

Case No. 23-6414

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Court Original Copy

In re: Joseph Raimondo for;

Petitioner

v

United States et al.

Respondents

RE: District Case, No. 21-cv-10854, In RE: To Civil Cases, No. 2:01-cv-71352,  
No. 2:01-cv-71353, and No. 2:02-cv-71696.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

INDEX

---

Joseph Raimondo In Pro se:  
P.O. Box 330  
Armada, Michigan 48005  
Phone Number 586-405-5365  
Email, Josephraimondo426@gmail.com

This Courts Rule 44.2 authorizes petitions for writ of mandamus rehearing based on the individual demonstrating a legitimate constitutional secured right that is a question of law.

### **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING**

- I.** Respondents of Armada Village Government, Macomb County Sheriff Department, County of Macomb, Township of Clinton, Armada Police Department, Jeffrey A. Bahorski, Norman Farver, Stephen Clark, David Coenen, Terrence Rooney, Patricia Major, Ben Delecke, Robin Caruss, Larry Cunningham, Shane Diehl, Roy Kinch, John King, Jerry Poston, Chris Lewis, John Lewis, Jo E. Adair, Sherrie Elliott, , Nancy Parmenter, Paul O. Shoemaker, Dennis Lemieux, Linda Jackman, Joseph Golembiewski, are by majority, public elected and appointed, and or paid employees and or public servants of the Village of Armada government.
- II.** Armada Times, was the Village of Armada's local newspaper.
- III.** Noel L. Lippman, and Douglas junior Touma were attorneys directly involved in carrying out the Extortion of Petitioners real estate before Circuit Judge, Mark S. Switalski on July 9<sup>th</sup> 2001.
- IV.** Macomb County, Circuit Judge, Mark S. Switalski, District Judge, Richard L. McLean, acting former executive, John Hertel, current executive Mark Hackel, and former Sheriff, and former deputy of Macomb County Sheriff's Department, former Sheriff of Macomb County, William Hackel, former public prosecutor, Carl J. Marling, former Macomb County police Lieutenant, Lynn Baumgarten, and current Corporate Attorney for Macomb County, Frank Krycia, are by majority, public elected and appointed, and paid employees and or public servants of Macomb County.
- V.** Community Planning and Management, P.C., and Stan S.G. Woodhouse were paid by the Village of Armada government that were relied upon for zoning and

development advise, Joseph F. Sales was the president and official over, Capac State Bank, Wade Trim a private business that drafted and mapped the Village of Armada governments master plan incorporating Appellants’ real estate into a government master plan.

**VI.** Delecke Welding, Incorporated, a private business used by the Village of Armada government for conducting routine Governmental Planning Commission business from within with Respondent, Ben Delecke as the Village of Armada Planning Commissioner himself.

**VII.** Kyle Klein acted on behalf Macomb County Sheriff Department, as an officer for the Clinton Township Police Department was on lone directly under the supervision and direction of, Lt. Lynn Baumgarten that operated the Macomb County Auto Theft Unit that swore out the affidavit he had probable cause that secured that warrant for the interest of the Armada Police Department.

**CORPORATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Rule 29.6, Joseph Raimondo states, To my understanding, the parties, Village of Armada, Macomb County, and Clinton Township MI, are incorporated Governments having elected, and appointed officials who conduct the affairs of those respective governments that preform their official duties under the color of law.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
REASONING FOR REHEARING.....	1.2
REHEARING ARGUMENT I.....	2.3

