

No. 23-6726

**ORIGINAL**

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
**DEC 22 2023**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Brenda Dawson Battle — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

Judge Cameron Currie vs. Attorney Philip Creel - Mark Stuckey  
Judge Bryan Griffin vs. Jennifer Kennedy - Donna Hamer  
Judge Paige Gossett vs. Ashley Ackerman - Jimmy Lowery  
Judge Kristi Curtis — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Brenda Dawson Battle  
(Your Name)

1601 Assembly St #2101  
(Address)

Columbia South Carolina  
(City, State, Zip Code)

(404) 723-9370  
(Phone Number)

## **QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

**(1.)**

**WHY DID JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE ORDER MY REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO PREPARE PETITION WRIT OF CERTIORARI DENIED AND WARNING ME:CASE CLOSED 08/24/2022 THE SUPREME COURT ORDER ME TO NOTIFY THE RESPONDENTS TO WHICH HE IS A RESPONDENT.**

**WHY DID JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE CLOSE MY LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE WITH OUT ANY CERTIFIED NOTIFICATION CORRESPONDENCE THE US POSTAL MAIL ELECTRONIC EMAIL PHONE CONTACT AND WHY DID HE STATE PLAINTIFF BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE TAKE NOTHING FROM THE DEFENDANTS THAT DID SO DISCRIMINATED AGAINST MY HEALTH AND HOUSING MATTERS?**

**WHY DID JUDGE PAIGE GOSSETT FORWARD MY CASE TO JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE WITHOUT NOTIFYING A NEW JUDGE WAS NOW JUDGING MY LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE?**

**WHY DID JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS ILLEGALLY EVICT AFFIRMING WITH JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN WHO UNLAWFULLY EVICTED ME. BUT FIRST ORDERD IN MY BOND HEARING JUDGEMENT TO PAY MY RENT. AND WHILE MY RENT WAS ESTABLISH MONTHLY IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT AND DURING MY APPEALS TRIAL MY STATEMENT TO JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM PAYING MY LEASE RENT AND JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS STATED; "TELL HIM THAT."?**  
**WHY DID JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS TELL ME "TELL HIM THAT," JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS JUDGEMENT A APPEAL DECISION; AFFIRM AFFIRM TO CONTINUE PAYING HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY \$31.00 OR AFFIRM \$445.00 INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS?**

(2.)

**QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

**WHY DID ATTORNEY PHILIP CREEL LIE STATED HE NEVER RECEIVED MOTION TO LESSEN RENT FROM JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN RULING 03/29/2021? AND WHY DID CLERK OF COURT KAREN STATE ATTORNEY CREEL LIE TO ME THAT HE DID SO RECEIVED THE MOTION TO LESSEN RENT SHE EMAILED ATTORNEY CREEL THE DATE OF BOND HEARING? WHY DID JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN AT MY BOND HEARING FIRST ORDER PAY LEASE RENT TO COURT AFTER APPEALS HEARING JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN AND JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS ILLEGALLY EVICT ME IN THE MIDDLE OF THE MONTH?**

**WHY DID JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN USE A ILLEGAL AFFIDAVIT GIVEN BY INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS FROM HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY INCOMPLETE ONE LEGAL SIGNATURE WTH OUT MY SIGNATURE TO ILLEGALLY EVICT ME? WHY DID JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN JUDGEMENT EVICT ME AFTER HE EXCEPTED A LIST OF HOUSING PROCEDURES FROM HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE AND EVICTED ME WITH OUT NO SUBSTANTIATED LEGAL PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE AND HIS PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE DID NOT HAVE NO RELATABLE ALLEGING ACCUSATIONS NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT PROOF THAT I OWED INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS?**

