

No. 23-6140

IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

—o0o—

IN RE YI TAI SHAO

Yi Tai Shao, Petitioner

vs.

Respondents

Judge Barry G. Silverman, Judge Ryan D. Nelson, Judge
Patrick J. Bumatay, Chief Judge Mary Murquia and
Appellees for the underlying case, Shao v. Roberts, et al., Rob
Bonta, California Attorney General who is representing
California Committee of Judicial Performance, in Appeal No.22-
15857 pending with the Ninth Circuit

—o0o—

REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G.
ROBERTS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICES CLARENCE THOMAS,
SAMUEL ALITO, ELENA KAGAN, SONIA SOTOMAYOR, NEIL
GORSUCH, BRET KAVANAUGH, AND KETANJI JACKSON

YI TAI SHAO, ESQ. *In pro per*,

P.O. Box 300; Big Pool, MD 21711

Tel.: (408) 873-3888

**PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS RECUSAL OF ALL
EIGHT JUSTICES EXCEPT JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT**

In Petition No.12-8660, where Chief Justice John G. Robert, Jr. is the Respondent, all associate justices recused themselves, except Justice Elena Kagan. The proceeding looks irregular in that Justice Kagan later refused to decide the Petition based on Fee Waiver denial when the fee waiver was granted in the beginning of the case docket or there would not have a case docket developed for a few months. However, Justice Kagan did handle the "Conference" alone when all other Justices were recused. Petitioner has filed Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett; yet it was not shown on the docket, when it was returned once. Rule 22.1 requires the Application to be immediately transmitted to Justice Barret to handle, or constitutes a crime of 18 U.S.C.§241, §242, §1001, §1503 (obstruction of justice), §1506, §1512(b) & (c), and §1962. This Court, under the administration of Chief Justice Roberts, had systematically blocked filings including 18 Applications to Justice Amy Coney Barrett that constituted racketeering activities under the RICO.

**A. PETITIONER RESPECTFUULY REQUESTS RECUSAL OF
CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE
CLARENCE THOMAS, SAMUEL ALITO, ELENA KAGAN AND
SONIA SOTOMAYOR BASED ON DIRECT CONFLICTS OF
INTEREST AS THEY ARE APPELLEES FOR THE SUBJECT
MATTER OF THE PETITION.**

Chief Justice Roberts, Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Elena Kagan and Sonia Sotomayor are appellees in the subject matter of this Petition, i.e., Shao v. Roberts, et al., Appeal no. 22-15857. (See App.007) Petitioner waited 28 days after case docketing but did not see any recusal by these justices and thus, respectfully requests recusal based on direct conflicts of interest.

**B. PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS RECUSAL OF
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE NEIL GORSUCH BASED ON
DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND APPEARANCE
OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE**

Petitioner declares that Justice Neil Gorsuch has the appearance of bias and prejudice that should be recused based on the following facts:

- (1) Justice Gorsuch was referred by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy into this Court and had employment history with Justice Kennedy. Justice Kennedy is at default in the underlying District Court case that a reversal that this Petition is seeking will prejudice the interest of Kennedy who is closely related to Justice Gorsuch such that there is a reasonable appearance that Justice Gorsuch would be unable to be fair and impartial in handling the key issue of this Petition.

- (2) Justice Gorsuch is an officer and closely related to American Inns of Court Foundation which is itself as well as 6 other “children” being defendants in the District Court Case and Appellees in this subject Appeal No.22-15857.
- (3) Justice Gorsuch has financial conflicts of interest with American Inns of Court Foundation.
- (4) Justice Gorsuch will be added as a Defendant for having joined other five Justices in failure to decide Recusal in Petition No. 21-881, Petition No.22-28 and petition No.22-350, therefore, has direct conflicts of interest on the issue involved here in the Petition. With deliberate refusing to decide Request for Recusal, Justice Gorsuch would be unable to decide the following question for this Petition:

Question No. 7: In denying judicial disqualification, should the panel judges lay out all relevant facts as required by *Moran v. Clarke*, 309 F.3d 516, 517 (8th Circuit 2002)?

C. PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS RECUSAL OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRET KAVANAUGH BASED ON DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND APPEARANCE OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE

Petitioner declares that Justice Bret Kavanaugh has the appearance of bias and prejudice that should be recused based on the following facts:

- (1) Justice Kavanaugh was referred by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy into this Court and had employment history with Justice Kennedy. Justice Kennedy is at default in the underlying District Court case that a reversal will prejudice the interest of Kennedy who is closely related to Justice Kavanaugh that this Petition is seeking will prejudice the interest of Kennedy who is closely related to Justice Kavanaugh such that there is a reasonable appearance that Justice Kavanaugh would be unable to be fair and impartial in handling the key issue of this Petition.
- (2) Justice Kavanaugh is an officer and closely related to American Inns of Court Foundation which is itself as well as 6 other “children” being defendants in the District Court Case and Appellees in this subject Appeal No.22-15857.
- (3) Justice Kavanaugh has financial conflicts of interest with American Inns of Court Foundation.
- (4) Justice Kavanaugh will be added as a Defendant for having joined other five Justices in failure to decide Recusal in Petition No. 21-

881, Petition No.22-28 and petition No.22-350, therefore, has direct conflicts of interest on the issue involved here in the Petition. With deliberate refusing to decide Request for Recusal, Justice Kavanaugh would be unable to decide the following question for this Petition:

Question No. 7: In denying judicial disqualification, should the panel judges lay out all relevant facts as required by *Moran v. Clarke*, 309 F.3d 516, 517 (8th Circuit 2002)?

(5) This underlying case is *Shao v. Roberts, et al.* (2:22-cv-00325), directly related to Petition No.22-350, based on new facts happened after filing the complaint in the first *Shao v. Roberts, et al.* (1:18-cv-01233RC) where Justice Kavanaugh has recused himself conscientiously. Therefore, it appears reasonably that Justice Kavanaugh has also conflicts of interest in handling this Petition.

D. PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS RECUSAL OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE KETANJI JACKSON BASED ON DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND APPEARANCE OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE

Petitioner declares that Justice Ketanji Jackson has the appearance of bias and prejudice that should be recused based on the following facts:

(1) Justice Jackson was sponsored by American Inns of Court Foundation to enter this Court as a Justice.

- (2) Justice Jackson is an officer and closely related to American Inns of Court Foundation which is itself as well as 6 other “children” being defendants in the District Court Case and Appellees in this subject Appeal No.22-15857.
- (3) Justice Jackson has financial conflicts of interest with American Inns of Court Foundation.
- (4) Justice Jackson is personally involved in the underlying District Court case where Petitioner was seeking an injunctive relief to require D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal to change venue when Justice Jackson was one of the judges asking to be recused.
- (5) Justice Jackson will be added as a Defendant for having joined other five Justices in failure to decide Recusal in Petition No.22-28 and petition No.22-350, therefore, has direct conflicts of interest on the issue involved here in the Petition. With deliberate refusing to decide Request for Recusal, Justice Ketanji Jackson would be unable to decide the following question for this Petition:

Question No. 7: In denying judicial disqualification, should the panel judges lay out all relevant facts as required by *Moran v. Clarke*, 309 F.3d 516, 517 (8th Circuit 2002)?

WHEREFOR, pursuant to the precedent of this Court in how the Court had allowed a Justice to decide Certiorari in Petition No.12-8660 as stated at the beginning of this Request, Petitioner respectfully requests that all Justices except Justice Barrett be recused and let Justice Barrett to decide, and to ensure administration of justice in the Petitioner's Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret shown in the following link

[https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOhD7upxCQNla--vJ ?e=77JI30](https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOhD7upxCQNla--vJ?e=77JI30)

with appendix in

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOhD-PxdM9kZgVTc u?e=jeOSOZ>

should be filed without any more delay.

In Petition No.22-28 that all eight Justices requested to be recused through Petitioner's Renewed Request for Recusal that they all failed to decide is attached hereto.

The undersigned swears under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of her knowledge.

Dated: December 29, 2023


Yi Tai Shao

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

--000--

YI TAI SHAO, AKA LINDA SHAO
Petitioner-Petitioner

vs.

California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Clerk Jorge Navarre, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, Mcmanis Faulkner Law Firm, Tsan-Kuen Wang, David Sussman, in the capacity as attorney of Tsan-Kuen Wang, Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood, Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, Judge Patricia Lucas, Judge Maureen Folan, Judge Rise Pichon

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to California Supreme Court regarding its order of May 17, 2022, which delayed adjudication by three months then summarily denied SHAO's vexatious litigant application for a petition for habeas writ of corpus that was filed on February 16, 2022 (S273215) by Acting Chief Justice who has conflicts of interest

RENEWED REQUEST FOR RECUSAL AGAINST CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SAMUEL ALITO, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SONIA SOTOMEYER, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE NEIL GORSUCH, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRET KAVANAUGH, ASSOCIATE JACKSON

