under 42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III) administrative terms of the Act.

As a question of law, the lower courts cannot reject a state court judgment when it does not exist or is rendered null. There is no evidence of a relevant hearing of a judgment to reject or to enforce Title IV public service enforcement and collections. After the deposit of prima facia evidence, there are Civil Rules and Constitutional duty to review the documentary evidence of a Title IV-A public debt, examine evidence of Blessett's consent to Title IV-D public services or review and accept the judicial order that complies with Title IV spending clause statutes. Why not respond with the evidentiary document required under the Act as an affirmative defense? The Respondents can't because the Act was enforced under the color of law.

Blessett's Certificates of Nonresponse is a Texas notarized enforceable contract sworn under oath as documentary evidence on public record with the Federal Courts. The accusations and terms of the private contract went unopposed by Abbott, Paxton, Steven McCraw, and in the District Court opinion. The U.S. Federal Courts should have honored that contract under Constitutional protections for private rights. The documentary evidence supporting the contracts gave the District Court jurisdiction and direct evidence of the defendant's inaction "Failure to Act."

U.S. Congress's interpretation of the federal statute under the Act is that the Act does require notice of a hearing for due process, with rights to a "full and fair hearing and determination of all questions of fact asserted under the U.S. Constitution. Under Marbury v. Madison and Anniston Mg. Co. v. Davis, 301 US 337 - Supreme Court 1937 "the lower courts have no power or authority to overrule precedents set by the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Supreme Court has made it abundantly known to the lower courts that Title IV of the Social Security Act is not a protected entitlement. The U.S. Constitution does not mention or grant protected rights to child support, nor are there any protected entitlements codified under federal law or state law for child support or spousal support without documented acceptance of agreed public or private terms. The U.S. Constitution does define public and private freedoms, liberties, and immunities. There is a

defining difference between public child support debt under Title IV as government-controlled administrative terms under federal law and private child support debt with fiduciary responsibilities controlled by private terms between parents or private entities. There is no evidence available to create a presumption of Blessett committing a 13th Amendment crime[11] for forced service to debt, evidence of an administrative hearing or voluntarily waiving U.S. Constitutionally protected immunity to decline public services, and benefits of the Act.

Blessett has clearly defined his child support debt in this civil action as private debt, under a private agreement with overwhelming facts and evidence in the original complaint, Appellant Brief, and the Appellant Reply Brief. The U.S. 5th Circuit Appellate Court contradicts its burden of proof test under Barrera—Montenegro v. United States, 74 F.3d 657, 659 (5th Cir. 1996) and Voluntary Purchasing Groups, Inc. v. Reilly, 889 F.2d 1380, 1384 (5th Cir. 1989). The Certificate of Nonresponse supports the complaint's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims as prima facie evidence against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw. Under a private administrative process, Blessett sent Antony Blinken, Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw a notice of intent to sue for actions under the color of law. Blessett first notices requested documentary evidence to show standing to

[11] 13th Amendment Section 2 Granting Congress the power enforces involuntary servitude, as a punishment for crime under appropriate legislation.

enforce penalties or stop enforcement. Nothing in the lower Court's opinions and the respondent's argument point to any set of facts or evidence to refute Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw's consented to the terms of a private agreement accusing them of acting under the color of law. Although nothing in the District Court opinion and the respondent's argument conclusively points to Blessett's rejection of the relevant 2017 state court judgment. Nothing supports a Rooker-Feldman Doctrine defense. Nothing in the lower Court's opinion and the respondent's argument or evidence rebuts Blessett's Certificates of Nonresponse as valid private contracts.

Xavier Becerra, Health and Human Service

Antony Blinken's response to Blessett's administrative process is prima facie evidence of ongoing Title IV-D penalty against Blessett in 2005 under 42 U.S.C. 652(k) administrative order U.S. Passport denial without verifiable proof of compliance with the Act—Antony Blinkin response directs Blessett to the Secretary for the certification of the Title IV debt for enforcement. Blessett presented prima faci evidence that U.S. Dept. Health and Human Services as an interested party in November of 2020 that Texas State Title IV agency certified a debt under the color of law. From that point forward, after receiving notice, the Secretary continued to operate under the color of legal authority to continue debt enforcement under Title IV penalties. The

Secretary failed to uphold his sworn oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution and competently administer Title IV of the Social Security Act as he swore before U.S. Congress. Xavier Becerra is responsible for his actions as Secretary, and it is his sworn duty until his resignation or removal. Blessett correctly challenged the Secretary's and the agency's immunity under Administrative Procedure Act (APA) 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 and 704 for failure to act when federal obligations called for protecting the United States' interest. Congress provided no private individual remedies in Title IV, but APA permits relief for "Failure to Act" after receiving notices of Blessett's injuries under the Act.