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
District Judge Hood's Court Analysis of April 6 <sup>th</sup> 1998.....	3
HAINES v KERNER ARGUMENT II.....	4.5.6
HAINES v KERNER ARGUMENT III.....	6.7
FAIRNESS ARGUMENT IV.....	7.8.9
EMOTIONAL EMPATHY ARGUMENT V.....	9
U.S. SUPREME COURT FINDING OF FACT ARGUMENT VI.....	9
THE COURT IS NOT LESSONING ARGUMENT VII.....	9.10
READING ARGUMENT VIII.....	10.11
UNDER THE CHIN ARGUMENT IX.....	11.12
FOLLOWING THE CROWD ARGUMENT X.....	12
CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT XI.....	13
THE RECORD OF THE COURT SHOWS.....	14.15
CLOSING STATEMENT.....	15
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	15
NOTARIZED.....	15
Certificate of Good Faith by Petitioner	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Cheney v. United States District Court for the District of Columbia</i> , 542 U.S. 367 (2004).....	2
<i>Haines v. Kerner</i> , 404 US 519, 520 (1972).....	3.4.5.6.7

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page
<i>McNeil v. United States</i> , 508 US 106 113 (1993).....	3
<i>Burnett v. Grattan</i> , 468 you US 42, 50 (1984).....	3
<i>Jourdan v. Jabe</i> , 951 F. 2d 108, 110 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991).....	3
<i>Eglinton v. Loyer</i> , 340 F. 3d 331, 335 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003).....	3
<i>Brock v. Henershott</i> , 840, F.2d 339,343 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).....	3
<i>Conley v. Gibson</i> , 355 US 41, 355 US 45-46 (1957).....	5
<i>Dioguardi v. Durning</i> , 139, F2d 774 (CA2 1944).....	5
U.S. Supreme Court, <i>Wilkenson v. Garland, Attorney General</i> (2024).....	7.8.9
U.S. Supreme Court, “compare” <i>Raimondo v US of America et al.</i> , (2024).....	9

## **RULES OF THIS COURT**

Rule 44.2.....	1
Rule 12 (b)(6) of the F.R.C.P.....	5.7

## **U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY**

The 4 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	13
The 5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	13
The 8 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	13
The 14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	13
The 1st Amendment .....	13

Now Comes Petitioners, Joseph Raimondo Petition request for Reconsideration of Case No. 23-6414 and states the following.

### **PETITION FOR REHEARING**

Petitioners request for a Rehearing on Civil Case No. 23-6414 being a “Fraud on the Court” matter created from a “Public Corruption” case, District Judge, Denise Page Hood voided, which related to the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment affects the nation as a whole.

### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The Question asked in Case No. 23-6414 docketed before this Court was a, Question of Law surrounding both, Officers of the Court in their “Fraud on the Court” and Respondents of the Village of Armada et al., in their “Public Corruption” asking if Respondents are entitled to Qualified Immunity for April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998.

Following that question came: *To properly answer the question, it calls for this Court to carefully read, and review facts as presented in this signed sworn affidavit “Writ of Mandamus” supported by evidence, not seen nor heard of since they were voided, 22 years ago by Judge Hood, and Respondents Attorneys, and their Law Firms.* Today’s current statement. It did not mean those facts nor that evidence was unknown to the Courts for the last 23 years.

The most vulnerable way to take April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 off the docket is for the United States Supreme Court to deny a Writ, for the political makeup of District Judge, Hood, and Respondents, by redefining “Fraud on the Court, and Public Corruption” law to thwart Case No. 23-6414, due to, Petitioners Political makeup when the Courts finger prints are on voiding charges in a civil litigation surrounded a violated warrant which created great hardship, and destruction for a law abiding family acting pro se who pleaded before the Courts for the last 23 years, defenseless to the Courts defiance of facts, evidence, and truth!

### **REASONING FOR REHEARING**

*Haines v. Kerner*, 404 US 519, 520 (1972) does not authorizes voiding a factual Public Corruption civil case and using Fraud on the Court to coverup Public Corruption. District Judge, Denise Page Hood’s finalized civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 calling Mr. Raimondo, a vexatious litigant. In the beginning civil case No. 2:01-cv-71352, No. 2:01-cv-71353, and No. 2:02-cv-71696 came before the Courts as a Public Corruption Complaint case matter of law as: Whether the Village of Armada

et al., respondents Conspired as government and used their enterprise of Organized Public Corruption throughout Macomb County Mi., and unlawfully pulled off, April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, creating great hardship, and destruction for a law abiding family that led to the July 9<sup>th</sup> 2001 extortion of the Raimondo's real estate for a master development plan, Macomb County's government officials advocated for.