**WHY DID INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS TAKE A ILLEGAL AFFIDAVIT GIVEN BY HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY TO USE IN A COURT OF LAW TO UNLAWFUL EVICT ME? WHY DID INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS ILLEGALLY ACCUSE EVICTING ME A SECOND AND THIRD TIME OF NO RENT BACK RENT LATE RENT WITH OUT SUBSTANTIATED PROOF OF THEIR ALLEGATIONS AND THE DEFENDANTS NEVER SUBMITTED ANY PROOF FROM THE INITIAL TO ME OR ATTORNEY CREEL AFTER REQUESTING? WHY DID JUDGE GRIFFIN REFUSE MY SUBSTANTIATED PROOF AND STILL EVICED ME OF NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT? WHY DID JUDGE BRYAN GRIFFIN DISMISS MY FIRST EVICTION CASE AND EVICTED ME A SECOND TIME STATING HE NEEDED MORE PROOF WHY DID HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY JENNIFER KENNEDY AFTER I DID NOT SIGN THE ILLEGAL AFFIDAVIT SHE INVOLVED INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS WHO HAVE NO LEGAL AUTHORITY BUT DID FILE A ILLEGAL EVICTION FOR NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT AFTER HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY AND BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE BOTH SIGN LEGAL AFFIDAVIT TO WHICH MY RENT \$31.00? WHY DID HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY JENNIFER KENNEDY MAIL A RENT INCREASE LETTER TO ME AFTER STATING WRITE OFF MY SSI AS A MEDICAL EXPENSE TO WHICH MY RENT WILL NOT INCREASE? WHY DID HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY MAKE THIS VERBAL STATEMENT WRITE OFF MY SSI AS A MEDICAL EXPENSE?**

**=END OF QUESTIONS=**

## 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:

## RELATED CASES

Evergreen Villas V. Brenda Dawson Battle - Mag. Court  
CASE # 2021 CV 4310100236 - DISMISSED 02/3/2021 Sumter S.C.

Evergreen Villas V. Brenda Dawson Battle Mag. Court  
CASE # 2021 CV 4310100531 EVICTED 03/22/2021, Sumter S.C.

Evergreen Villas V. Brenda Dawson Battle Mag. Court  
Evergreen Villas V. BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE Sumter S.C.  
CASE # 2021 CP 4300477 APPEAL 03/22/2021 Circuit Court  
CASE # 2021 CV 4310100531 BOND HEARING 03/29/2021 Mag. Court  
Sumter S.C.

Judgement: PAY LEASE RENT 03/29/2021

MOTION TO LEASE RENT 03/29/2021

confer with ATTY Philip Creech 03/29/2021

Evergreen Villas V. Brenda Dawson Battle  
CASE # 2021 CP 4300477 APPEAL TRIAL 5/11/2021

05/18/2021 Affirm

05/19/2021 EVICTED

05/19/2021 CASE # 2021-000-527 APPEAL COURT, Columbia S.C.

10/07/2021 CASE # 2021-001148 FILE LAWSUIT, Supreme Court  
Columbia S.C.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	(1)
JURISDICTION.....	28 U.S.C. § 1254 (2)
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS unpublished;
APPENDIX B	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT unpublished;
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

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 A1 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 B1 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 July 27, 2023.

☐ 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 July 27, 2023 (date) on December 24, 2023 (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).

**(1.) THE JUDICIAL BRANCH ARTICLE 111 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GUARANTEES THAT EVERY PERSON ACCUSED OF WRONGDOING HAS THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BEFORE A COMPETENT JUDGE AND A JURY OF ONE'S PEERS.**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

**The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (link is external) ("Act"), 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("Rules") (pdf), as amended on March 12, 2019**

**DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE-WARNING**

**CASE CLOSE**

**PETITIONER BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE WAS CLOSED BY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FEDERAL JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE THE 24TH OF AUGUST 2022 THEREFORE WITHOUT ANY CERTIFIED DOCUMENTATION OF MAILED CORRESPONDENCE TO MY US POST OFFICE BOX, ELECTRONIC EMAIL AND OR PHONE CALL. JUDGE CAMERON JUDGMENT MADE VERY NEGATIVE REMARK , PLAINTIFF BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE TAKE NOTHING FROM MY DEFENDANTS AND REFUTE CITED; BURGESS V. CHALOTTESVILLE SAV. & LOAN ASS'N 477 F.2D 40, 43, (4TH CIR. 1973) MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE IS NOT TO BE MOCKED BY JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE NOR DO I CHALLENGE THEREFORE WITHOUT DISRESPECT TO JUDGE CAMERON CITE, HE FAILED IN HIS JUDGEMENT CALL OVERLOOKING TRUTH CITING; BANK AND SAVINGS LOAN COMPANY, THEREFORE WITH NO PREJUDICE. DID I HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING? The case is Harris v. FedEx Corporate Services, 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 23-20035 FedEx to pay \$366 million to a former employee who sued over racial discrimination and retaliation. MY SUBJECT TO THIS CASE IS MY SUBJECT TO MY LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE AGAINST MY DEFENDANTS FOR RACIAL MOTIVATION AGAINST MY DISABILITY AND EVICTING FROM MY HOME AND REFUSAL TO REINSTATE MY LEASE ON THE MERE GROUNDS OF MY DISCRIMINATION COMPLAIN AGAINST HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY AND INTERMARK MGMT AND MAGISTRATE JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE AND JUDGE PAIGE GOSSET FOR CLOSING MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE WITHOUT PROPER DUE NOTIFICATION MAIL. AND FREEING THE DEFENDANTS FROM ILLEGALLY AND UNLAWFULLY ACCUSATIONS NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT, DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MY DISABILITY A INCURABLE DISEASE OSTEOPOROSIS RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS A DEBILITATING BONE JOINT DISEASE WHICH WILL DEFINITED MAKE YOU TAKE YOUR MEDICINE AND EVICTING ME FROM MY HOME DURING COVID19-THE DEFENDANTS HAD NO BURDEN OF EVIDENCE AND SUBSTANTIATED PROOF TO SHOW THEIR BURDEN.**