Yi Tai Shao, Esq., In Pro Per

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 280; Big Pool, MD 21711

Telephone: (408) 873-3888

Fax (408) 418-4070 Email:attorneyshao@outlook.com

Attachment

Table of Contents

A.	I. 8 Justice ignored their absolute and paramount duty to decide recusal, this is the 10 th recurrence of such irregularity/felony since 2017.	1
B.	ii. Additional direct conflicts of interest of the 8 Justices in committing or aiding/abetting the 200 felonies, including 43 in Petition No.22-28 as Petitioner is the victim of these felonies and they are felons who had been harbored by the U.S. Attorney.	2
C.	iii. these acts done in the cases are not excuses not to decide but otherwise constitute "pervasive bias exception"	4
D.	IV. New discovery/evidence of this Court's systematically using "Distributed for Conference" without waiting 14 days in violation of Rule 15.5 to block Petitioner's access to the Court in view of the crimes of purging filed court record and docket and entry of false docket in conspiracy in one morning of November 3, 2022.	5
	2. The motivation of 4 felonies on 11/3/2022 was tacitly admitted by Chief Justice Roberts—to keep the case "closed" without Petition for Rehearing, in order to block filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett.	8
	3. This Court's systematic misusing "Distributed for Conference" in a premature way with intent to "dump" or "quickly dispose or close the Petition."	10
	4. Such malice is also shown on 8/24/2022, imultaneouslywhen Robert Meek returned the second filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret with false notice, the Court "Distributed for Conference" the Petition for Writ of Certiorari-- signifying blocking Petitioner's access to the impartial Court.	11
E.	V. The proceeding of Petition 21-881 with 30 felonious acts proves existence of conspiracies between James McManis and the 7 PRESENT Justices (JACKSON NOT INCLUDED) through American Inns of Court, which corroborated with CALIFORNIA CHIEF JUSTICE Tani CANTIL-SAKAUYE's admission in the underlying order of 8/25/2021 for Petition No.21-881 AS WELL AS A KEY EVIDENCE IN PETITION 22-28, that the Court maliciously suppressed the merits.	13
	1. 11/2/2005 Order in Petition No.04-607—	14
	1. Concealed the name of James McManis from being a Respondent, who is a founder of the American Inns of Court where all 7 Justices received financial benefits.	15
	2. Respondents had illegally blocked and concealed 7 filings in Petition 21-881 with false notice of "beyond the court's jurisdiction"; this has a public view that 7 Justices conspired with James McManis in these acts or harbored these acts due to their conflicts of interest.	18
F.	VI. Illegal blockage of Petitioner's seeking grievance in front of Justice Amy Coney Barret 8 times, including twice in Petition 21-881 and 6 times in Petition 22-82, which is proven to be directed by Chief Justice John G. Roberts and in conspiracy with McManis when they shared the hacker's information on stalking over petitioner.	20
G.	VII. Respondents had blocked and concealed 7 filings of Motions for Judicial Notice, including one in Petition 21-881.	22
H.	VIII. Systematically concealed filings (7 in Petition No.21-881 and 8 in Petition No.22-28)	24
I.	IX. EVIDENCE proves that the 7 disqualified Justices in Petition No.21-881, repeatedly conspired in each not deciding recusal with the malice to illegally retain their voting power to manipulate orders to implement the common goal of blocking Petitioner from accessing the court, and permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner:	25

1. New discovery that the Justices had a record of 182 acts of spontaneous recusal proves that the Justices failures to decide his/her recusal in Petitioner's 10 R.R.s were indeed willful and with malice, and that in Petition No.21-881 the 6 Justices other than Roberts should have all recused when Roberts recused on 4/18/2022.....25

Evidence of 8 Justices' malice in refusing to decide recusal for 10 times.....25

2. Tani's admission and McManis Respondents' tacit admission that must be considered according to F.R.E.801(d)(2) supply the justices' "malice" in willful not deciding on recusal, willfully not vacating 2/22/2022 order in Petition 21-881 in order to suppress these admissions and maintain denying certiorari, and willfully retaining the 8 Justices' illegal voting power to suppress the crimes of 12 years' judicial child abduction in order to ensure denial of certiorari in Petition No.22-28. 34

3. 2/23/2004 docket entry of Petition No.03-475, Cheney v. U.S.D.C. for the D.C., 541 U.S. 913 re-affirms the Justices' knowledge that each of them holds in his/her hands on decision of recusal, and that there is not one Justice made a decision on recusal i the past 10 Requests for Recusal could not logically happen without conspiracies among all disqualified justices: 35

4. The 2/23/2004 entry affirmed Wisconsin Supreme Court's research in State v. Allen (2010) 2010 WI 10, and the Justices were informed at least 20 times, which affirmed existence of conspiracies in not deciding R.R.s.35

5. Respondents' purging court records reflects their malice of conspiracy in not deciding the court records removed.....36

(i) Purging Requests for Recusal on 9/30/2022 in Petition No.22-28 reflects the Justices'

conspiracies not to decide the 10th R.R.36

a. (ii) Respondents deterred R.R.'s filing by 23 days in Petition No.19-639 reflected the

malice not to decide that 7th R.R.36

(iii) Purging filed Petition for Rehearing at the night of 3/22/2022 in Petition 21-881 reflects

the malice in denying the Petition for Rehearing.....37

6. 5 of the 7 justices in 21-881 had previously recused in Petition 20-524, the 5 Justices who are now Respondents in Petition 22-350 therefore has malice in willful not deciding recusal in both Petitions 21-881 as well as in Petition 22-28 that came after 20-524. 37

7. exposure of the plot in Petition 20-524 provides motivation for the 5 Justices' egregious malice of going back to their prior-20-524 conspiracies in not deciding recusals. 37

8. Objective of the disqualified Justices' malice retaining their voting power is obvious to cover up all crimes which include in this Court alone, 200 felonious acts of 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2701(b), §1001 and §371; 30 in Petition No.21-881 and 43 in Petition No.22-28 unambiguously corroborated with Tani's admission that Respondents did conspire with McManis, Tani and Kennedy to block Petitioner's access to the court in the past 12 years and perpetrated child abduction for 12 years.39

J. X. The hackers hired by McManis is closely connected with Supreme Court, likely Chief Justice Roberts, Justice Alito and Justice Kagan, who had been stalking on Petitioner in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2261A while McManis had tacitly/adoptively admitted that he hired burglars to burglarize Petitioner's residence to destroy database and installed surveillance devices..... 40

K. CONCLUSION..... 43

Cases

(National Education Assoc. v. Lee County Board of Public Instruction, 467 F.2d 477 (5th Cir. 1972))	2
(O'Hair v. Hill, 641 F.2d 307 (5th Cir. 1981) in ft.1),	1
, <i>State v. Allen</i> (2010) 2010 WI 10.....	26
<i>Arizona v. Ash Grove Cement Co.</i> , 459 U.S. 1190 (1983).....	1
<i>Isuzu Motors, Inc.v.Ntsebeza</i> , 553 U.S. 1028 (2008)	1
<i>Mardikian v. Commission on Judicial Performance</i> (1985) 40 Cal.3d 473, 477.....	1
<i>Petition No.03-476, Cheney v. U.S.D.C. for the D.C.</i> , 541 U.S. 913.....	26
The 11/2/2005 docket.....	14

Statutes

18 U.S.C. §1001 and §371, ¶1	1
18 U.S.C. §1001 and §371, ¶1.....	43
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c) and §2701.....	24
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2701(b), §1001 and §371	39
28 U.S.C. §455	43
28 U.S.C. §2109, ¶2	38
28 U.S.C. §2109, ¶2,	37
28 U.S.C. §455(a).....	44

Other Authorities

the First and Fifth Amendment in the Constitution.....	24
--	----

Rules

<u>Rule 22.1 of Supreme Court Rules</u>	12
---	----

Petitioner respectfully renewed her request for recusal asking all 8 Justices to be recused based on not only evidence of conspiracy with extrajudicial source but also based on pervasive bias, especially when Petitioner is a victim to **200 felonies** of this Court that has been committed or covered up/harbored by all 8 Justices, which caused **direct conflicts of interest**. The Justices's joint failure to decide recusal in conspiracy is not only violation of Due Process Clause of the Constitution, not only a willful violation of 28 U.S.C. §455 when they were sensitive and had voluntarily and spontaneously recused with 182 acts in the past since 2000, but is a crime of 18 U.S.C. §1001 and §371, ¶1, a felony of conspiracy to disrupt the fundamental and paramount duty to decide recusal. Moreover, on 9/30/2022, at about 3:45 p.m., the Court further feloniously removed the filed court records of Supplement to R.R. and R.R. and altered the docket by removing the docket entry of Supplement to R.R., 3 felonies in one afternoon, similar to 11/3/2022's incident where 4 felonies were done in one morning.

I. 8 JUSTICE IGNORED THEIR ABSOLUTE AND PARAMOUNT DUTY TO DECIDE RECUSAL, THIS IS THE 10TH RECURRENCE OF SUCH IRREGULARITY/FELONY SINCE 2017.

In United States v. Will, 449 U.S. 200 (1980), this Court stated the Congressional intent since 1837 A.D. that **a judge/justice's duty to decide is "absolute" and paramount**. See also, Am. Isuzu Motors, Inc.v.Ntsebeza, 553 U.S. 1028 (2008); Arizona v. Ash Grove Cement Co., 459 U.S. 1190 (1983).

Refusing to rule is a clear violation of judicial duty. Mardikian v. Commission on Judicial Performance (1985) 40 Cal.3d 473, 477. The Court has a duty to decide recusal (O'Hair v. Hill, 641 F.2d 307 (5th Cir. 1981) in ft.1), which is "absolute" (Comer u. Murphy Oil USA, 607 F.2d 1049, 1057 (5th Cir. 2010)) and is

"Constitutionally imposed" (National Education Assoc. v. Lee County Board of Public Instruction, 467 F.2d 477 (5th Cir. 1972)).

When the court's website shows the truth that the Justices, including Jackson, had taken 182 acts to spontaneously recused themselves without a motion, there is a public view that the Justices's failure to decide the R.R. and Supplement to R.R. but went ahead to vote against certiorari on 10/3/2022 were to retain their voting power in order to manipulate to accomplishing the goal of James McManis, leading attorney and initial founder of American Inns of Court—in continuing parental deprivation—a joint conspiracy to child abduction.

II. ADDITIONAL DIRECT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OF THE 8 JUSTICES IN COMMITTING OR AIDING/ABETTING THE 200 FELONIES, INCLUDING 43 IN PETITION NO.22-28 AS PETITIONER IS THE VICTIM OF THESE FELONIES AND THEY ARE FELONS WHO HAD BEEN HARBORED BY THE U.S. ATTORNEY.