Case No. 23-6414 brought before this Court, factual *evidence* showing Lieutenant, Lynn Baumgarten's and officer Kyle Klines actions on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 presented in that denied, (Undefended by Respondents) Writ of Mandamus, indeed violated law.

This Court on March 1, 2024 lacked the ability to reason logically, and accurately analyze this case on the situations which actually took place in Judge Hood's lower Court room to insure her decisions and/or actions were in compliance with federal law due to, Court Clerk's failure to read, left nine Justices, reasonably uninformed.

Mr. Raimondo's, writ of mandamus, creating Case No. 23-6414 filed before this Court was well drafted, supported by facts, and by evidence was laboring, and costly, which compelled the U.S. Supreme Court to act, and properly fulfill its official duties. *Cheney v United States District Court For D.C. (2004)*. To Coverup for Macomb County's Public Corruption. District Judge Hood simply voided civil case, No. 2:01-cv-71352, and rewrote the facts for, No. 2:01-cv-71353, and No. 2:02-cv-71696 making things disappear with Fraud on the Court, then calls Mr. Raimondo a Vexatious Litigant standing on *Haines v. Kerner* using Fraud on the Court to suppress evidence.

### **REHEARING ARGUMENT I.**

Americans, nationwide woke on March 26, 2024 to the shocking impossible news that the Francis Scott Key Bridge which took five years to build was destroyed in a forty second time span by a Cargo Ships engine failure which turned people's lives upside down, and inside out.

President Joe Biden announced that same day, every bit of American resources

will be invested in rebuilding the Baltimore, Maryland bridge.

When questioned about accountability; “Those responsible will be held accountable”.

April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 took 7 and a half hours for law enforcement officers to conduct a search for a crime that never was there that destroyed Petitioners business that took twenty years to build, taking away a career, and the life of a man which took 44 years to build. April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 disrupted a family unit, which turned the world for us, upside down and inside out. (But) help never came! Investigations were denied, accountability was denied, judicial justice was denied, and relief to was even denied!

Respondents Village of Armada’s Local and County’s known governmental public corruption, the DOJ knew about caused, April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, has stood silent about for the last twenty five years knowing, Judge Hood now titles Mr. Raimondo as a vexatious litigant the Federal Government expresses contempt for has the makings of a notification book, a U.S. House Judiciary Committee hearing, or even a movie where all this “Fraud on the Court” and “Public Corruption” becomes known.

I have a story that needs to be told how one Federal Judge was allowed to make a mockery of this case, as well as the law, in defense of truth, facts, and evidence, starting with this “Notarized Petition for Rehearing”.

### **District Judge Hood’s Court Analysis of April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998**

Exhibit (I) entered on 08/19,22, in civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 creating Case No. 23-6414. “Pro Se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by attorneys. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 US 519, 520 (1972). However, the Supreme Court has “never suggested procedural rules in ordinary civil litigations should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel.” *McNeil v. United States*, 508 US 106 113 (1993). “Indeed, a pro se litigant must conduct enough investigation to draft pleadings that meet the criteria of federal rules.” *Burnett v. Grattan*, 468 you US 42, 50 (1984). “Courts have refused to excuse pro se litigants who failed to follow basic procedural requirements such as meeting readily comprehended court filing deadlines”. *E.g., Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F. 2d 108, 110 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991); *Eglinton v. Loyer*, 340 F. 3d 331, 335 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). “Likewise, courts also refused to grant special or preferential treatment to pro se parties in responding to summary judgment motions”. *Brock v. Henershott*, 840, F.2d 339,343 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).



## HAINES v KERNER ARGUMENT II.

The pleadings this Court holds in its records of Civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 show Mr. Raimondo asked, District Judge for a hearing that allowed for the presentation of proof as in evidence, Officer Baumgarten had indeed violated the law. Judge Hood was again presented every piece of evidence this Court now holds with the exception of the exhibit (A) that showed, Judge Hood voided civil complaint No. 2:01-cv-71352 as the 1<sup>st</sup> amended Complaint, and exhibit (38A) showing the District Court changed the Court's docket. But as Mr. Raimondo explains in American English for the world to read, those two facts weren't known at that time.