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**



**(2.). THE JUDICIAL BRANCH ARTICLE 111 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GUARANTEES THAT EVERY PERSON ACCUSED OF WRONGDOING HAS THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BEFORE A COMPETENT JUDGE AND A JURY OF ONE'S PEERS.**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (link is external) ("Act"), 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("Rules") (pdf), as amended on March 12, 2019

**DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE-WARNING CASE CLOSE**

20TH OF JULY 2022 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FEDERAL JUDGE PAIGE GOSSETT MAILED TO MY POBOX A REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND MADE CLAIMS; NO PROOF OF MY DOCTORS REMISSION NO PROOF OF MY DISABILITY NO PROOF OF HOW THE DEFENDANTS DISCRIMINATED RACIAL MOTIVATION AGAINST MY HEALTH AND HOME. WITH ALL DUE RESPECT THIS STATEMENT WARRANTS MY JUSTICE OF SPEECH DESCRIBE TO THE COURTS IN COMMON LANGUAGE OR DIRECT COMMUNICATION WITH HIGH PROFILE JUDGES WHO UNDERSTOOD MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE THEREOF IN MY DEFENDANTS DEFENSE ACKNOWLEDGE THE DEFENSE OF THE DEFENDANTS GREATER IN SPEECH. HOWEVERSO, 8TH AUGUST 2022 THREE CLAIMS WERE ANSWERED SAY BEFORE ME AND HAND CARRIED INTO THE FEDERAL COURT HOUSE ADDRESS TO JUDGE PAIGE GOSSETT. I FOUND THAT JUDGE PAIGE GOSSETT FAILED TO COMMUNICATE AND I ALSO FOUND THAT BOTH JUDGES RECEPTION STATUTE LACK OF COMMUNICATION NEGLECT MISCONDUCT ON MY BEHALF. ONE FAILED TO REPLY FROM THE SAY, CLAIMS AND NOTIFICATION CASE CLOSE.

JUDGE BYRAN GRIFFIN 1ST DISMISSED EVICTION CASE AND RE-TRIED FOR THE SAME CASE WITH OUT THE DEFENDANTS BURDEN OF PROOF. JUDGE KRISTI CURTIS AFFIRM, AFFIRM WAS NOT CLEAR NOR DID SHE CARE TO FULLY EXPLAIN IN HER JUDGMENT; DO I PAY THE LANDLORD \$31.00 OR \$450.00? AT THE CLOSING OF MY APPEALS TRIALS I STATED TO JUDGE CURTIS, I AM ABLE TO PAY MY RENT, SHE STATED; "TELL THAT TO HIM." MEANT JUDGE GRIFFIN WHO AT THIS TIME ORDERED MY RENT PAID TO THE COURT DURING THE SECOND EVICTION CASE JUDGE GRIFFIN EVICTION RULING AND HIS JUDGMENT; PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE LACK PREPONDERANCE. HUDSUMTER HOUSING AUTHORITY SERVED AN AFFIDAVIT WITH NO PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE DID NOT SHOW PROOF MY RENT WAS; NO LATE BACK THE JUDGES USE OF PREPONDERANCE WAS A FAILURE TO EVICT DID NOT PERMIT ME TO SEE HIS EVIDENCE THEREFORE A QUICK APPEALS HEARING, AFFIRM, AND FINAL ILLEGAL EVICTION. THE DISCRIMINATION OF KNOWING A PERSON OR PERSONS IS RACIALLY DISCRIMINATING THEIR WAYS, SOME WILL NOT VERBALLY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST YOU AND SOME WILL PHYSICALLY DISCRIMINATED THE DEFENDANTS ILLEGAL EVICTIONS ACTIONS IS AGAINST DISABILITY AND HOME MY DISEASE AND HOUSING WAS APPARENT THEY FORCED ME OUT OF MY HOME AND THEIR FAILURE NOT TO HIDE THEIR RACIAL MOTIVATION WAS CLEARLY NOTICABLE IN THEIR PHYSICAL OUTWARD DEemeanor ESPECIALLY AFTER I FILED THE DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT FOR HARASSING ME WITH A SECOND ILLEGAL EVICTION WITHOUT SUBSTANTIATE PROOF AND A THIRD ILLEGAL EVICTION ORDERED BY JUDGE GRIFFIN PAY RENT TO THE COURTS AND EVICTED IN THE MIDDLE OF MONTH.