The following table shows 43 felonious acts in this Petition 22-28; please copy and past the link for 200 felonies

https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgR_P14DZsCP832qr?e=gi7RPJ (See also,

Supplement to R.R. filed on 9/15/2022):

Codes violated	Felonious acts
18 U.S.C §1001 & §371, ¶1	Assigned to special agent Emily Walker (did not deny conflicts of interest) who delayed docketing by 4 days, and delayed posting the Petition for Writ of Certiorari until a week later. (2 acts)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Conspired with Emily Walker to conceal posting Page v. of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari , in concealing the Respondents' names of Judges Patricia Lucas, Theodore Zayner, Rise Pichon & Maureen A. Folan, in disregard of at least 7 requests to post the Page v. (2 act)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c),	Conspired and Concealed filing of Request for Recusal after withholding for 15 days, and delayed 56 days in posting the Request for Recusal. (4 acts)

§2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, Jeff Atkins and Jordan Danny Bickell conspired with Lorie Wood (Attorney) to try to find fault in the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett which is <i>beyond the ministerial duty to file of the Clerk's Office</i> , violated Rule 22.1 willfully, and returned on 8/4/2022, after withholding 6 days, the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett; further refused to enter into the docket of the rejection of filing (3 acts)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	Emergency Application attorney Robert Meek conspired with Roberts, Harris, Atkins, Bickell to illegally block Petitioner's right to seek grievance in front of Justice Barrett by blocking filing of Application to Justice Amy Barrett on 8/24/2022, 9/7/2022, with false notices in concealing the nature of the Application (concealing the grievances for emergency relief to release child custody as well as change court) with false excuse that the Application is moot because R.R. had been entered into the docket , in violation of Rule 22.1 to block Petitioner's access to the court. (4 acts) *Refused to enter into the docket: not accepted for filing (2 acts)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	After withholding 12 days from filing, in conspiracy, Emily Walker returned, de-filed a motion for judicial notice on 8/5/2022, with false excuse that the motion is beyond jurisdiction of this Court (when this Court had filed motion for Judicial Notice before at least in 2 other cases); and further refused to enter into the docket of rejection of filing (3 acts) ; Petitioner resubmitted which she returned with the same false notice on 9/8/2022, and further failed to docket not accepted for filing with clear intent to block access to the court and conceal filing. (3 additional acts)
18 USC §1001 & §371, ¶1	With an intent to block Petitioner's access to the court, knowing Barrett being the only justice who is impartial, the Court willfully set for conference on 8/24/2022, immediately when Robert Meek returned, blocking filing, of the amended Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett on the same date, in violation of Rule 22.1, meaning to deprive Petitioner's right to seek grievance in front of Justice Barrett in accordance with Rule 20 and 22. (conspiracy+ set for conference for the purpose of blocking access; 2 acts)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c),	On 9/30/2022, this Court purged the filed Supplement to Request for Recusal and altered the docket and removed the posted record for R.R., which signified their plot to not to decide on

§2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	recusal in order to summarily deny certiorari, just like in 21-881; and put it back immediately after hacker knew Petitioner noticed the alteration of the docket (4 acts-3 alterations plus conspiracy)
18 U.S.C. §1001 & §371, ¶1	Delayed 5 days in issuing decision on 10/3/2022 with conspiracy not to decide on recusals (1 act)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	10/13/2022 Robert Meek illegally returned the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett based on the excuse that the case was closed and concealed filing. (3 acts)
18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2071(b), §1001 & §371, ¶1	10/25/2022 Robert Meek illegally returned the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett with a false notice that the case was closed; yet the Petition for Rehearing was filed on 10/23/2022; refused to enter into the docket “not accepted for filing” (3 acts)
	<p>On 11/3/2022, after Petitioner inquired the Court of the filing status of the Application on 11/1/2022 (see in Appendix XIV), the Court purged the filing record of Petition for Rehearing and altered the docket. (2 acts: purging + conspiracy) in the morning of 11/3/2022.</p> <p>Then, after exposure of the criminal act, the Court put back the Petition for Rehearing, concealment of filing of Application to Amy Coney Barrett that was re-filed on 10/29/2022, and rushed setting for conference with a fraudulent antedated entry of 11/2/2022, merely 8 days following entry of the docket of Petition for Rehearing (10/25/2022). This Court ironically sent for Conference before the due date of Opposition of the Petition for Rehearing that there is a public view that the Court participated in the conspiracy to block Petitioner’s access to the Court in the past 12 years and predetermined denial of Rehearing. (2 act)</p> <p>The court put a false docket entry with an antedated date of sending out for conference. (1 act)</p>
	On 11/4/2022 Robert Meek unreasonably concealed and blocked the 6 th Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett; the Application had not been returned (2 act)

III. THESE ACTS DONE IN THE CASES ARE NOT EXCUSES NOT TO DECIDE BUT OTHERWISE CONSTITUTE “PERVASIVE BIAS EXCEPTION”

In *Liteky v. United States* 510 U.S. 540 (1994), this Court held that cases in which the "source" of the bias or prejudice was clearly the proceedings themselves (for example, testimony introduced or an event occurring at trial which produced unsuppressible judicial animosity), the supposed [extrajudicial judicial] doctrine would not necessarily be applied. See, e. g., *Davis v. Board of School Comm'rs of Mobile County*, 517 F. 2d 1044, 1051 (CA5 1975), cert. denied, 425 U.S. 944 (1976) (extrajudicial source doctrine has "pervasive bias" exception). Petitioner does not consider these felonies and Justices' refusal to decide recusal for 10 times already are defined to be in the proceedings themselves. Yet, for argument sake, the crimes taken place in the proceeding should otherwise qualified as pervasive bias exceptions.

IV. NEW DISCOVERY/EVIDENCE OF THIS COURT'S SYSTEMATICALLY USING "DISTRIBUTED FOR CONFERENCE" WITHOUT WAITING 14 DAYS IN VIOLATION OF RULE 15.5 TO BLOCK PETITIONER'S ACCESS TO THE COURT IN VIEW OF THE CRIMES OF PURGING FILED COURT RECORD AND DOCKET AND ENTRY OF FALSE DOCKET IN CONSPIRACY IN ONE MORNING OF NOVEMBER 3, 2022.

This Court's administration, apparently led by Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Clerk Scott Harris, two Deputy Clerks, had plotted to use "Distributed for Conference" to perpetrate expedited dismissal of *almost all* Petitioner's Petitions with intent to block Petitioner's access to the court in violation of Rule 15.5 without waiting for 14 days to cause "summary denial" in a premature way. This plot of evil now is shown for the coming Petition for Rehearing.

Such conspiracy was discovered on 11/3/2022 morning, when Roberts and this Court committed 4 felonies—purging from Petition No.22-28

docket the filed court record of Petition for Rehearing which was discovered at 9:52 a.m. (The evidence of 11/3/2022's 4 felonies in one morning is posted at Exhibit 1) , altering/removing the docket entry for Petition for Rehearing (in violation of Rule 1 of Supreme Court Rules, and 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(c), 2701(b) and 1001; this Court put the altered court records back one hour after Petitioner made objections to this Court in writing at 10:22:48 a.m. to Emily Walker (See a true copy of Petitioner's email to Emily Walker at the first page of **Exhibit 3.**). Yet, in reluctantly putting the altered court record back, there was a new docket entry of "Distributed for Conference" (See **Exhibit 1, the second page**) even though the Petition for Rehearing was only docketed 8 or 9 days prior.

Clearly, to cover up these crimes that took place on 11/3/2022, the new docket entry was antedated to 11/2/2022, which became **the 199th felony** of the Respondents of this Petition. However, the docket of 11/2/2022 did not have "Distributed for Conference". (See Exhibit 2 for a true copy of 11/2/2022's screenshot of the docket.

Then Petitioner discovered that Rule 15.5's 14 days' waiting time had been violated by this Court frequently in almost all Petitions filed by Petitioner.

- 1. The felonies on 11/3/2022 were prompted by this Court's attempting to block Petitioner's 6th filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, as tacitly admitted by Chief Justice Roberts.**

This purging Petition for Rehearing incident appears to be prompted by this Court's trying to find justification not to file Petitioner's 6th filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett in Petition 22-28. It was because the court had blocked

Petitioner from 5 filings of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett with no more excuse other than the case was closed—as contained in the last false notice of Mr. Robert Meek dated 10/25/2022 with true copies in Exhibit 4, who had concealed his job title in returning the Application to Justice Barrett.

His 10/25/2022 notice for this 5th return was false as the Petition for Rehearing was filed on 10/23/2022. The 5th filing of Application to Justice Barrett was made simultaneously with the filing of Petition for Rehearing. See in Exhibit 5 the true copies of the cover letter dated 10/22/2022 and emails to Case Analyst Emily Walker inquiry where the Application was after seeing the Petition for Rehearing was filed in Exhibit 5.

On 10/28/2022, after Petitioner received the 5th return from Robert Meek, Petitioner sent an email to Meek objecting his letter notice of 10/25/2022 is false and Petitioner asked him to respond whether he intentionally returned the 5th filing with fraudulent intent in creating a false notice to block process. (See a true and accurate copy of the 10/28/2022 in Exhibit 6) Meek failed to respond.

Therefore, on 10/29/2022, Petitioner made the 6 filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett with a cover letter and filed endorsed cover of the Application attached hereto in Exhibit 7.

Two days prior to the 11/3/2022 incident, Petitioner sent a long email dated 11/1/2022 at 3:51 p.m. to Chief Justice Roberts, Robert Meek, Clerk Scott S. Harris, Laurie Wood, Deputy Clerk Jeff Atkins, and Deputy Danny Jordan Bickell, complaining that Chief Justice Robert had conspired with James McManis and

Respondent California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye in blocking Petitioner's child custody return in the past 12 years by "vehemently blocking filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett", and that Meek knew he was guilty in participating this conspiracy so that he did not answer nor respond to Petitioner's phone calls. That is a demanding email demanding the court to file the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett which was submitted on 10/29/2022 as the sixth filing. See **Exhibit 3**, the 2nd and 3rd page for this 11/1/2022 demanding email.

At the second page of the 11/1/2022 email these people were forwarded Petitioner's email to Robert Meek on 10/28/2022 04:26:09 PM where Petitioner wrote:

"Mr. Meek

Your return on 10/25/2022 is weird as the Petition for Rehearing for Petition 22-28 is not closed as you stated in your letter of October 25, 2022. You have wasted 16 hours of mine in sending you the Application. I do not know who gave you the 5th submission of the Application but it was re-submitted simultaneously with the Petition for Rehearing.

Your letter is unintelligible. Please respond immediately if you did unintentionally."

(See **Exhibit 3**, pages 3 & 4)

- 2. The motivation of 4 felonies on 11/3/2022 was tacitly admitted by Chief Justice Roberts—to keep the case "closed" without Petition for Rehearing, in order to block filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett.**

F.R.E.801 states in relevant part that:

"(d) Statements That Are Not Hearsay. A statement that meets the following conditions is not hearsay:

(2) An Opposing Party's Statement. The statement is offered against an opposing party and

(A) was made by the party in an individual or representative capacity;

(B) is one the party manifested that it adopted or believed to be true

(c) was made by a person whom the party authorized to make a statement on the subject;

(D) was made by the party's agent or employee on a matter within the scope of that relationship and while it existed; or

(E) was made by **the party's coconspirator** during and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

The statement must be considered but does not by itself establish the declarant's authority under (C); the existence or scope of the relationship under (D); or participation in it under (E)."