Judge Hood was asked in Civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 on the record for a hearing to present material evidence of proof, that on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, Officers Baumgarten and Klien violated the law when they violated their warrant that was voided facts & evidence. As well through pleadings, and oral decision on, July 9, 2022. Did Officer Baumgarten's actions violate the law on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998. Judge Hood's response to that oral question was. Are you asking me a question, Mr. Raimondo? Responding, yes I was, I was expecting a reply to my pleaded and oral question. Judge Hood though surprisingly told Mr. Raimondo on the Record in that zoom held hearing held at response request to dismiss Civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 objecting to that hearing to present evidence the law was violated. Judge Hood stated that I would have to wait for her ruling for that answer. When the ruling came, the question still was not answered and the hearing and the complaint was Denied, and in the Courts frustration, called Mr. Raimondo a vexatious litigant and mandated the case was over. Then Judge Hood granted Respondent Village of Armada's motion to deny filing this dispute before the U.S. Supreme Court as a stranglehold on review.

In review of U.S Supreme Court language when it ruled in, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 US 519, 520 (1972). Pro Se complaints should not be dismissed to recover damages

for a claim of deprivation of rights without affording a Pro se the opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims. Page 401 US 521 of this Court rulings states; “beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of the claim which would entitle him to relief,” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 US 41, 355 US 45-46 (1957). See *Dioguardi v. Durning*, 139, F2d 774 (CA2 1944).

The right to Deny relief, by refusing to read facts, and Denying a hearing for evidence to be presented that allows a pro se to show proof in support of their claims is not written anywhere in, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 US 519, 520 (1972).

Judge Hood makes a mockery out of *Haines v. Kerner* by acting as a rouge judge that’s acted outside her jurisdiction without authority in law by granting respondents motions under rule 12 (b)(6) of the federal rules of Civil Procedure to dismiss Civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. This Court must take into account Judge Hood’s Motives & Opportunity.

Accordingly, the *U.S. Supreme Court* wrote, “all though we intimate *no view whatever on the merits of petitioners allegations, we conclude that he is entitled to an opportunity to offer proof.* The judgment in *Haines v. Kerne* was reversed in that case and remanded for further proceedings consistent here with. Yet on face value of this Courts own rulings from, *Haines v. Kerner*, applying to the Denial of Case No. 23-6414, morally and ethically conflicts its own standard set in *Haines v. Kerne*.

District Judge Hood based on the facts supported by evidence, voided Petitioners 1<sup>st</sup> Amended complaint allegation, followed by suppressing that complaints proof then granting respondents motion under rule 12 (b)(6) of the federal rules of Civil Procedure to dismiss the complaint stating a failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted knowing, District Judge Hood herself voided the case facts intentionally, then presented a misrepresentation of the case facts entirely.

Judge Hood in her forgoing Analysis notes in Exhibit (I) leads this Court to

believe without any review of the case record. Mr. Raimondo was a troublesome Pro Se that made countless “mistakes” “failed in his investigation to draft pleadings that meet the criteria of federal rules” “failed to follow basic procedural requirements such as meeting readily comprehended court filing deadlines” “who wanted special or preferential treatment as a Pro se” when I was a model pro se.

If anyone’s getting special or preferential treatment in this case, its Judge, Denise Page Hood, Respondents, and their attorneys who corrupted this litigation, through “Fraud on the Court” to conceal the focus on Macomb’s Public Corruption.

Mr. Raimondo’s mistake was in good faith telling Judge Hood, I would rely on my pleadings, before her Court. Judge Hood wrote notes to that fact, then voided the pleadings, which took care of the facts, allowing to suppress the evidence of proof.

