

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE:
BETTY JANE AYERS and DAVID RUSSELL AYERS,
pro se *Petitioners,*

v

TRE HARGETT, MARK STEPHENS,
JONATHAN SKRMETTI, JANET KLEINFELTER,
DAVID KUSTOFF, JIM COOPER, STEVE COHEN, MARSHA BLACKBURN, and
BILL HAGERTY

Respondents,

On Petition For A Writ Of Mandamus
To The Supreme Court Of The State Of Tennessee

PETITIONER'S CORRECTED PETITION FOR REHEARING

BETTY JANE AYERS AND
DAVID RUSSELL AYERS,
162 Wade Lane Oak Ridge, TN 37830
865-243-5217
Petitioners, Pro Se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------------|
| POINTS, AUTHORITIES AND ARGUMENT | Page 1 |
| Table of Cited Authorities/Rule for Rehearing | Page 1 |
| Argument | Page 1 |
| Conclusion | Page 7 |

POINTS, AUTHORITIES AND ARGUMENT

Rule For Rehearing

Rehearing of the denial of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus is warranted in situations involving “intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.” Supreme Court Rule 44.2. This Petition was timely submitted within the 25 day window but sent back by Clerks for our failure to submit a proper in forma pauperis. Petitioners today re-submit with the signed in forma pauperis form Clerks sent. Additionally, one party in this matter has withdrawn, so her name and signature have been omitted.

ARGUMENT

On October 2, 2023, this Court entered a denial of Petitioners’ Petition upon the docket of this matter: “Petition DENIED.”¹ Petitioners are in full agreement with Petitions from a related case from Loy Brunson, whom this Court has also denied. Petitioners pray the Justices who voted to deny hearing of Petitioners in this matter will reconsider and now grant our Petition to be heard, as the new

¹ Petitioners do not believe they received a copy of this in the mail, they found out by checking the SCOTUS docket of this matter.

substantial grounds created by the denial of hearing their Petition establishes that this Court:

Does not agree that it is the duty of the Supreme Court to say what the law is, and to settle the differences in the law handed down in this matter by the State Supreme Court of Tennessee, vs that of the State Supreme Courts of Delaware and Georgia,

And that this Court does not agree that it has a duty to protect Citizens' Constitutional liberty and privilege of right to vote and to hear a case of national importance, which exposes a national security breach in our electronic voting machines which flip the votes of not only Petitioners, but every Citizen in the United States, which this Court has a duty to remedy in this case,

And that this Court does not agree it is prudent to agree to hear a case which exposes several expert witnesses who affirm not only the above breach of our nation's electronic voting machines, but also affirms a national security breach of the overthrow of the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States by our own Government agency in cooperation with foreign entities, which this Court has a duty to remedy,

And that this Court does not agree that it has a duty to act to assure the lower courts uphold their State Constitution and State laws, as well as the Supreme Court laws cited in this matter in Petitioners' Appendix,

And that this Court does not agree that it has a duty to act to settle the conflict between a Federal Law and State Law which the lower courts in this matter refused to hear, and a duty to act to uphold the right to vote with a pure ballot box of Petitioners as written in the Tennessee State Constitution, and liberty for such affirmed in the US Constitutions, both of which have been violated in this matter, and to hear this matter which importantly affirms the lack of certification per Federal law of the majority of not only Tennessee's, but all States of the United States' electronic voting machines in the 2020 and 2022 elections, and this Court is stamping its approval for continued use of these machines which are uncertified, unprotected, in violation of Federal law and able to flip votes for not only Petitioners but all voting citizens,

And that this Court does not agree it has a duty to assure legislators do not violate the right of Petitioners to a pure ballot box, affirmed by The State of Tennessee's Constitution, and to protect Petitioners' privilege and liberty of right to vote guaranteed by the US Constitution,

And that this Court does not agree that its Oath of Office affirms a duty of allegiance from this Court to protect and defend the Constitution and the United States against the enemies foreign and domestic clearly presented within the evidence in this case by multiple experts,

And that this Court does not agree that Respondents and others in the Petition who are bound to uphold the Constitution by their Oath of Office, yet aided foreign and domestic enemies in flipping the tally of the vote for the top two elected

offices in our nation and allowed a President and Vice President We the People did not elect to be seated should be held accountable for their breach of Oath, as evidenced in the Petition,

And that this Court does not agree that these acts of war and acts in aid of the enemy committed against the United States by US Congressmen and women and US Senators and Tennessee legislators and government officers- all with an Oath to uphold the Constitution - should be heard. Such acts were clearly outlined within the evidence submitted of aiding the flipping of votes to overthrow the Presidency and Vice Presidency and failure to return this known fraudulent vote to the States to be re-certified when given an affidavit and affirming evidence the vote was flipped, but instead tabling and parking bills that addressed the impurity of the ballot boxes, and failing to pass and follow legislation to protect Petitioners,

And this Court does not agree that it has already established that one need not pick up arms in order to levy war against the Constitution, or that it should hear this case when presented with evidence that Respondents and others as related in Petition have given aid and comfort to our enemies,

And this Court does not agree that Respondents or Congressmen and women and Senators have a duty to make, uphold, and follow laws to protect against treason and treasonous acts, and a duty not to violate their oath of office,