Tacit admission is a statement made in the party's presence was heard and understood by the party, who was at liberty to respond, in circumstances naturally calling for a response, and the party failed to respond. E.g., *Jenkins v. Anderson*, 447 US 231 (1980); *Alberty v. United States*, 162 US 499, 16 S. Ct. 864, 40 L. Ed. 1051 (1896).

Here, as shown in Exhibit 3, page 1, after this Court committed the 4 felonies mentioned above on 11/3/2022 morning, at 12:28 p.m., Petitioner sent an email to Chief Justice Roberts, Robert Meet, Legal Counsel Nathan Torrey and Clerk Scott Harris, as well as U.S. Attorney asking where is Petitioner's Application to Justice Barrett (should be 6th, instead of 5th) including severe criminal accusations by stating the following:

"Chief Justice:

It is a tremendous shame for you to commit 4 felonies in one day.

You tried to purge the Petition for Rehearing in order to block the Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett. Then you saw your plot and crime in purging filed court record failed, you concealed the filing of Application to Justice Barrett, could not wait the due date for Opposition and rushed for "conference" with a backdate of November 2, 2022.

Please remember the docket(sic: dockets) I printed out include that of November 2 and 3.

You forged the court record again to cover up your crimes.

I urged Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett be ENTERED INTO THE DOCKET NOW. Please be reminded that new blood to the sleeping Congress will energe soon. Do not expect these 195 felonies will be buried forever."

Exhibit 8 proves that all recipients at this Court for the above emails **did** receive Petitioner's email. As shown in Exhibit 8, Petitioner sent an email to Mr. Meek on 10/14/2022 at 12:07 p.m. and Mr. Meek responded **5 minutes later** at 12:12 p.m. with a copy of his letter dated 10/11/2022.

With such severe criminal accusations, none of them responded, including Chief Justice Roberts. Such non-responsiveness is willful, a willful avoidance to respond to severe criminal accusation out of sense of guilt. Thus, this should constitute Chief Justice's tacit admission about his commission of the 4 felonies and the motivation being to block Petitioner's seeking grievance in front of Justice Amy Coney Barrett.

WHEREFOR, it reasonably appeared that case closure being the only excuse left for this Court to block filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett. Therefore, in order to use the only justification left, the Court purged the record of Petition for Rehearing on 11/3/2022.

3. This Court's systematic misusing "Distributed for Conference" in a premature way with intent to "dump" or "quickly dispose or close the Petition."

As shown in the Table below, this Court's usage of "Distributed for Conference" to block Petitioner's access to the court prematurely took place in almost all Petitions filed by Petitioner, without waiting for the 14 days requirement in Rule 15.5:

Waiting days (between filing and dispatchment)	Petition No.	Filing date for Petition for Rehearing	Date of "Dispatchment for Conference"
--	--------------	--	--

5 days	14-7244	3/15/2015	3/20/2015
7 days	17-82	10/25/2017	11/1/2017
1 day	17-256	11/28/2017	11/29/2017
5 days	17-613	2/2/2018	2/7/2018
8 days	18-800	3/19/2019	3/27/2019
7 days	19-639	2/12/2020	2/19/2020
Block filing	20-524	1/19/2020	Returned 1/29/2020
7 days	21-881	3/18/2020	3/29/2020
8 days	22-28	10/23/2022	11/2/2022

The above highlighted case numbers are those arising from the related legal malpractice case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel (Santa Clara County Court, 2012-1-cv-220571) where James McManis is the same Respondent to this Petition 22-28 and his name was concealed by this Court systematically as a Respondent in Petitions 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, and 21-881.

After involuntarily resumed the docket one hour after 10:22 a.m.(Exh.3, P.1, Petitioner's email inquiry over case analyst Emily Walker), the Court intended to use "Distributed to Conference" with the malice to prematurely suppress the matter, as a pattern systematically done by this court, in corroboration with Tani's admission.

4. **Such malice is also shown on 8/24/2022, imultaneouslywhen Robert Meek returned the second filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barret with false notice, the Court "Distributed for Conference" the Petition for Writ of Certiorari– signifying blocking Petitioner's access to the impartial Court.**

On 8/24/2022, in returning the second filing of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett in Petition 22-28, Chief Justice Roberts conspired with its Emergency Application Attorney Robert Meek to give a false notice to block filing, instead of delivering the Application to Justice Barrett promptly as required by Rule 22.1. Chief Justice Roberts *also caused this Court to simultaneously* entered

into the docket “DISTRIBUTED FOR CONFERENCE”, meaning that Application to Justice Barrett was blocked and will not be considered, in direct violation of Rule 22.1 of Supreme Court Rules.

Meek’s 8/24/2022 notice is false, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1506, in that Meek falsely mischaracterized the Application to be for only one relief—to let Justice Barrett decide the Petition, and he pre-determined that the Application is moot on the ground that the Court had entered into the docket of Request for Recusal, suggesting that the 8 Justices would have recused leaving Justice Barrett being the only remaining Justice, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Clerk’s Office.

In Meek’s false notice of 8/24/2022, in order to use the aforementioned excuse to return filing of Application to Barrett, Meek willfully concealed two major grievances of Petitioner’s Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett: to release the minor immediately from the unlawful and dangerous child custody and to change court pursuant to case laws to the Second Circuit Court of Appeal.

Meek did know the other emergent relief but willfully blocked Petitioner’s access. See, e.g., Exhibit 6, p.1, in Petitioner’s email 11/3/2022, 1:07 p.m., Petitioner wrote “Where is the application? The Application will change venue and release my child from the dangerous and unhealthy custody confinement. In Exhibit 6, p2, Meek, Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris were reminded that “Human life is at jeopardy.” In Exhibit 7, p.1, on 10/28/2022 cover letter when Petitioner did the 6th filing of Application to Justice Barrett, Petitioner complained that Meek had for 4 times willfully concealed the nature of the Application. In p.2, Petitioner wrote:

“I had attached a letter of Ms. Wood in my last submission on October 23, 2022 and hereby given you again—she correctly stated that the Application has 3 reliefs requested, including application for emergency relief to immediately release my child from illegal confinement of dangerous child custody based on imminent risk of harm, as well as an application to change court. If you have trouble understand the nature of the Application, please call me immediately. I also have left a voice mail to you on October 28, 2022 at 4:15 p.m. about your wrongful return.

As an emergency application attorney, I believe you were fully aware that the Application asked for emergency relief to release a child from confinement and I believe that was the reason why you had my Application, but you willfully conceal this issue of emergency relief and had unwantingly delayed Justice Barrett from deciding on the issue for already 3 months!

....asked you to recuse yourself due to your apparent bias and prejudice in willful violation of Rule 22.1 3 times before 10/22/2022 and apparent conspiracy with Chief Justice in keeping blocking my reasonable access to the court pursuant to First Amendment of the Constitution..... you had illegally returned the 4th time, with illegal concealment of filings also 4 times, in repeated violation of 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1001 and 371, Paragraph 1.”

Thus, in Petition 22-28 alone, there were already two recurrences of misusing
“DISTRIBUTED FOR CONFERENCE” to reflect Roberts’ motivation to
block Petitioner’s access to the Court.

V. THE PROCEEDING OF PETITION 21-881 WITH 30 FELONIOUS ACTS PROVES EXISTENCE OF CONSPIRACIES BETWEEN JAMES MCMANIS AND THE 7 PRESENT JUSTICES (JACKSON NOT INCLUDED) THROUGH AMERICAN INNS OF COURT, WHICH CORROBORATED WITH CALIFORNIA CHIEF JUSTICE TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE’S ADMISSION IN THE UNDERLYING ORDER OF 8/25/2021 FOR PETITION NO.21-881 AS WELL AS A KEY EVIDENCE IN PETITION 22-28, THAT THE COURT MALICIOUSLY SUPPRESSED THE MERITS.

The 7 present Justices involved in the conspiracies in the related Petition No.21-881 are Chief Justice John G. Roberts,Jr., Associates Justices Thomas, Alito, Kagan, Sotomeyer, Gorsuch and Kavanaugh.

Any reasonable person seeing what happened in Petition No.21-881 will conclude all the 30 felonies in Petition No.21-881 are caused by conspiracies between Chief Justice Roberts and McManis and Tani and the other 6 Justices aided or abetted the conspiracies by illegally maintained the 2/22/2022 order denying certiorari:

1. 11/2/2005 Order in Petition No.04-607—

Proves that but for the conspiracies among the 7 Justices to retain voting power to illegally manipulate the proceeding, the 2/22/2022 order in petition no.21-881 should have been vacated, pursuant to stare decisis doctrine, in following the precedent of 11/2/2005 order in petition no.04-607 where the court spontaneously vacated the 10/31/2005 order regarding the petition for writ of certiorari, when chief justice roberts acknowledged recusal two days later on 11/2/2005. The 11/2/2005 docket states:

“having been advised by the chief justice that he now realizes that he should have recused himself from participation in this case, and does now recuse himself, the court vacated its order of Monday, October 31, 2005...the court has reconsidered the petition for writ of certiorari... the chief justice has not participated in the vote to withdraw the order of October 31, 2005 or in the instant reconsideration of the petition for certiorari.”

The same as in 04-607, in Petition No.21-881, Chief Justice Roberts acknowledged recusal on 4/18/2022, almost two months following 2/22/2022 order regarding certiorari; however, instead of vacating the 2/22/2022 order as what the court did in its 11/2/2005 order in 04-607, the Court denied rehearing on the same date of Roberts' recusal, which was to affirm 2/22/2022 Order where Roberts had

participated in voting, in opposite to 11/2/2005 Order. The 4/18/2022 Order irregularly shows:

“Rehearing Denied. The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition”. (App.19)

- 1. Concealed the name of James McManis from being a Respondent, who is a founder of the American Inns of Court where all 7 Justices received financial benefits.**

In drafting this part of argument in another Petition for Writ of Mandamus against the 8 Justices (to be filed simultaneously or a bit later), the hacker kept deleting this portion such that Petitioner had to record her 4th re-typing on her FaceBook. See the video link of

<https://www.facebook.com/100002594967624/videos/pcb.5599764970119946/2007485339450198>

No court would conceal the names of Respondents but for existence of a conspiracy; Tani’s admission filled in the conspiracy; this Court plotted to suppress Tani’s admission and Respondents’ adoptive/tacit admissions as to Tani’s admission in Petition No.21-881. The doctrine of spoliation of evidence also creates a presumption that the persons whose names are purged or spoliated as Respondents had conspired with the court to breach its duty to maintain integrity of the docket.

