


No. 23 - 6334



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

1 First St NE, Washington, DC 20543

Nira Woods, Dr. — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Department Of Housing And
Community Development et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Nira Woods, Dr. – non-Attorney in proper
(Your Name)

2550 Pacific Coast Hwy., #68,
(Address)

Torrance, CA 90505
(City, State, Zip Code)

T: 424-327-3610 E: niraschwartzwoods@yahoo.com
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Question 1:

Is the Existence of the State Courts Interlocutory Order(s) in this case impairs / offense / invalidate Federal Constitution and Due processes ?

Question 2:

Is the Existence of the State Courts Interlocutory Letters in this case impairs / offense / invalidate Federal Constitution and Due processes ?

RELATED CASES

1. S282126 Woods v. Department Of Housing And Community Dev.
2. (People v. Nesler (1997) 16 Ca1.4th 561, 579.)
3. (Carter v. Kentucky (1981) 450 U.S. 288; Hicks v. Oklahoma
(1980) 447 U.S. 343.), (Estelle v. McGuire (1991) 502 U.S. 62, 75 .);
4. (Crane v. Kentucky (1 986) 476 U.S. 683, 687-692.)
5. (Darden v. Wainright (9th Cir. 1986.)
6. (Arizona v. Fulminante (1991) 499 U.S. 279, 309-310;
7. Rose v. Clark (1986) 478 U.S. 570,577-578.)
8. (Estelle v.McGuire, supra, 502 U.S. at p. 75, quoting Lisenba v.
California (1941) 314 U.S. 219, 228).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	6
CONCLUSION.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	2023/08/25 California Appeal Court Interlocutory Order
APPENDIX B	2023/08/30 California Appeal Court Interlocutory Order re: 2023/08/28 Petition for Review & Rehearing
APPENDIX C	2023/11/15 California Supreme Court Interlocutory Order deny Petition for Review
APPENDIX D	2023/11/16 California Supreme Interlocutory Letter Denied /blocked my efforts to file Petition for rehearing
APPENDIX E	LIST OF PARTIES
APPENDIX F	2023_10_26 Interlocutory Letter of Exhibits disappearance

LIST OF PARTIES

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

[X] 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:

Respondents / Defendants LIST:

1. Department of Housing and Community Development:

failed to appear Represented by: A.G. Robert Andres Bonta;

300 S. Spring Street, Ste 1702, Los Angeles, CA 90013; Rob.Bonta@doj.ca.gov;

Jamil Radwan Ghannam, Bruce Donald McGagin, and Jeffrey Phillips all are at:

Dept. of Justice/Tort & Condemnation 1300 I Street, 12th Floor, Sacramento, CA 90581; jamil.ghannam@doj.ca.gov; bruce.mcgagin@doj.ca.gov;

Jeffrey.Phillips@doj.ca.gov;

2. N & K Commercial Property, Inc.

Ken Miyake, individual; Victor G

Manuel Guzman,

Individual are represented by: Rick L Peterson, Bremer & Rene Chrun

Bremer; Bremer Whyte Brown & O'Meara LLP

20320 SW Birch Street, 2nd Floor, Newport Beach, CA 92660

rpeterson@bremerwhyte.com ; rchrun@bremerwhyte.com

3. Jon Megeff, individual, Torrance Police Department and

Department of Mental Health City of Torrance are represented by:

Jeanne-Marie Kathleen Litvin City of Torrance City Attorney's Office,

3031 Torrance Blvd Torrance, CA 90503;

jlitvin@torranceca.gov; psullivan@torranceca.gov;

4. Robin Famighetti, individual Represented by:

Sarah Lee Overton Cummings McClorey Davis & Acho,

3801 University Ave Ste 560, Riverside, CA 92501 ; soverton@cnda-law.com;

5. Dowdall Law Offices, A.P.C., Represented by: Maureen A. Levine Dowdall

Law Offices, 284 N Glassell St, Orange, CA 92866; mahl@dowdalllaw.com ;

6. Mailing Address of the Solicitor General of the United States

(see Rule 29.4) Room 5616, Department of Justice,

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, DC 20530-0001

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

(Carter v. Kentucky (1981) 450 U.S. 288;
Hicks v. Oklahoma (1980) 447 U.S. 343.),
(Estelle v. McGuire (1991) 502 u.s. 62, 75 .)
(Estelle v. McGuire, supra, 502 U.S. at p. 75,
quoting Lisenba v. California (1941) 314 u.s. 219, 228).

6

(Estelle v. McGuire, supra, 502 U.S. at p. 75,
quoting Lisenba v. California (1941) 314 u.s. 219, 228).

5

STATUTES AND RULES

3-6

The 1st; 4th; 5th; 6th; 7th; 14th; 15th; US Constitutional amendment

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 _____ 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 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 petition for review is denied.

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

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The petition for review is denied.

The opinion of the IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA court appears at Appendix C 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 _____.