The opinions expressed nothing to address the evidence provided by law favoring Blessett's claims. The opinions ignore how all state court judgment benefits Blessett's argument establishing private debt. The opinions show the Court cannot distinguish between private and public debt. At this point, it is crucial to understand the 2017 judgment to assign child support debt to a private entity. There is no Title IV commitment, administrative order, or new judicial order to enforce Part D against Blessett.

Accepted law rejects an opinion or argument that ignores the evidence and facts—the complaint against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw focused on the contents of the Certificates of Nonresponse and the supporting documents.

Xavier Becerra, Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw are either incompetent or willingly decided to ignore their sworn oaths of office in obedience to federal statutes and the U.S. Constitution.

Sinkin Law Firm

Protections provided by the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(a) and the 5th, 10th, and 14th Amendments guarantee the liberty not to accept documents from an attorney not recorded with the Clerk of the Court. Federal civil procedures decline documents from individuals not signed by the attorney of record with the Clerk of the Court. In addition, the 5th and 14th Amendments' liberties, immunities, and equal application of federal law, federal civil procedure Rule 11, and Rule 52a guarantee Blessett's right to a default judgment against the Sinkin Law Firm. The Court records show that the Sinkin Law Firm counsel made his first appearance on February 23, 2022, twelve days after the due date of February 10, 2022. Sinkin Law Firm could not respond to and comply with Rule 11 and did not respond on time to comply with Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(i). Blessett objected by motion to the Court's decision to not default Sinkin Law firm per the Rules and U.S. 5th Circuit Court stare decisis Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sav. Ass'n, 874 F.2d 274, 276 (5th Cir. 1989)[12] and Bass v

[12] "That argument, upon which we intimate no opinion, may be made by motion for summary judgment if, after being given notice, American formally appears. American and its counsel

Hoagland U.S. 5th cir. Court 1949. In Bass v Hoagland U.S. 5th cir. Court 1949, "the defendant's counsel appeared and filed an answer to the merits. Although counsel later withdrew from the case, he did not withdraw the appearance." The critical issues against the 5th Cir. Court's opinion are Rule 11 and the counsel for Sinkin Law Firm made its first appearance on the record after Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(i) due date and the first document signed by the attorney record after the due date.

The lower Court's reasons for dismissal cannot stand against the public protections for Blessett's private rights and other Constitutional obligations.

Undisputed Recorded Facts

1. A Federal Court cannot reject null state court support orders for a child that has reached the age of maturity under the Rooker Feldman Doctrine.
2. The 2017 state court order for the debt assigned to a private entity superseded and voided the previous child support order.
3. A Title IV public child support debt assignment cannot occupy the same space as a private debt assignment.
4. No documentary evidence was recorded with the District Court to enforce Title IV-D penalties

---

should, of course, comply with Rule 11 in whatever documents it may file. " Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead & Savings Ass'n, 874 F.2d 274, 277 (5th Cir. 1989)

against Blessett after the June 2017 transfer of the debt to the private entity Sinkin Law Firm.

5. There is documentary evidence on the record submitted by Sinkin Law Firm that the custodial parent assigned the outstanding child support debt for collection in a Texas court to the private entity Sinkin Law Firm in June 2017.
6. Blessett's driver's license was revoked in 2014 until 9999 without valid documentation to prove due process.
7. Blessett is subject to Federal Tax Offset lien without valid Title IV documentation to certify debt under the Act.
8. Blessett was subject to U.S. Passport Denial in 2005 without valid Title IV documentation to certify debt under the Act.
9. There is no documentary evidence on the record to satisfy 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) compliance to enforce federal penalties under the Act against Blessett.
10. There is no documentary evidence on the record of a judicial order to satisfy compliance to enforce federal penalties under the Act against Blessett.
11. There is documentary evidence on the record that the District Court ignored Blessett's motion to remove Texas as a defendant and was unopposed in the defense response to the motion.
12. Documentary evidence on the record proving Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw federal courts jurisdiction under §1983 relief to adjudicate the case under Ex parte Young for failure to act.

13. Documentary evidence shows that Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw received private Notice and Notice of Acceptance.
14. Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution Contract Clause protects Blessett's private agreements with Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw in their unofficial capacity against state intrusion.
15. Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw can only agree to Blessett's Private agreement in their private capacity.
16. Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw should have declined Blessett's Private agreement in their official capacity before the legal action.
17. Recorded documentary evidence is proof Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw knew about Blessett's injuries and chose indifference[13] over action,
18. Blessett made claims for inaction (failure to act) against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw, not stopping the Title IV enforcement after receiving notice grants relief under § 1983 requested to prevent all Title IV-D enforcement against Blessett.
19. There were no objections to the recorded documentary evidence of the "Certificate of Nonresponse, Notice of Acceptance and Notice,"

[13] Document proof that Abbott, Paxton and Mc Craw received notices creates a federal cause of action against state officials who deprive private citizens of their constitutional rights under § 1983.

the supporting evidential documents of private contracts with Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw.