### ***Haines v. Kerner* ARGUMENT III.**

The case Analyst assigned to Case No. 23-6414 from the Clerk’s office, Emily Walker, Scott S. Clark and Law Clerks on behalf of the U. S. Supreme Court in their failure to read, did not insure this Courts decisions and/or actions were in compliance with federal law when Case No. 23-6414 was voted on March 1 2024 due to the Clerks lacking the ability to: Reason logically and accurately analyze situations; by failure to reading effectively; making it impossible to prepare reports and summary sheets on the merits, which led to that denied writ, on March 1, 2024 in that conference hearing when Case No. 23-6414 came up for vote before this Court on merits. Based upon *Haines v. Kerner*, this Court is denying all entitled opportunity to offer proof of Fraud on the Court, or Public Corruption while those facts, and evidence are in that Writ of Mandamus proving, *Lt. Baumgarten violated the law..*

According to the United States Department of Justice claim is; A mandamus is an extraordinary remedy which should only be used in exceptional circumstances, peculiar emergency, or public importance. Addressing the merits presented in Petitioners writ of mandamus, measured by the abnormality of the history of Clerks

failure to inform Judges, and Justices of the Courts travelling back in time to Judge Hood's Clerks in 2001. Failure to read mounts to exceptional circumstances, peculiar emergency, and public importance being citizens place their faith and trust in the Courts to secured our rights by constitutional law by ruling as the informed.

Failure to read that Writ focusing if nothing else but on Pages 13, through page 30 creates exceptional circumstances, of public importance because it makes this Court appear incompetent, and uncaring, showing it has too few Justices, being understaffed with incompetent Clerks. This Court due to being misinformed denied an "undefended writ of mandamus", and sided with Judge Hood's view of *Haines v. Kerner* when granting respondents motion under rule 12 (b)(6) of the federal rules of Civil Procedure, when dismissing civil case, 2:21-cv-10854 for a failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, when there was a clear violation in law.

Now, the need is to provide Judge Hood, special or preferential treatment because she is an African American, a Democrat, and a Female. And the thought of over turning her, finality of judgments, for Pro se Evangelical Born Again Christians, Conservatives, and Republican citizens, or even questioning, Judge Hood's Judgement rulings by the Conservative Majority side of this Court would be seen as racism in today's political society, when it has nothing to do with racism! It has to do with the rule of law, and equal justice for all under law, Regardless of society politics.

#### **FAIRNESS ARGUMENT IV.**

Turning the attention away from the Court Dening, of Civil Case No. 23-6414. This Court passed a 6 to 3 vote in granting a Petition to waive deportation in the *Wilkinson v. Garland, Attorney General* case, over turning the Third Circuit ruling that ruled, federal appeals courts had no jurisdiction to stop that deportation.

In that case, Situ Kamu Wilkinson born in Trinidad and Tobago in 2003 came to America to flee violence in his own country. A decade later, he and his girlfriend had

a son who became by birth an American Citizen, the Courts title as M. Petitioner, Wilkinson over stayed his tourist visa here in the U.S. A decade later, he has a child from his girlfriend. He was then detained by authorities in 2019. Mr. Wilkinson sought to avoid deportation under a provision of a federal statute that allows relief to people whose removal would cause "great hardship to a spouse, parent, or child". Mr. Wilkinson satisfied the laws other criteria, he had been present in the United States for at least 10 continuous years, to have good moral character, and to have not been convicted of certain crimes. The immigration Judge ruled, that those circumstances did not amount to the kind of hardship that would warrant an exception to the usual rules. The Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed that ruling.

The facts are, Mr. Wilkinson over stayed his visa which constitutes a violation of U.S. law. Mr. Wilkinson Petition was addressed as a question of law the lower courts disagreed with.