And this Court does not agree that the breached Oath of Office of individuals of the judicial department and other government officers in this case should be heard and adjudicated with the laws and penalties for acts and aid of treason,

And this Court does not agree that an act of treason committed by Respondents is also an act of fraud as outlined in Petition,

And this Court does not agree that itself or the Judges in the lower courts in this matter not only have the power but the duty per their Oaths to immediately hear an accusation of treason and remove Respondents from office for acts of treason,

And this Court does not agree that the Constitution protects a Petitioner's right to seek a redress of grievances,

And this Court does not agree that a voting injury gives standing to anybody who seeks a redress of grievances, as this Court has refused to hear that Two State Supreme Courts as listed in Petitioner's Appendix recently affirmed that a voting injury gives standing to be heard and again, this is in Conflict with Petitioners' State of Tennessee Supreme Court ruling and to not hear this is to say it is not the job of this Court to resolve this Conflict,

And this Court does not agree that pursuant to Article III Section 2 of the Constitution that this Court's duty is to *"extend to all cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution,"* – that its duty is to protect and defend the

Constitution, and when given an opportunity to do that, as this case does, this Court must do so,

And that this Court does not agree that it is We the People who commissioned government to secure our rights and that the Preamble of our Constitution affirms it is We the People who establish Justice and are to assure it is kept [and re-established] forever for our posterity, that this is affirmed that it is We the People who have this right under Amendment 1 to petition our government for redress of grievances, and that this Court does not agree that it upheld this in Yick Wo v. Hopkins 118 US 356, *"the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law . . . while sovereign powers delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power."*

And this Court does not agree that the Oath of Office they swore to uphold the Constitution, "So help me God," should be upheld,

And this Court does not agree that they have a duty to act under the Constitution when they have been given a full, evidenced report of treason and that the law upholds this *"Constructive notice in law creates an irrebuttable presumption of actual notice"*. Mooney v. Harlin, 622 SW 2d. 83.

And finally, this Court agrees that they do not have to follow the Constitution and their own rules of what qualifies a petition for a hearing, which includes, but is

not limited to, resolving a Conflict between States, resolving a case with a Conflict between Federal law and State, resolving a case that addresses a national concern and breach of national security, resolving a case with a contradiction of law as handed down by this Court, or resolving a case with serious threats to the Constitution, all of which the evidence in this case fully satisfies and more, that a case with this evidence can be disregarded by this Court and our nation left with individuals in government elected seats which We the People did not elect and that this Court can leave our Citizenry with no voice because Our vote can be flipped at the will of this enemy for which you have received full, identifying and sworn evidence.

CONCLUSION

A vote from this Court to deny this Petition for Rehearing would mean this Court is in full agreement with all the above Conflicts the vote not to hear this Petition has created.

Respectfully re-submitted this 15th day of November 2023,

The image shows two handwritten signatures. The signature on the left is "Betty Jane Ayers" and the signature on the right is "David Russell Ayers". Both signatures are in cursive and appear to be written in black ink.

Betty Jane Ayers and
David Russell Ayers,
162 Wade Lane Oak Ridge, TN 37830
865-243-5217
Petitioners, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH - RULE 44

Pursuant to S. Ct. R. 44, petitioners, to the best of their ability, hereby certify that this petition for rehearing complies with the restrictions of this rule and is presented in good faith, no intent of ill will and not for delay.

November 15, 2023

Respectfully re-submitted,

The image shows two handwritten signatures. The signature on the left is "Betty Jane Ayers" and the signature on the right is "David Russell Ayers". Both signatures are in cursive and appear to be in black ink.

Betty Jane Ayers and
David Russell Ayers,
162 Wade Lane Oak Ridge, TN 37830
865-243-5217
Petitioners, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT
No. 23-45

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE:
BETTY JANE AYERS, DAVID RUSSELL AYERS,
Pro se
Petitioners,

v

TRE HARGETT, MARK STEPHENS,
JONATHAN SKRMETTI, JANET KLEINFELTER,
DAVID KUSTOFF, JIM COOPER, STEVE COHEN, MARSHA BLACKBURN, and
BILL HAGERTY
Respondents,

Petitioners declare under penalty of perjury to the best of our ability that the foregoing is true and correct, that petitioners petition for rehearing contains, excluding parts to be excluded, the number of words as stated below as determined by Microsoft Word:

There are 1676 words.

Resubmitted this the 15th day of November 2023.



Betty Jane Ayers and
David Russell Ayers,
162 Wade Lane Oak Ridge, TN 37830
865-243-5217

Petitioners, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF PARTIES UNREPRESENTED BY COUNSEL

Petitioners are pro se and present this Petition in good faith and not for bad will, harm, or delay.

November 15, 2023

Respectfully re-submitted,

The image shows two handwritten signatures. The signature on the left is "Betty Jane Ayers" and the signature on the right is "David Russell Ayers". Both signatures are in cursive and appear to be written in black ink.

Betty Jane Ayers and
David Russell Ayers,
162 Wade Lane Oak Ridge, TN 37830
865-243-5217
Petitioners, Pro Se