

23-6234

NO.

FILED

NOV 14 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Harland Robinson — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.  
Compass Group USA INC. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
United States  
Sixth Circuit Court  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Harland Robinson  
(Your Name)

18275 North dr Apt 28  
(Address)

Southfield, MI 48076  
(City, State, Zip Code)

248/277/0534  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

I tried to filled out the information  
in detail to the supreme court  
to the best of my knowledge is  
there any more information needed  
my telephone # 218/277/6534  
my name: Harland Robinson.

## LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

Harland L. Robinson

VS.

Compass Group USA, INC.

## RELATED CASES

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES		PAGE NUMBER
No: 22-1819		
United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Court	① Authorizing: Chief Judge: White and The PHR Circuit Judges Deborah S. Hunt, Clerk	
No: 220-CV-13365-		
Nature of suit(890) STATUTES AND RULES Suit (890)	Honorable Kimberly G. Altman (magistrate judge) Clerk Erica Parkin Clerk of the court Kinikia Essix	Judge: Laurie J. Michelson
OTHER		

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[ ] For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is  
[] reported at Pace monitor/Publish on internet website; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

[ ] For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

[ ] For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was August 15, 2022

[] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

[ ] For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- ① Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 allows qualified employees to take 3 months of unpaid leave.
- ② The Fair Labor Standard Act
- ③ The Occupational Safety & Health Act
- ④ The Equal Employment Act of 1972
- ⑤ U.S Department of Labor Law
- ⑥ Statutory Civil Law
- ⑦ 400, 508b; Retaliation and Discrimination Act of 1981
- ⑧ Punitive Damages
- ⑨ Defamation of Character
- ⑩ Economic & Non Economic damages
- ⑪ Pain Suffering

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The plaintiff brought on an employment law/wrongfull termination case in this case the plaintiff clearly outline his paperwork for FMLA and was sent over timely as seen in case documents Respondent disagrees. Other cases regarding false disciplinary actions in Mr. Harland Robinson file that the plaintiff does not agree with, with that being said harland Robinson feel he face retaliation harassment and informed he felt he was in a hostile work environment harland did proceed to file a harassment case, and the supervisor's ~~Bob~~ <sup>HR</sup> who told to take classes regarding this in not sure if it help but later was terminated in 2021, January 14 due to he say/she say allegations regarding Mr. Coates sexuality. The case was brought upon the judge Lacerie J. Michelson and upon the civil case that plaintiff brought through dispostion where hearded and both opposing parties where present to hear any question & answers where exchanged after dispostion concluded. Respondents sent interrogations to plaintiff answer question and after that Respondent offer settlement

but Plaintiff refused amount respondent  
filled a motion for summary judgment.  
Judge granted judgment and dismiss  
case based on oral arguments and  
facts made by both parties. Plaintiff  
Appealed to Sixth Circuit Court and  
later case was denied based of oral  
arguments case was dismissed and  
sent back to lower court. Plaintiff is  
asking for another decision based of  
facts if oral arguments needed Plaintiff  
will accommodate the paperwork  
and facts to present to Judge  
overseeing case and documents if  
needed.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I feel my petition should be granted because I timely sent my ~~Federal~~ Medical Leave act documentations on time as presented in my case. I have no access to the company computers at ascension hospital therefore I could not gain access to the computers or use it no where in the building, I don't even have a logging in or was informed of records showing any attempt's. I never left trash/garbage outside of the front lobby near billing for representative office i usually ~~Always~~ always picked up my trash before end shift 11:30 pm. Even though I was discipline before 11:30pm the same day. I Always worked and stayed in my Area and stay until I finish my work duties untill lunch/break. I do not use my cellphone on work time at work. I never received a company employee handbook by employer even when I asked supervisor Coates I feel my name was defamed and I feel retaliated against and feel like ~~harassment~~ and micromanged upon that then fired I feel PUNITIVE Damages should be included and economic / non economic damages, I feel this case was overlooked and I feel my case is valid and proof is there in my complaint. Thank you.

Reasons for Granting Petition after  
being on F1ma for about 2 yrs or  
more I feel that after also resubmitting  
my documents and filling harrasment  
claim that i was later terminated  
Maybe because of calling the speak  
up - hotline on mr. R. Coates / K. Baxter  
(Supervisors) Head (Supervisors) I felt  
targeted and that's when the microman-  
aging and Disciplinary action began  
to terminated my employment.

I was giving a settlement offer  
in the beginning that's speaks volume  
rejectel it. Reason for granting  
petition is for me to have justice  
and hold the supervisor and company  
for the actions. I want justice.  
that's it's even while injured from  
car accident and still trying to do  
my due diligence job and perform  
my job task appropriately.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Harland L. Robinson

Date: November 14 2023