☐ 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 on 11/15/2023. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 11/16/2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D I USPS priority mailed it on 11/16/2023 and also Emailed it. Both made on 11/16/2023

☐ 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

- A. Article III of the Constitution power the of US Supreme Court
- B. Article VI, Paragraph 2 of the U.S. Constitution establishes it take precedence over state laws, and even state constitutions.
- C. “An interlocutory judgment or order is a provisional determination of some or all issues in the cause.” (7 Witkin, Cal. Procedure, supra, Judgement, § 12, p. 548.) (CCP § 872.720.) provisional order means an order that is not effective until confirmed by a court; (“ordonnance conditionnelle”)
- D. The 1st; 4th; 5th; 6th; 7th; 14th; 15th; US Constitutional amendment
- E. US Constitutional amendment-14/05-procedural-due-process-civil.
Right to be "heard" without qualifications in front of all live Justice(s);
at one Court Room. 760 Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67, 80–81 (1972).
- F. Superior Court case 20trcv00564, the Complaint dated 08/11/2020, p. 4;
and the FAC dated 02/26/2021, p. 4; and the 2AC dated on 07/26/2021,
p. 3, par. 1; all of those were:
“... filed under Equitable Relief / State Laws / Federal Laws
and Federal Constitution (“LAW”).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Interlocutory Order dated 08/25/2023 - Appendix A

This Interlocutory Order Appendix A allowed for Appeal Court Proceedings that impairs / offense / invalidate my Federal Constitution and Due processes; Deny / preventing /Blocked me to be "heard" in person in front of Live Justices Grouped Together; when isolation of COVID 18 lifted; said Appeal Court Proceedings that provides for "Hearings" ONLY for the Defendants; when Petitioner Woods wish to be "heard" under Federal Constitution and Due Process; Woods made her wish known in her Petition for review /rehearing filed on 08/28/2023; and on 08/31/2023 Woods Petition for leave for review/rehearing of order 08/30/2023. And even so, on 09/27/2023 ONLY the Defendants were "Heard" while there was No Option for Woods to select said Appeal Court Proceedings to be under Federal Constitution and Due processes; Woods' Complaint, 1AC. 2AC (instant page 3, par. F.) are under Federal Constitution and Due Processes; were excluded from being a parte to the case;

2. IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Interlocutory Order dated 08/30/2023 - Appendix B

This Interlocutory Order 08/30/2023 Appendix B, was issued in response to Woods' Petition for review /rehearing filed on 08/28/2023; created Interlocutory status that failed to address Existence of Woods' Emergency Motions & their Rulings on: 07/26/2022; 06/27/2023; 06/26/2023; 06/28/2023; 06/29/2023; 06/30/2023; 07/07/2023; which the Appellant Reply Brief (ARB 1-9.) dated 07/13/2023 heavily rely on; while clearly the 08/28/2023 Petition for review page 1, referred to ARB (1-9.); and the court farther went on to issue Opinion on 09/28/2023 denied ARB(1-9.); impairs / offense / invalidate my Federal Constitution and Due processes;

4. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

Interlocutory Order dated 11/15/2023 - Appendix C

Interlocutory letter dated 11/16/2023 - Appendix D

The Interlocutory order dated 11/15/2023 , Appendix C denied petition for review sealed an interlocutory Status that impairs / offense / invalidate my Federal Constitution and Due processes; denying me timely petition for rehearings wrote by an interlocutory letter from the Clerk of the California Supreme Court, Appendix D; without an Order that allow that; without providing me with the law that allow that;

5. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

Interlocutory Letter of Exhibits on 02/28/2023 - Adopt AOB(1-29.)

Interlocutory letter dated 10/26/2023 - Appendix F

Adopt Appellant Opening Brief(1-29.) and (AOB 18-20.) and Appendix F recorded the State Court(s) repeated lost of control over my case exhibits and lost of their accuracy / authenticity, while these Exhibits are key information to the Complaint and integrated part of the the 1AC, and the 2AC (first and second amended complaints); Interlocutory Letter "so infused the trial with Evidentiary unfairness as to deny due process"

(Estelle v.McGuire, supra, 502 U.S. at p. 75, quoting Lisenba v. California (1941) 314 u.s. 219, 228).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. This case is in the interest of large number of people that are in pro-per non attorneys, that request to be protected by our Federal Constitution and Due processes while still wish to be in State Court. and since economy is difficult, cause large number of non attorneys in pro-per that can not afford an attorney to seek justice by themselves; it became a National Importance; to preserve our Federal Constitution and Due process in State Courts that we in Pro-per non-Attorneys deprive.

2. The interlocutory Orders and Letters in this case created / resulted in cumulative / repeated offense/invalidate of the Federal Constitution and Due process that took place in the state courts should convince the US Supreme Court to grant this PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI;
(Carter v. Kentucky (1981) 450 U.S. 288; Hicks v. Oklahoma (1980) 447 U.S. 343.), (Estelle v. McGuire (1991) 502 u.s. 62, 75 .)

3. THE EXISTENCE OF THE STATE COURT'S INTERLOCUTORY ORDER, and Interlocutory Court(s) letters, and the repeated CUMMALITIVE disappearance of State Court Exhibits, IMPAIRS ANY PRO-PER NON ATTORNEY APPELLANT OF THIS CASE AND MAKES IT IMPRACTICAL AND IPOSSIBLE TO PROCEED FURTHER AND HAVE JUSTICE IN THE STATE COURT(S)

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Woods Woods

Date: 12/15/2023