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**

**(3.)THE JUDICIAL BRANCH ARTICLE 111 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GUARANTEES THAT EVERY PERSON ACCUSED OF WRONGDOING HAS THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BEFORE A COMPETENT JUDGE AND A JURY OF ONE'S PEERS.**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

**The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (link is external) ("Act"), 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("Rules") (pdf), as amended on March 12, 2019**

**DURING THIS TIME INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS HAD RECEIVED MY 2022 RENEWAL LEASE CERTIFICATION PACKAGE RENT WAS TO BE RENEWED ON THE 20TH OF MAY, 2021- IN THE PACKAGE, A FAMILY MEMBER CAN ASSIST WITH RENT PROOF OF HOW MY RENT WAS TO BE PAY CONSECUTIVELY FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS BY MY BROTHER, RETIRED CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER WILLIAM CHATMAN JR. AND JAG LEGALLY NOTARIZE A AFFIDAVIT TO SHOW THE DEFENDANTS I RENT WAS SECURED.**

**MR. LOWERY DID NOT RETURN ANY OF MY CALLS LEFT, BEFORE DURING OR AFTER MY APPEALS HEARING REGARDING. MY LEASE RECERTIFICATION WAS IN MR. LOWERY'S OFFICE BEFORE MY APPEALS HEARING HE WAS PRESENT AT MY APPEALS HEARING HE HEARD JUDGE CURTIS MAKE STATED REFERENCING, I AM ABLE TO PAY MY RENT AND TELL HIM THAT-MR. LOWERY DID NOT COMMENT TO EITHER OF THESE STATEMENTS.**

**JUDGE CAMERON CURRIE RULINGS WAS SOMEWHAT TOO JUDGMENTAL USEFUL CITES NAME CALLING AND UNCALLED FOR BY A FEDERAL JUDGE. ONE OF HIS REMARKS; "FRIVOLOUS OR MALICIOUS" BAD FAITH CLAIM IS EXACTLY WHY I FILED MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE AGAINST MY DEFENDANTS; THEIR BAD FAITH NO SUBSTANTIATED PROOF MOVING FROM ONE EXTREME TO THE OTHER EVICTING AND THE RACIALLY MOTIVATED WAS REVEALED AFTER I CAME HOME FROM HAVING MY TOOTH EXTRACTED AND FINDING ANOTHER EVICTION NOTICE ON MY DOOR-WHILE AWAITING FOR ANSWERED FROM THE COURTS FROM THE 1ST EVICTION. TO WHICH, ATTORNEY CREEL STATED, YOUR CASE WAS DISMISSED. QUESTION WHY DID THE DEFENDANTS EVICT ME A 2ND TIME WHILE WAITING TO FIND IF I WAS EVICTED OR DISMISS? I BELIEVE THE SOUTH CAROLINA LAWS ARE GOVERN INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS DID NOT WAIT FIVE DAYS TO SEE IF I WOULD PAY ILLEGAL RENT-THE DATE JUDGE GRIFFIN INFORMED THAT MY CASE WAS DISMISSED IS THE DATE INTERMARK MGMT LEFT A SECOND EVICTION NOTICE ON MY DOOR.- Under the Fair Housing Act, it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of disability in the sale, rental, financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions. South Carolina's Eviction Process this means that the landlord must carefully follow all the rules required under South Carolina law, or the eviction may not be valid. Notice Requirements for Nonpayment of Rent YOU MUST GET NOTICE BEFORE YOU ARE EVICTED Remember: Your landlord must file in court to have you legally evicted. A landlord who wants to evict a tenant for this reason may first need to give the tenant a five-day notice to pay rent. TWO THINGS WERE WRONG TO MY BELIEF: I DID NOT HAVE WRITTEN PROOF MY EVICTION CASE WAS DISMISS AND SECOND THE LANDLORD DID NOT WAIT FIVE DAYS TO EVICT ME AGAINST FOR THE SAME ACCUSATIONS; NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT.**