20. Blessett's private agreement with Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw consenting in their private capacity is protected by the "Contract Clause."
21. Inaction after being notified is a failure to act and is a direct injury performed by Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw.
22. Blessett requested no monetary damages from the state against Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw under §1983 relief.
23. Blessett has a contract with monetary agreed terms with private individuals Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw. Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw cannot acquiesce to private agreements in their official capacity.
24. There is no documentary evidence of a Title IV debt for the Secretary to certify for federal Title enforcement.
25. The documentary evidence shows that the Secretary was notified in November 2020 of the Texas Title IV agency issues.
26. Blessett's request for APA grants federal jurisdiction for judicial review for issues concerning the Secretary's agency actions under Title IV.
27. There is no evidence of the Secretary correcting the agency's enforcement of the Acr to prevent continued injury to Blessett in 2023.

28. Admissible evidence provided by Federal Statutes 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(H) and 42 U.S.C. § 603(a)(5)(C)(iii)(III) challenges the actions of the Appellees to prove compliance with the Act's proof of due process before enforcement of penalties.
29. No evidence of Judicial review of the fiduciary failures claims against Sinkin Law Firm's challenge to dismiss.
30. There is no evidence to satisfy the equity claims against Sinkin.
31. Sinkin Law Firm disregarded the Federal Civil Rules of Procedures 11a quoted in the U.S. 5th Circuit opinion. Id. Sun Bank of Ocala v. Pelican Homestead and Sav. Ass'n.
32. There is a difference between the Public and Private sides in the science of law. Blessett has conducted his business in private.
33. Blessett has not claimed fraud as a cause of action in this civil action.
34. All the state court judgments as written[14] benefit Blessett's arguments. Blessett has requested to enjoy his Final Divorce Decree as written, without Title IV-D enforcement language.
35. Joe Blessett is a firsthand witness.
36. The courts did not distinguish between public and private matters.
37. Blessett is a 62-year-old African American male self-educated maritime engineer who was an

[14] 28 U.S. Code § 1738B - Full faith and credit for child support orders

executive engineering officer licensed by the U.S. Coast Guard and a recording artist.

Blessett's private administrative process for discovery is documented evidence recorded with the U.S. District Court that the enforcement of Title IV is being performed in manor repugnant to the U.S. Constitution. Blessett's rights were denied to preserve a corrupt application of a federal program. Brett Favre put a famous face on the corruption in Title IV of the Social Security Act program. It is a crime against the United States under 18 U.S.C. § 371 or 18 U.S.C. § 286. The lower Courts gave Blessett no consideration and "did not accept as true all material allegations of the complaint and construe the complaint in favor of the complaining party." The lower court opinions are nonsensical with the inclusion of Blessett's private contract (Certificates of Nonresponse), evidence provided by federal statutes, stare decisis, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedures. Accordingly, the mistakes made against Blessett in this civil action are not 28 U.S. Code § 2111 "Harmless Errors." The Courts ignored individual protected rights, evidence, and federal laws. Blessett made Harmless Errors that did not interfere with rights. The conclusion reached by the courts and ignored by the respondents cannot survive being discredited by the Notices, Notices of Acceptance, and Certificates of Nonresponse as evidence to decide the judgments. Title IV of the Social Security Act is a public service that offers no individual protected rights to the

services. Public services without protected rights can only grant rights, protection, and enforcement through agreed terms of service by all parties involved. To enforce the terms of a public service program without consent is a direct violation of constitutionally protected rights. The lower courts discarded Contract and Commerce Clause protections (Federal Tax Offset Lien)and the Supremacy Clause restrictions on state law versus the Act's statutes in its decision against Blessett's protected private rights and immunities.

CONCLUSION

Blessett respectfully submits this Petition for Writ of Certiorari to resolve the Public and Private law issues, reinforce Congressional intent of the Act for Noncustodial parents, Contract Clause enforcement of the private agreement with Abbott, Paxton, and McCraw, decertify Blessett's Title IV child support debt with the federal agencies, approve the APA Judicial Review or request an OIG investigation of the Department of Health and Human Services and approve the Default Judgment against Sinkin Law Firm with the relief Blessett requested against the firm.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Joe Blessett
Joe Blessett *Petitioner-Pro Se*
7970 Fredericksburg Rd. Ste. 101-708
San Antonio, TX 76011
Ph. 281-667-1174 / joe@joeblessett.com