Such concealment of Respondents took place in all cases arising from Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel (Santa Clara County Court, 2012-1-cv-220571)[“the Legal Mal Case”] since 2017 including

Petitions Nos. 17-82 (names removal took place after case closure), 17-256 (names removal took place after case closure), 18-344, 18-880 and 21-881.

This concealment is unambiguously a conspiracy with Tani and with California Sixth District Court of Appeal, as both California appellate courts also removed and concealed all individual names of McManis from all dockets that are cases arising from this legal mal case.

On 11/8/2022, when the hacker saw this argument, this Court put back “et. al.” on Petition 17-256 docket, trying to spoil this incriminating evidence awkwardly. There are only 4 Respondents that all Respondents should have been posted on the docket instead of using “et. al.”

In this Petition where McManis’s buddy California judges are Respondents, the *same pattern* of concealment of Respondents’ names re-cured. Despite being informed via certified letter dated 8/2/2022, Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Harris, deputy clerks, Legal Counsel Ethan Torrey, continue conspiring to conceal Page v. of Petition for Writ of Certiorari in Petition No.22-28 that contains 4 buddy judges to McManis, in disregard of at least 7 requests from Petitioner asking posting of Page v. that contains the names of these 4 Respondents-- Judges Theodore Zayner, Patricia Lucas, Rise Pichon and Maureen Folan who had contributed significantly to feloniously implement McManis’s conspiracies to block Petitioner’s child custody return.

Attorney Meera Fox has attested, in 2017, in ¶4 and ¶31, to the existence of judicial conspiracies in blocking Petitioner’s child custody return and McManis’s

motivation. See, Petition for Writ of Certiorari NO.22-28, App.161, 171-72. Their malicious concealment of the 4 judges' names from being Respondents in No.22-28 when all 40 books of Petition for Writ of Certiorari contain the Page v, demonstrates their conspiracies with McManis as attested by Ms. Fox—to block Petitioner's child custody return, and to block Petitioner's access to the court.

This pattern of concealing McManis's names from all Petitions started from 10/25/2017 when Jeff Atkins instructed the docketing clerk who uttered excited statement to Petitioner, immediately after such instruction as Petitioner telephoned in. Such instruction which was stated on the complaint in Shao v. Roberts et al. (now Petition No.22-350) was never disputed by any Respondents in that proceeding.

Atkins' instruction from extrajudicial resource was firstly recorded in Supplemental Appendix filed in Petition No.17-613 on 10/30/2017. The document was not scanned and not posted on the docket of 17-613. The story was repeated in Pages 36 and 37 of the "Renewed Request for Recusal" filed in Petition No.17-613 that was filed on 2/6/2018, which the present 5 justices of this Court (Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Kagan and Sotomeyer) had tacitly admitted to the facts contained therein by willfully not decide the R.R.:

10/25/2017	The docket of "decision date" of 17-613 that was created on 10/24/2017 was altered in the morning of 10/25/2017 from "April 28, 2017" to "June 8, 2017" pursuant to the instruction of Jeff Atkins. Mr. Atkins also instructed the deputy clerk to return the filings of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari based on typos on the captions of the orders of California courts.
------------	---

Mr. Atkins told the Deputy Clerk that the Respondents should be "McManis Faulkner LLP" only and not to include the individual names of James McManis and Michael Reedy.

Yet because of my close monitoring, the typos on the orders were agreed to be fixed by way of filing a Supplemental Appendix. The typos of the orders are that the case caption of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel was used as a template in typing the orders to appeal from, when in fact, they should bear the caption of the divorce case. Mr. Atkins's being a supervisor and not the docketing clerk, his spontaneously directing the docketing deputy clerk to alter the docket on the ensuing morning following the docketing, can only be explained by a logical inference that someone was manipulating Mr. Atkins to alter the docket and that person must have been closely watching my filings with the US Supreme Court and familiar with the state's proceedings.

The Court hated this, and *immediately* "Distributed for Conference" the Petition for Rehearing in No.17-613 with the same expedited pattern as mentioned above in A.2.

McManis is the leading attorney as well as a founder of American Inns of Court Foundation from where 7 disqualified Justices received financial benefits. Roberts never denied his close relationship with Mcmanis as shown in App.209-210.

All 7 Justices were bribed by McManis through the American Inns of Court's functions, including but not limited to Temple Bar Scholarship which was jointly designed by Kennedy, Ginsburg, Judge J. Craig Wallace and McManis, the founders of AIC in 1996.(See Reasons why a Writ Should Be Issued)

2. Respondents had illegally blocked and concealed 7 filings in Petition 21-881 with false notice of "beyond the court's jurisdiction"; this has a public view that 7 Justices conspired with James McManis in these acts or harbored these acts due to their conflicts of interest.

In 21-881, this Court unreasonably blocked 7 filings

(i) Appendix to Request for Recusal, at [https:// studenthagerstownccmy-sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/lshao student hagerstowncc edu/EXaOzu7vRNikfH4ZYPHStsBw y5X61n2ZxRRHeizzirrg?e=kLQcxZ](https://studenthagerstownccmy-sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/lshao_student_hagerstowncc_edu/EXaOzu7vRNikfH4ZYPHStsBw_y5X61n2ZxRRHeizzirrg?e=kLQcxZ)

(ii) Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett

https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgR2OqEaEZDqEZI_j?e=QdI7Ct

Appendix to the Application

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRp9jbzBYHg2F65T?e=a5mr6W>

(iii) Petition for Writ of Mandate (28 U.S.C. §1651(a))

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRYN9CnbOZm2ilR0?e=JcT6sB>

(iv,v,vi) 3 motions (Motion for Judicial Notice, Motion to Transfer court to Second Circuit Court of Appeal, and Motion to file Motion to Transfer) in ECF 3-2 filed with the U.S.D.C. for Eastern California in Shao v. Roberts, et al. (2:22-cv-00325), in the following link:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRe0mlUypmlyh1cc?e=A4QFaP>

Motion to transfer court(App.114-134)

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRlBYDGexKXKb2bH?e=sB5xo3>

Motion to file Motion to Transfer(App.135-163)

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRiEVJKbeeqFoUZr?e=6DLv7Q>

(vii) Second Application to Justice Barrett filed on 3/30/2022 (App.47-85)

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgRzgNhNPm3DO3RgH?e=AxeuYp>

Regarding the issues of concealing/blockage of filings in Petition No.22-28, which is similar to 21-881, this Court returned filings and reacted adversely after

Roberts received the letter of 8/2/2022(App.89-95); Respondents had blocked 6 filings of Application to Justice Barrett and 2 filings of Motion for Judicial Notice.

Including in these felonies, Respondents directed Emily Walker, who has failed to disclose her conflicts of interest upon repeated inquiries, to return the First Application to Justice Barrett and Petition for Writ of Mandate (the same word for Mandamus) filed in 21-881 on 1/26/2022 with a false notice that these two filings were beyond the court's jurisdiction. Such notice is false as Petition was authorized in Rule 20, and Application, Rule 22. The return constitutes a felonious act to avoid process of the two papers in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§1506, 1512(c) and 2701(b).

Ms. Walker used the same false ground of "beyond jurisdiction" in returning twice, de-filed, the Motion for Judicial Notice in 22-82.(Supplement to R.R.) It appears that whenever the Court could not find any justification to de-file, "beyond jurisdiction" is used as a false excuse.

VI. ILLEGAL BLOCKAGE OF PETITIONER'S SEEKING GRIEVANCE IN FRONT OF JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT 8 TIMES¹, INCLUDING TWICE IN PETITION 21-881 AND 6 TIMES IN PETITION 22-82, WHICH IS PROVEN TO BE DIRECTED BY CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS AND IN CONSPIRACY WITH MCMANIS WHEN THEY SHARED THE HACKER'S INFORMATION ON STALKING OVER PETITIONER.

Chief Justice Roberts has blocked 8 filings of Applications to Justice Barrett to block the only neutral justice from providing grievance; two of them are in Petition 21-881.

Blocking application to Justice Barrett to get immediate child custody release 6 times in Petition 22-28 proved directly the conspiracies among Mcmanis and Respondents and Kennedy, Breyer and Ginsburg to block child custody return since 2012, as admitted **by Tani**.

Roberts' involvement is proven by having been given notice of the crimes, through Petitioner's certified letters dated 1/26/2022, 2/4/2022 and 2/12/2022(to Roberts, Clerk Harris, two deputy Clerks. (See R.R.)Case laws were provided to Roberts. **Roberts was personally informed of the docket error in omitting McManis's names.** E.g., 8/2/2022 letter (Supplement to R.R.)

Roberts is obviously connected with the hacker as while Petitioner was writing to Roberts in her letter dated 1/26/2022, on the same day, 1/26/2022, Emily Walker returned filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandate and Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett filed in Petition No.21-881 with a false ground that the papers are beyond the court's jurisdiction.

2/12/2022 letter is a final demand letter before filing the Motion for TRO at U.S.D.C. for the Eastern California District in 2:22-cv00325 on 2/22/2022 was on 2/12/2022.

As mentioned above, Roberts expressly blocked Petitioner's seeking grievance in front of Justice Barrett since 8/24/2022 in Petition 22-28 (appeal from California Supreme Court's blockage of Petitioner's access to the Court on Petition for Habeas Corpus) through the letter of Robert Meek, who concealed his title being Emergency Application Attorney, and in his denial letter, he concealed two major reliefs

requested in Petitioner's Application to Justice Barrett in Petition 22-28: emergency relief to release the minor from confinement of unlawful child custody based on child safety, and to change court due to lack of quorum.

As mentioned above, in blocking filing of Application to Barrett, the Court immediately "Distributed for Conference" the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in Petition No.22-28 on the same date of Meek's return--8/24/2022.

Robert Meek's excuse to return was that the Application was moot because the Request for Recusal had been filed in 22-28; after Respondents failed to decide R.R., this excuse failed, as the 8 Justices failed to decide R.R. and Petitioner resubmitted the Application. Meek's new excuse was that the case was closed. When Petition for Rehearing was filed and no more excuse in Petitioner's 6th re-filing of the Application to Barrett, the Court feloniously took Petition for Rehearing off from the docket on 11/3/2022; then, after putting back, immediately "Distributed for Conference."