Turning back to Mr. Raimondo's the dispute with the lower courts over law. Did Respondent, Lt. Lynn Baumgarten's actions violate the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment as a result of April 6, 98 leading to the extortion of Petitioners family's home? Judge Hood in open Court told respondents attorneys when she learned the Raimondo's real estate was sold from defendant to defendant at a Motion hearing in July of 2002. That if Mr. Raimondo can ever prove your clients violated the law. The United States Federal Government would return to the Raimondo's their land, regardless of your clients development. The Courts are thwarting, Mr. Raimondo's abilities to present evidence the law indeed was violated. That question is before this Court to answer, just as this Court took time to address, Mr. Wilkinson's question of law. Mr. Wilkinson violated federal law! Mr. Raimondo did not! Equal Justice is not being served. Show the heart for the Raimondo's, like this Court had for the Wilkinson's. Two different families stories whose lives were turned into a crisis. Mr. Wilkinson

created his crisis by not renewing his visa. Respondents, on the record, refusing to respond, created the Raimondo's family crisis! Where is that fairness by this Court?

#### **EMOTIONAL EMPATHY ARGUMENT V.**

Where is that same emotional empathy for Mr. Raimondo's Fraud on the Court case, that resulted from a Public Corruption Coverup, Mr. Wilkinson's received for great hardship for his family's deportation case? What about Mr. Raimondo, my wife, and my two sons great hardship over the last 24 years? How does Mr. Wilkinson deportation case effect the nation as a whole? And why does Mr. Raimondo Fraud on the Court case, created from a coverup of damaging Public Corruption not affect the nation as a whole? Public Corruption created the Mr. Raimondo's family great hardship, not Mr. Raimondo violating the law. Comparing *Raimondo v the U.S. of America et al.*, to *Wilkinson v. Garland, Attorney General* Case. Attorney General Garland, political policies on the DOJ refused to allow an investigation into the alleged charges of Civil Case, No. 21-cv-10854. Society, both Democrats and Republican don't accept "Fraud on the Court or Public Corruption".

#### **U.S. SUPREME COURT FINDING OF FACT ARGUMENT VI.**

Justice Stephen Breyer in the early history of this case in an interview made known:

This Court knows lower courts make mistakes all the time, and when those mistakes reach the U.S. Supreme Court, because this Courts has such a busy workload having only nine Justices, it is limited as to the case load this Court can hear making it impossible to fix all the lower Courts mistakes, unless the mistake effects the nation as a whole, ending by. Sadly many mistakes go uncorrected, "We just try to do our level best at serving justice". Is that not a message to the fallible?

#### **THE COURT IS NOT LESSONING ARGUMENT VII.**

Justice, Stephen Breyer on March 21 2024 NBC News Meet the Press when asked if he worried, to many people in the U.S. lost their ability to lesson, it was a



direct YES, When asked where does that leave us, the response was a direct BAD. When asked what does that means for the current state of this Country's Democracy. Steven Breyer stated two thoughts. Justice Breyer pulled his copy book of his Constitution of the United States, and replied. This is what's Important to the United States of America, going on to say, to the U.S of America, we use to think, and I still think, we aren't lessoning as much as we should.

Is this Court lessoning to be informed on the merits involved in Case No. 23-6414, as it did for one deportation, for a man guilty of over staying for a decade or more a guest visa, as being an issue affecting the nation as a whole. Yet Officers of the Court engaging in "Fraud on the Court to covering up Public Corruption, is not an issue affecting the nation as a whole?

### **READING ARGUMENT VIII.**

I. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case No. 23-6414, when someone should have invested an appearance of good faith, establishing even (one) read the facts, and reviewed the presented evidence as the Courts center ethical duties expected of this competent Court from its nine justices when what should have been read, proved in law, by actions, those police officers on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 violated their warrant, which was made clear to a reasonable mind that read page 13, and 14, along with the legal argument as presented on page 14, and 15, on to the standard review of MI law governing search and seizure (excerpt) act 189 Of 1966?

II. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case No. 23-6414, when this Court's (Clerks) read through pages 15, 16, 17,18, into 19 the police officer, when seizing private properties, indeed violated the law which lead to the taking of the Raimondo's real estate properties, along with their private properties, in an act without any form of due process?

III. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case No. 23-6414, when this Court's (Clerks) read through pages 19,20, 21,22,23,24,25,26 onto page 27, when the policers own police report told this Courts reader, those

officers on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, violated their warrant by their own actions, and what was then done in turn, to coverup for themselves, through retaliation?

IV. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case . No. 23-6414, when this Court's (Clerks) read through pages 19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26 learning the real facts as to what those police officers actually did on, April 6<sup>th</sup> "under the color of law" to law abiding citizens, who for twenty three years have been pleading for relief before this Court?

V. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case No. 23-6414, when this Court's (Clerks) read through pages 27,28,29, ending on page 30 when the police officers own sworn affidavit told this Court, the police in their actions again violated their warrant?

IV. Where was the due diligence when this Court on March 1, 2024, Denied, Case No. 23-6414, when this Court's (Clerks) read through those 40 pages, when those three material facts, shown in real evidence became common knowledge to this Court, and its Clerks, when that Writ of Mandamus brought just this to the Courts attention asking for relief, from three main key exhibits, which brings the police officer's actions on, April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, front and center, in clear easy to understandable layman's words, before this Court, that in turn, still Denied that Writ?

"With due diligence, "was this Court working at its level best on, March 1 2024 to ensure it served equal, and fair justice for the Petitioner, and my family"?

#### **UNDER THE CHIN ARGUMENT IX.**

"No, it was not". It was this Courts way of giving the late Justice, Anthony Scalia's famous, Italian four finger under the chin flip off to Mr. Raimondo, as well as to the "Fraud on the Court" charges, as well as to that Writ of Mandamus's, supporting evidence. And being, Judge Hood is an African American, a Democrat, and a Female, it all works in respondents favor, being Petitioners happen to be, White



Evangelical Born Again Christian, Conservative, and Republicans. While Respondents by majority are all White, Democrats.

### **FOLLOWING THE CROWD ARGUMENT X.**

“To now deny this Petition request for rehearing, is the John Roberts Court on the record making a judicial public statement of fact. The Roberts Court in its good faith review of Civil Case No. 23-6414, found no credible evidence of any civil rights laws violated in Civil Cases, No. 2:01-cv-71352, Civil Case No. 2:01-cv-71353, and Civil No. 2:02-cv-71696 finding, Case No. 23-6414 without merit in support of “Fraud on the Court” finding there is no 14<sup>th</sup> amendment issue to rule on, and that Lt. Lynn Baumgarten’s actions on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, and their after were fully lawful.

Denying today, Petitioners rehearing is pandering to Democrat’s and their rouge Judges lawlessness for the camera. Such ensamples, the current “Trump civil and criminal cases” where the legal system has been turned into political carnival show for tens to hundreds of million dollar awards to be handed out on alleged charges, with the mindset. The public is too stupid and/or uninformed to figure out the party of spirited politics involved. Here Respondents, Democrats, the perpetrators who created and cause the damages April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 brought upon foes of the Democrat party, refused to even defend the charges in Civil Case, No. 23-6414 real evidence supports. Here Judge Hood voids the original complaint facts, tampers with the docket, her summary judgment’s rest on Fraud and this Court denies review!

The crowd this Courts taken to, and has sided with in the past four failed attempts before this Court in the last twenty years is, “District Judge, Denise Page Hoods Court, who ruled on the side of the interests of Village of Armada et al., parties, for their Insurance Carriers, Meadowbrook’s Claims Services who retained the law firm, Garan Lucow Miller, P.C. to head the defense before the Hood Court

over the last twenty four years, and for the governmental entities of, Macomb County and the Village of Armada, who spearheaded the events that took place on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, with their police departments, and their public officials who played an active part in planning and plotting April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, to take needed land through April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998. The crowds objective today as always been to coverup for April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, so not to pay a damage claim when they made a mockery of the law.

That very crowd thwarted, obstructed and covered up for themselves what they pulled off in the lower courts with what's known as a "Red Herring Fallacy" the "John Roberts Court" should not want on its record, Hook, Line, and Sinker, without a demand for response, for redefining the reality of the makeup of Case No. 23-6414.