Likewise, in 20-524, this court blocked filing of the Second Request for Recusal which had the effect of blocking Barrett from making decision.

This blocking filings of Application to Barrett corroborated Tani's admission of the conspiracies that this Court to blanketly deny all Petitions filed by Petitioner in order to secure McManis's common goal of permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner and block Petitioner from access to the court.

VII. RESPONDENTS HAD BLOCKED AND CONCEALED 7 FILINGS OF MOTIONS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE, INCLUDING ONE IN PETITION 21-881.

Deputy Clerk Danny Bickell had unreasonably blocked filing of Motion for Judicial Notice in Petition Nos. 18-344, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881 and 22-28(2x). Recently in 22-28, after being frozen for 12 days, Clerk Harris eventually gave the reason—beyond the jurisdiction of this Court (App. 189, 190 in Petition 22-350), which, however, conflicts with Rule 21 and this Court's history of filing such motion in at least 2 other cases, Petition No. 14-527 and 22O129.

The abstract for the Motion for Judicial Notice that was blocked from filing in 21-881 includes:

(1)&(2) take judicial notice of the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children filed with Petition 18-569 which was feloniously purged by this Court after the Petition was closed (McManis Faulkner admitted adoptively that McManis conspired with Roberts to do so) with a copy of the Amicus Curiae Motion and (3) this Court's forging 12/14/2020 Order and 1/15/2021 Judgment, by taking them off three times from Petition 20-524 docket and put back three times and blocked Petitioner's access to the court by applying an inapplicable Code of 28 U.S.C. § 2109 to block Petitioner's access to the Court. The order did not contain the names of issuing Justices and appeared to be forged with the names of the three unrecused justices (Gorsuch, Kavanaugh & Barrett).

The Request for Recusal filed on 7/24/2022 in Petition 22-28 contains 22 undisputed facts/truth for judicial notice, but this Court refused to decide. It is clear that the **8 Justices willfully averted decision**, and that caused 7 blockage of filings of the Motions for Judicial Notice.

VIII. SYSTEMATICALLY CONCEALED FILINGS (7 IN PETITION NO.21-881 AND 8 IN PETITION NO.22-28)

In blocking filings, Respondents systematically concealed Petitioner's filing by not entering into the docket "not accepted for filing", in violation of #10 of this Court's Guidelines for Electronic Submission as well as 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c) and §2701, when this Court's website posted 100 docket entries of "not accepted for filing", whether in pro per or with counsel's representation. The most recent entry of "Not accepted for filing" is on 10/5/2022 in Petition No. 21-8051(App.103). The case authorities that such blockage of filing and concealment of filing violated the First Amendment right to access the Court and Due Process Clause have been provided to Chief Justice Roberts at least 4 times in writing, in addition to numerous filings with the Court since 2017 crying out --- it violates the First and Fifth Amendment in the Constitution by blocking Petitioner's filings.

Yet, Respondents have concealed(or harbor the concealment) the following filings

- (1) all appendixes of all 10 Requests for Recusal.
- (2) The R.R. for Petition 17-82 and the first R.R. in 18-344.
- (3) Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in Petition 17-82 (did not return).
- (4) Many pages of appendix for Petitions in 17-613, 18-344, 18-800, 19-613 (did not post).

- (5) All 8 filings of Application to Justice Barrett as mentioned in A.4 (did not return the 3/30/2022 submission in Petition 21-881, and the 10/29/2022 submission in Petition 22-28)
- (6) 7 filings of Motion for Judicial Notice as mentioned in A.5 (did not return all except in Petitions 21-881 and 22-82).
- (7) Petition for Writ of Mandate in 21-881.
- (8) Petition for Rehearing, Second Request for Recusal(Gorsuch and Kavanaugh), and Motion to File Petition for Rehearing in Petition 20-524.

IX. EVIDENCE proves that the 7 disqualified Justices in Petition No.21-881, repeatedly conspired in each not deciding recusal with the malice to illegally retain their voting power to manipulate orders to implement the common goal of blocking Petitioner from accessing the court, and permanent parental deprivation of Petitioner:

1. New discovery that the Justices had a record of 182 acts of spontaneous recusal proves that the Justices failures to decide his/her recusal in Petitioner's 10 R.R.s were indeed willful and with malice, and that in Petition No.21-881 the 6 Justices other than Roberts should have all recused when Roberts recused on 4/18/2022.

The 182 recusal acts proved that the 7 Justices are in fact very familiar with 28 U.S.C.§455 and *frequently* exercised recusals spontaneously without need of R.R.s such that their 10 times not deciding on R.R.s can only be considered as non-incidental, willful, with malice.

Evidence of 8 Justices' malice in refusing to decide recusal for 10 times

The following Table shows the number of acts of voluntary and spontaneous recusal by the following Justices:

Kagan: 91 acts;

Roberts 60 acts

Alito 60 acts

Thomas 5 acts

Breyer 7 acts

Kennedy 9 acts

Gorsuch 4 acts

Kavanaugh 6 acts

Barrett 11 acts

Jackson 1 act

There is no doubt that the Justices were aware and very familiar with 28 U.S.C. §455 that they had no justification not to decide 10 times of my R.R..

Being so sensitive and familiar with 28 U.S.C. §455, **it is impossible for not one Justice decided on his/her recusal in response to 10 formal written Requests for Recusal** (Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256, 17-613(2x), 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881, 22-28) **unless there were conspiracies among all these disqualified Justices** that each of them jointly not to decide recusal.

The practice that each Justice decides his/her own recusal was noted in 2/23/2004 docket entry of Petition No.03-476², *Cheney v. U.S.D.C. for the D.C.*, 541 U.S. 913:

“In accordance with its historic practice the Court refers the motion to recuse in this case to Justice Scalia.” See, also, *State v. Allen* (2010) 2010 WI 10.

²This case docket was somehow altered in 2019 as its chronological order is placed after 19-211 during my search of “recuse” in the “docket search.”

This case docket of 03-476 was somehow altered in 2019 as its chronological order is placed after 19-211 during Petitioner's search of "recuse" in the "docket search."

	Docket entries show "recused" without a motion	Docket entries show "took no part" in orders	Motion to recuse
22A317	Gorsuch		
22-5848	Gorsuch		
22-161	Barrett		
21-1585	Chief Justice Roberts	Jackson	
22A165	Alito		
21A849	Barrett		
21-1353	Barrett	Barrett	
22A29	Barrett		
20-1375		Barrett	
20-794		Alito	
21A592	Chief Justice Roberts		
21A200	Barrett		
21A604	Barrett		
19-720	Kagan		
17-1107		Gorsuch	This irregular sequence indicates this docket was altered somehow in 2019.
19-8467	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts	
19A959	Chief Justice Roberts		
19-7119	Alito	Alito	
19-674	Alito		
19A353	Alito		
19A343	Kagan		
19A327	Alito		
03-475 Cheney v.			The docket is out of chronological order which is likely altered somehow in 2019, probably the

U.S.D.C . for D.C.			Court removed Justice Scalia's order denying recusal
19-211	ChiefJustice Roberts	ChiefJustice Roberts	
18-1509	Kagan	Kagan	
18A123 2	ChiefJustice Roberts		
17-1011	Kavanaugh	Kavanaugh	
17-1484	Kavanaugh		
17-5410	Alito	Alito	
17-290	Alito	Alito	
18A954	Kagan	Kagan	
18-8855	ChiefJustice Roberts	Kavanaugh	
18A863	Chief Justice Roberts		
17-1077	Kavanaugh		
18-7268	Alito		
17-1244	Alito		
09-291		Kagan	
17-1669	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts	
17-1592	Kennedy		
17-1438	Alito	Alito	
16-1189	Alito	Alito	
17-1327	Chief Justice Roberts		
17A1171	Chief Justice Roberts		
17A1058	Kennedy		
17-1370	Alito	Alito	
17A856	Alito		
17A1095	Kennedy		
17A728	Alito		
17-1031	Alito		
17A787	Chief Justice Roberts		
17A513	Alito		
16A1264	Alito		
16A1084	Alito		
13A808	Kagan		

13A807	Kagan		
13A759	Alito		
13A685	Alito		
11-431	Kagan		
10-290	Chief Justice Roberts		
09-5801		Kagan	
09-834	Kagan	Kagan	
09-658	Kagan	Kagan	
09-529	Kagan	Kagan	
09-103	Chief Justice Roberts		
07-219		Alito	
06-43		Chief Justice Roberts and Alito	
04-607		Chief Justice Roberts	The Court spontaneously vacated the 10/31/2004 order on 11/2/2004 because Roberts should not have participated in voting
17A121	Chief Justice Roberts		
16-7372		Alito and Gorsuch	
16A899	Alito		
16A878	Chief Justice Roberts		
16A820	Alito		
16A77	Alito		
16A755	Alito		
16A729	Alito		
16-187	Alito		
16-1241	Chief Justice Roberts		
15A876	Alito		
15A35	Kagan		
15A198	Kagan		
15A121	Alito		
5			
15-9925	Alito	Alito	
15-7824	Kagan	Kagan	
15-7043	Alito	Alito	

15-5032	Kagan	Kagan	
15-1330	Chief Justice Roberts		
14A916	Kagan		
14A915	Breyer		
14A803	Kagan		
14A437	Alito		
14-9900	Kagan		
14-778	Alito		
14-1423	Breyer		
13A43	Kagan		
13A1218	Kagan		
13-959	Alito		
13-7623	Kagan	Kagan	
13-7600	Kagan	Kagan	
13-6417	Kagan	Kagan	
13-6050	Kagan	Kagan	
13-5465	Kagan	Kagan	
13-461		Alito	
13-1115	Alito	Alito	
12A933	Chief Justice Roberts and Scalia		
12A921	Kagan		
12A605	Kagan		
12A284	All justices other than Kagan		
12A149	Chief Justice Roberts		
12A1147	Kagan		
12A1098	Kagan		
12-8660	All justices except Kagan recused		
12-6682	Kagan	Kagan	
12-5508	Kagan	Kagan	
12-355	Chief Justice Roberts		
12-1408	Kagan	Kagan	