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT XI.**

This Courts in this pro se litigation involving, April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998 over the last twenty years used its Court Rules to Circumvent, and/or Trump over the U.S. Constitutional civil rights violations which made up Civil Cases, No. 2:01-cv-71352, Civil Case No. 2:01-cv-71353, and Civil No. 2:02-cv-71696 which created, this Civil Fraud Case, known as No. 23-6414 presented in a Denied Writ of Mandamus.

The 1<sup>st</sup> the 4<sup>th</sup>, the 5<sup>th</sup>, the 8<sup>th</sup> and the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments rights are embedded in the United States Constitution governs over America's Democratic Democracy. Yet for this one case, this Courts is willing to turn law upside down and redefine the law to accommodate respondents social justice policies, for targeting, Evangelical Born Again Christians, Conservatives and Republicans without accountability. Here this Court wont lesson, it refuses to read, and it won't reason with the situations that created Case No. 23-6414 because. This Court today is busy pandering to the Democrats demands in fear of what they may say about this Court!

## THE RECORD OF THE COURT SHOWS

The record shows, this Court is resting its judgement in this pro se “Fraud on the Court, an Public Corruption civil litigation,” Petitioner signed a certified sworn statement of fact in my Petition for Rehearing, Respondents refused to respond to, where there’s no trial record, this Court wasn’t present behind Judge Hood’s closed wooden doors, so this Court couldn’t possible witness the events of this case play themselves out though out 2001 thru 2003, but supports those summary judgments!

The “Roberts Courts” in Denying Petitioners, Writ of Mandamus facts for the crowd in this case, who’s on the record not responding to presented facts, and the evidence draws a conclusion. This believes, Mr. Raimondo’s, is a “Vexatious Litigant” who can’t, and has never has proven a thing as a pro se to the Courts!

The chemistry of this nonfictional 2024 judicial coverup before this Court, far outweighs the Republicans 1970’s Water Gate Coverup which this Court in those times had to get involved in, ordering those denied, Republican White House tapes, Republicans alleged, did not exist to Democrats, which ended by toppling, President Nixon.

This coverup is every American’s worst nightmare for their families, carried out now by Democrats coverup, for their Public Corruption in the extortion of private land, and private properties, and destroying this law abiding family, and branded their victims as “Vexatious Litigant” despite the evidence, and the facts showing, Respondents violated the law on April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998, then formed a pattern of practice to cover up April 6<sup>th</sup> 1998. The “Conservative Majority of this Court, for the Democrats should not, hook, line, & sinker buy into, Mr. Raimondo’s, is a “Vexatious Litigant.”

***God tells that the unrighteous Judge: You will be held accountable for ruling with oppression and cruelty. The Bible is full of Gods warnings to Judges. Remember Mathew 25, verses 29 thru 40, KJV.***

*"Never just follow the crowd, make your own decision!" "Margaret Thatcher".*

### CLOSING STATEMENT


My, God knows the hearts, of this Courts today, and what it's doing for the crowd. God has repeatedly sent me before his Courts Judges asking they "Give me back my land, and restore, and make my family, and I, better then new". Where is this Courts search in Case No. 23-6414 for truth, facts, and evidence when it has it all on its docket, yet wont review anything so it can resolve District Judge, Denise Page Hood's mistakes? Where is this Courts Emotional Compassionate Empathy for the long sufferings of the Raimondo family? Is it nonexistent because, Mr. Raimondo called out Judge Hood, and the crowd for their Court room corruption, and their Fraud on the Court as a pro se? Or it nonexistent due to the fact, the Raimondo's are White Evangelical Christians, Conservatives, and Republicans, making us targets of what's become, bipartisan visibility of injustice from within the Courts, being a byproduct of America's new Proclamation for a more perfect Union of Visibility in 2024, that's no longer in the closet?

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Therefore; Petitioners Prays this Court Reconsiders Judgment in Petitioner's "**UNDEFNDED**" Writ of Mandamus, supported by this Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully Submit by;

Joseph Raimondo



15

Signed before on April 19, 2024.