12-1352	Chief Justice Roberts and Scalia	Chief Justice Roberts and Breyer	
11A68	Chief Justice Roberts		
11A592	Kagan		
11A565	Kagan		
11A244	Kagan		
11A227	Kagan		
11A187	Chief Justice Roberts		
11A110 4	Kagan		
11-7020	Chief Justice Roberts		
11-343	Kagan	Kagan	
11-166	Kennedy	Kennedy	
11-122	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts & Kagan	
09A924	Alito		
09A79	Breyer		
09A457	Chief Justice Roberts		
09A453	Chief Justice Roberts		
09A341	Chief Justice Roberts		
09A304	Alito		
09A285	Alito		
09A119 5	Chief Justice Roberts		
09-889	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts	
09-8739	Chief Justice Roberts		
09-846	Kagan	Kagan	
09-837	Kagan	Kagan	
09-758	Chief Justice Roberts		
09-7073	Kagan	Kagan	
09-6822	Kagan	Kagan	
09-641	Alito		
09-6338	Alito	Alito	

09-587	Kagan	Kagan	
09-530	Kagan	Kagan	
09-479	Kagan	Kagan	
09-400	Kagan	Kagan	
09-350	Kagan	Kagan	
09-1526	Alito	Alito	
09-152	Kagan	Kagan	
09-150	Kagan	Kagan	
09-115	Kagan	Kagan	
09-1036	Kagan	Kagan	
08-838	Chief Justice Roberts		
08A1114	Chief Justice Roberts		
08A992	Alito	Alito	
08-9671	Souter	Souter	
08A1114	Chief Justice Roberts		
08-992	Alito	Alito	
08-942	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts	
08-1506	Breyer	Breyer	
08-1438	Kagan	Kagan	
08-1423	Kagan	Kagan	
08-1314	Kagan	Kagan	
07A881	Souter		
07A859	Thomas		
07A60	Chief Justice Roberts		
07A161	Chief Justice Roberts		
07-9358	Thomas	Thomas	
07-574	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts & Breyer	
07-439	Chief Justice Roberts	Chief Justice Roberts	
07-11584	Souter	Souter	
06A741	Chief Justice		
06A421	Chief Justice		
06A295	Chief Justice		
	Chief Justice Roberts		

06-9812	Chief Justice Roberts		
06-736	Chief Justice Roberts		
06-637	Kennedy	Kennedy	
05-1157		Roberts + Kennedy; after 3/27/2007, Kennedy	
00-10618	Thomas	Scalia, Thomas & Souter "out"	

These recusals were either done at the beginning of the cases by a docket entry showing "recused" and/or in the orders that "took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition". Therefore, **"The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition"** in 4/28/2022 order in 21-881 is Chief Justice Roberts' recusal.

Likewise, present 5 Justices³'s recusal took place the first time on 12/14/2020 in Petition No.20-524.

This spontaneous recusal has been frequently used by the Justices, even in the case when all but one Justice decided. E.g., Petition No.12-8660. It is noteworthy that in 12-8660, when Chief Justice Roberts is the only Respondent, all other Justices recused, except Kagan. And the proceeding appears to be fraudulent as discussed in Footnote 1. Nevertheless, this shows that there is no reason why the other 6 Associates Justice would not recuse, when Chief Justice Roberts recused himself on 4/18/2022 in Petition 21-881.

³They are Chief Justice Roberts, Justices Thomas, Alito, Kagan, and Sotomeyer. Breyer is retired.

2. **Tani's admission and McManis Respondents' tacit admission that must be considered according to F.R.E.801(d)(2) supply the justices' "malice" in willful not deciding on recusal, willfully not vacating 2/22/2022 order in Petition 21-881 in order to suppress these admissions and maintain denying certiorari, and willfully retaining the 8 Justices' illegal voting power to suppress the crimes of 12 years' judicial child abduction in order to ensure denial of certiorari in Petition No.22-28.**

Any reasonable person learns the 182 acts of spontaneous recusal acts of the justices will believe the justices(other than Barrett)'s 10 times' failure to decide Petitioner's Requests for Recusal must be *with malice for some ulterior purpose*. Tani's admission in the underlying order for 21-881, i.e., 8/25/2021 order in S269711, as well as McManis respondents's adoptive/tacit admissions to severe criminal accusations contained in Tani's admission many times supplies the purpose of such malice—conspiracy to block Petitioner from access to the courts to implement permanent parental deprivation.

Obviously, because of conspiracies, this Court failed to consider Tani and McManis's admissions that were required to be considered under F.R.E.801(d)(2) in both Petitions for Writ of Certiorari in Petition 21-881 and 22-28.

As mentioned above, **the new discovery of the precedent of 11/2/2005 order in Petition 04-607 proves the Justices' malice to obstruct justice—willfully maintain the denial certiorari in 2/22/2022 Order in 21-881. And, the new discovery of the court's systematically misusing "Distributed for Conference" to block access to the Court further proves the ulterior purpose of such malice--- to illegally retain their voting power to manipulate the proceeding of Petition**

No.21-881 to implement McManis's common plan of blocking Petitioner from seeking all grievances and to suppress or harbor the crimes involved.

3. 2/23/2004 docket entry of Petition No.03-475, Cheney v. U.S.D.C. for the D.C., 541 U.S. 913 re-affirms the Justices' knowledge that each of them holds in his/her hands on decision of recusal, and that there is not one Justice made a decision on recusal in the past 10 Requests for Recusal could not logically happen without conspiracies among all disqualified justices:

“In accordance with its historic practice the Court refers the motion to recuse in this case to Justice Scalia.”

This proves unambiguously the Justices's conspiracies that none of them would decide each of the 10 R.R.s filed by Petitioner, including the 9th R.R. in Petition No.21-881. There is no other explanation that could exonerate any of the Justices from these conspiracies jointly not to perform their Constitutionally mandated duty to decide.

4. **The 2/23/2004 entry affirmed Wisconsin Supreme Court's research in State v. Allen (2010) 2010 WI 10, and the Justices were informed at least 20 times, which affirmed existence of conspiracies in not deciding R.R.s.**

Since 2017, Petitioner kept informed the Justices of State v. Allen to show the Court historically let each Justice to decide recusal and that the Justices had conspired jointly not to decide, at least 20 times. This docket entry as shown in (b) above affirmed the 7 Justices' malice in conspiring **not to perform their paramount duty decide the 9th R.R. in Petition 21-881 and the 10th R.R. in Petition 22-28.**

5. Respondents' purging court records reflects their malice of conspiracy in not deciding the court records removed

(i) Purging Requests for Recusal on 9/30/2022 in Petition No.22-28 reflects the Justices' conspiracies not to decide the 10th R.R..

On 9/30/2022, the court altered the docket of Petition No.22-28, removed the entry and court record of Supplement to Request for Recusal ("R.R.") and removed the court record of R.R. which this Court had delayed 56 days in posting on the docket until 9/19/2022.

The timing was 2 days following 9/28/2022's purported Conference. Clearly 8 Justices of this Court felt guilty in not deciding on it and did not want the R.R. to be in existence. They had decided to re-play the conspiracy in not deciding again which they did *before Petition 20-524*, in order to retain their voting power to "kill" that Petition—a Petition asking habeas corpus—to release the child from unlawful and dangerous child custody which Tani conspired with McManis and Kennedy and Justices of this Court to blocked it since 2012.

The 10/3/2022 order which was entered 3 days later did confirm the court's purging records are related to their conspiracies in blocking Petitioner's access to the court.

a. (ii) Respondents deterred R.R.'s filing by 23 days in Petition No.19-639 reflected the malice not to decide that 7th R.R.

In Petition 19-639, the Court concealed filing of R.R. by 23 days. Later with inquiries by Process Server on 1/7/2021, this Court discriminatively required 10 additional copies of R.R. to be re-submitted as a condition to post the filing of the

R.R. On 1/9/2022, the Court entered into the docket that R.R. was filed on 12/20/2020.

(iii) Purging filed Petition for Rehearing at the night of 3/22/2022 in Petition 21-881 reflects the malice in denying the Petition for Rehearing.

On 3/22/2022 night 10:29 p.m., Petitioner discovered that this Court removed the docket entry as well as court record of Petition for Rehearing from the Petition No.21-881 docket. This signifies their malice to disregard the Petition for Rehearing.

Two minutes after Petitioner spotted the crime, the Petition for Rehearing was put back to 21-881 docket; this indicates that the hacker is closely connected with this Court.

The Petition for Rehearing was also "Distributed for Conference" expeditiously.

6. **5 of the 7 justices in 21-881 had previously recused in Petition 20-524, the 5 Justices who are now Respondents in Petition 22-350 therefore has malice in willful not deciding recusal in both Petitions 21-881 as well as in Petition 22-28 that came after 20-524.**
7. **exposure of the plot in Petition 20-524 provides motivation for the 5 Justices' egregious malice of going back to their prior-20-524 conspiracies in not deciding recusals.**

Seeing exposure of their plot of using recusal in 20-524 to trigger 28 U.S.C. §2109, ¶2, the Justices would rather retain their voting power in 21-881 as what the justices had done prior to 20-524. Therefore, again, Respondents conspired in not deciding recusal to block Petitioner's access to the court in 21-881, and again, in 22-28.

Such plot in 20-524 that Respondents wanted to use lack of quorum to apply 28 U.S.C. § 2109, ¶ 2 caused them to be willing to jointly recused themselves the first time on 12/14/2020, without deciding on recusals, with the malice clearly shown in the 12/14/2020 order-- to affirm the lower court's dismissal appeal order.

Respondents' plot failed and forgeries of court orders were exposed as the 12/14/2020 order and 1/15/2021 mandate/judgment were taken off from 20-524 docket three times and Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing pointed out that 28 U.S.C. § 2109 ¶ 2 is inapplicable as there was no appellate review taking place. Then the felonious docket alterations 6 times became the subject of Petitioner's Rule 60(b) motion, now pending in Petition No. 22-350.

Petitioner's 60(b) motion presented incriminating evidence of the Respondents which was tacitly admitted by all Respondents in Petition 22-350, including Respondents's concealing/blocking filing of Petition for Rehearing and Second Request for Recusal (Gorsuch and Kavanaugh), participating in hijacking the mail containing the two documents for 8 days, then refused to pick up the delayed mail, then froze them by 10 days after eventually received it, then returned the Petition for Rehearing and the 2nd Request for Recusal on 1/29/2021, on the same date of being served with Motion to file Petition for Rehearing and the 2nd R.R..

Please see Supplement to R.R. filed on 9/15/2022 in Petition 22-28 for the screenshots/evidence.

The effect of blocking second RR in Petition 20-524 was to block decision by Justice Amy Coney Barrett, the only neutral justice.

8. **Objective of the disqualified Justices' malice retaining their voting power is obvious to cover up all crimes which include in this Court alone, 200 felonious acts of 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(c), §2701(b), §1001 and §371; 30 in Petition No.21-881 and 43 in Petition No.22-28 unambiguously corroborated with Tani's admission that Respondents did conspire with McManis, Tani and Kennedy to block Petitioner's access to the court in the past 12 years and perpetrated child abduction for 12 years.**

Egregious injustice had resulted, with source of corruption being James McManis by way of American Inns of Court, that is, in this Petition No.21-881.

The 41 felonies in the proceeding of Petition 22-28, proved that Respondents did conspire with McManis and Tani and Kennedy to block Petitioner's right to access the court for McManis's common plan of permanent parental deprivation. The most obvious facts for such conspiracies are Respondents' persistence in systematically concealing the names of McManis in 5 Petitions including this Petition 21-881, and concealing his buddies 4 California Judges from being Respondents in Petition 22-28, outright blocking grievance in front of Justice Amy Coney Barrett 8 times including 6 times to seek emergency relief to release the minor from unlawful child custody to Petitioner. No court would allow a child to be exposed to such imminent risk for 12 years unless there were conspiracies. No would would hide names of parties and block filings without any reason like in these cases, unless there were conspiracies. Attorney Meera Fox attested to the public view existence of judicial conspiracies. The admissions of Tani and McManis supplied the conspiracies. Julie Serna's Certificate of Court Reporter Waiving

Deposit directly proved the conspiracies of California courts in forging false notices to block child custody appeal. Tani's admission is irrevocable as a matter of law, but Respondents manipulated the orders to disregard and suppress these admissions, in violation of F.R.E.801(d)(2).

X. THE HACKERS HIRED BY MCMANIS IS CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH SUPREME COURT, LIKELY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, JUSTICE ALITO AND JUSTICE KAGAN, WHO HAD BEEN STALKING ON PETITIONER IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C.§2261A WHILE MCMANIS HAD TACITLY/ADOPTIVELY ADMITTED THAT HE HIRED BURGLARS TO BURGLARIZE PETITIONER'S RESIDENCE TO DESTROY DATABASE AND INSTALLED SURVEILLANCE DEVICES.

Among many other evidence, Petitioner would highlighted the following facts which proved that McManis's hacker is closely connected with Respondents Roberts, Alito and Kagan is proven by:

Case	Incident of removal of court records	Time Petitioner discovered	Time the Court put back	How fast the Court reacted Petitioner's discovery
20-524	Took off 12/14/2020 order	Taiwan time 1/13/2021 7:15 pm (Eastern time 1/12/2021 7:15 p.m.) See, ECF 3-2 ⁴ , p.89 of 161	Taiwan time 1/13/2021 7:17 p.m. (Eastern time 1/12/2021 7:17 p.m.) See ECF 3-2, p.90 of 161	2 minutes
20-524	Take off 1/15/2021 judgment	Taiwan time 1/17/2021 4:23 A.M. (Eastern Time 1/16/2021 4:23 P.M.) See ECF 3-2, p.95 of 161	Taiwan time 1/17/2021 4:53 A.M. (Eastern Time 1/16/2021 4:53 P.M.) See ECF 3-2, p.96 of 161	30 minutes

⁴ ECF 3-2 filed with the U.S.D.C. for Eastern California District in the case of Shao v. Roberts, et al., case number of 2:22-cv-00325, Affidavit of Shao, in support of her motion for TRO regarding the court crimes in 21-881 in refusing to list the individual names of James McManis and his partners, and refusing to file 7 documents.

21-881	Took off filed Petition for Rehearing	3/23/2022 10:29 p.m. App.24	3/23/2022 10:36 p.m. App.24	7 minutes
22-28	Took off filed Supplement to Request for Recusal as well as R.R.	9/30/2022 3:45 p.m. App.21	9/30/2022 3:46 p.m. App.21	Immediately, about 1 min.

On 10/11/2022, the hacker spotted Petitioner was creating the list regarding the judges' recusal (App.35-46) and two days later, Petitioner discovered that the sequence of the cases where Chief Justice Roberts, Kagan and Alito recused were moved to the front on 10/13/2022, which meant that the affected Justices examined the dockets where they recused themselves and altered these dockets somehow. Without their connection with the hacker, they would not have known Petitioner's table creation involving these dockets that prompted some unknown alterations of dockets.

Further, as discussed above, on 1/26/2022, Roberts could instruct Emily Walker to return two filings, before Petitioner mailed out the 1/26/2022's letter about the two filings that Walker returned. That indicates that the hacker is directly connected with Roberts.(Petition 22-350, p.1 & its App.189-191)

The irregular stalking and eviction incident mentioned in 22-350 indicates that the incident is related to Roberts as for both times of eviction, Petitioner was working on Shao v. Roberts, et. Al. The Petition for Rehearing in Petition 21-881 cited the document links of Hagerstown Community College, which suggested the unreasonable evictions were directed by Roberts such that the Student Dean was

able to immediately know Petitioner's entering the library of the College and showed up to evict Petitioner, in order to interfere with Petitioner's work.

As mentioned above, 11/10/2022 hacker's deletion of my draft regarding this Court's conspiracies in concealing names of Respondents in Petitions 21-881 and 22-28, had caused to type 4 times on Jeff Atkins's instruction on 10/25/2017. See the video in

<https://www.facebook.com/100002594967624/videos/pcb.5599764970119946/2007485339450198>

One 10/28/2022, the hacker altered one of my laptops that has 365 office subscription to alter it to be "unable to be verified". See,

<https://www.facebook.com/linda.shao.75/videos/792408488499718>

Hacker muted 11/5/2022 Facebook recording from minutes 55

<https://www.facebook.com/linda.shao.75/videos/1587325078397862>

Policeman was instructed not to pursue investigation even after showing on the police's own cell phone that the neighbor was hired to use their government wifi to hack me (10/26/2022)

<https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=5556407474455696&set=pcb.5556402837789493>

James McManis put poison in milk bottle many times, e.g.,

<https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=5548897021873408&set=pcb.5548885941874516>

See also [https://scontent-iad3-2.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t39.30808-](https://scontent-iad3-2.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t39.30808-6/312257819_5548897005206743_2144769641511180124_n.jpg?stp=cp6_dst-jpg&nc_cat=107&ccb=1-7&nc_sid=8bfeb9&nc_ohc=HLCtE9QHmKAX_aCS99&nc_ht=scontent-iad3-)

[6/312257819_5548897005206743_2144769641511180124_n.jpg?stp=cp6_dst-jpg&nc_cat=107&ccb=1-](https://scontent-iad3-2.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t39.30808-6/312257819_5548897005206743_2144769641511180124_n.jpg?stp=cp6_dst-jpg&nc_cat=107&ccb=1-7&nc_sid=8bfeb9&nc_ohc=HLCtE9QHmKAX_aCS99&nc_ht=scontent-iad3-)

[7&nc_sid=8bfeb9&nc_ohc=HLCtE9QHmKAX_aCS99&nc_ht=scontent-iad3-](https://scontent-iad3-2.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t39.30808-6/312257819_5548897005206743_2144769641511180124_n.jpg?stp=cp6_dst-jpg&nc_cat=107&ccb=1-7&nc_sid=8bfeb9&nc_ohc=HLCtE9QHmKAX_aCS99&nc_ht=scontent-iad3-)

2.xx&oh=00 AfD8UJeR4itJUPhupZ0BQcdT1bHDwf4B-HptZQts5sCMkw&oe=6374DE25

On 10/20/2022, when the burglar entered on 10/18 and 19, a desktop computer showed a new hardware was installed, called Ethernet Controller.

<https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=5538992556197188&set=pcb.5538983236198120>.

As evidence indicates that the hacker is connected to this Court, it reasonably appears that Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. joined the conspiracy to at a minimum stalk in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2261A or even murder Petitioner.

With the conspiracies of keeping covering up the court crimes, now the felonies are accumulated to 200 felonies, even including Attorney Robert Meek and Laurie Wood. How much this Court could tolerate when there are already 200 felonies—this can only be halted when this Petition about the source of all evils is reopened.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFOR, any reasonable person knowing the above facts will believe eight justices asked to be disqualified has actually committed the felonies of 18 U.S.C. §1001 and §371, ¶1 that their willful refusing to recuse, when they had been very familiar with 28 U.S.C. §455 and exercised 182 times, are for the ulterior purpose for extrajudicial conspiracies with James McManis and California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye to perpetrate parental deprivation in sacrifice of a life and safety of a child for already 12 years. The conflicts of interest arose from their being bribed by James McManis through the gifts from the American Inns of Court

Foundation and had gone so high as to participate in criminal conspiracies to murder Petitioner, at least stalk Petitioner.

Chief Justice Roberts, Justices Thomas, Alito, Kagan and Sotomeyer are defendants and are already in default in Shao v. Roberts, et al, 1:18-cv-01233RC in USDC for the D.C. when they all tacitly admitted to 111 felonies in Appeal no.21-5210 proceeding which is pending with this Court in Petition No.22-350.

Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh joined these conspiracies in not deciding on recusal three times in 18-569, 21-881 and 22-82, including not to decide on Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children in 18-569.

Justice Jackson joined these conspiracy in not deciding on her recusal in 22-82, while her failure to decide recusal in 21-5210 (ECF1922459) is at issue in Petition No.22-350. She is a long term member of AIC, and the underlying respondent James McManis is a founder of AIC, that she has conflicts of interest according to Kirwan's 12/15/2017 order.


The decision of the 7 Justices' failure to decide on recusal will cast adverse impact upon all 8 Justices. Thus, all 8 Justices have direct conflicts of interest that should be recused under 28 U.S.C.§455(a).

200 felonies led by Roberts and harbored by 9 Justices in Petition 22-28 also constitute direct conflicts of interest. When Chief Justice Roberts knew that Justice Barrett is the only Justice that is disinterested, with the malice to block justice,

Chief Justice Roberts has willfully blocked filings 8 times Applications to Justice Barrett 8 times; twice in 21-881 and 6⁵ times in 22-28. (App.86-89).

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: November 13, 2022

/s/ 
Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Shao

⁵ Please see Footnotes 2 and 3, this does not include the 7th filing of Application to Justice Barrett in Petition 22-28, that is filed simultaneously with this Petition.