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**

**(4.) THE JUDICIAL BRANCH ARTICLE 111 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GUARANTEES THAT EVERY PERSON ACCUSED OF WRONGDOING HAS THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BEFORE A COMPETENT JUDGE AND A JURY OF ONE'S PEERS.**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

**The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (link is external) ("Act"), 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("Rules") (pdf), as amended on March 12, 2019**

**DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE-WARNING CASE CLOSE**

**THE DEFENDANTS RACIAL MOTIVATION BECAME CLEAR TO ME AFTER THE SECOND EVICTION AND I FILED MY DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT- THE DEFENDANTS WERE ACCUSING ME NO LATE BACK RENT AND MY BURDEN OF PROOF JUDGE GRIFFIN AND THE DEFENDANT HAD AND STILL THEY CONTINUED TO HARASSMENT HINDERING MY DOCTORS TREATMENT FOR MY REMISSION. ONCE THE DEFENDANTS RECEIVE WANT ME IN MY HOME ALLEGATIONS PASSING ILLEGAL AFFIDAVITS FROM HUDSON COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY TO INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS TO MAGISTRATE COURT JUDGE GRIFFIN TO EVICT. EVICTIONS 24HOUR WRITS EVICTIONS APPEALS EVICTIONS 24 WRITS VIRTUAL TRIAL COURT ROOM TRIALS DRIVING WHILE UNDER MEDICATIONS RIGHT HAND HANDICAPP, OSTEOPOROSIS RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS THERETO, THOUGHT OUT MY WHOLE BODY DOCTORS TRYING TO STABILIZE MY HYPERTENSION MISSED DOCTOR APPOINTMENT. MY CONSTITUTION RIGHTS AS A HUMAN BEING WERE OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT, ACCUSED OF A CRIME TO WHICH THE DEFENDANTS HAD NO SUBSTANTIATED PROOF TO ACCUSE ME AND MY SEVENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A TRIAL THE DEFENDANTS AND THE JUDGE GRIFFIN NEVER ENTER INTO SUBJECTION THEIR BURDEN OF PROOF.**

**WHAT I AM EXPRESSING; THE DEFENDANTS WARRANT NO MERCY FOR MY DISABILITY AND CONSTANT EVICTING ME FROM MY HOME AND THEY ALL NEED TO BE PUNISH FOR THEIR BAD FAITH JUDGMENT, RULINGS, SETTING THE DEFENDANTS FREE, STATING PLAINTIFF TAKE NOTHING FROM THE DEFENDANTS. MAKING UP THEIR OWN LAWS TO STATUTE ILLEGALLY AND UNLAWFULLY EVICTION THEIR BAD FAITH AGAINST MY DOCTORS CARE FOR REMISSION TRYING TO STAY IN MY HOME FROM COVID 19 AND TO AVOIDED CROWDED SHELTERS.**

**THE UNDERLYING TRUTH THE DEFENDANTS RACIALLY MOTIVATED THEIR PLAN TO EVICT ME FROM HOME INSIGHT OF MY DOCTORS TREATMENT FOR REMISSION.**

**RENT PAID EACH MONTH A DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT WAS FILE AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS FOR DISCRIMINATION. THE DEFENDANTS STARTED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ME MONTHS BEFORE I FILED. THEIR ACTIONS WERE RACIAL MOTIVATED CONSTANTLY HARASSING ME WHILE I WAS IN THE EARLY STAGES OF MY DOCTORS REMISSION AND NOT ONLY WAS I BEING TREATED FOR OSTEOPOROSIS RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS THERETO, HYPERTENSION.**

**THE ILLEGAL EVICTIONS THE FIRST EVICTION DISMISSED, LACK OF EVIDENCE ON MY DEFENDANTS BEHALF. MY BURDEN OF PROOF WAS HERE AGAIN**

**WARRANT, MONEY ORDERS TO SHOW PROOF OF THEIR BURDEN MY RENT WAS PAID EVERY MONTH FOR THE ILLEGAL TIMES QUESTION BY THE DEFENDANTS AND THE JUDGE.**

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**

(8)

ATTORNEY CREEL

LEGAL OATHS

FACTS: 03/29/2021 JUDGE GRIFFIN'S JUDGMENT FOR DISABLE PLAINTIFF TO PAY FULL LEASE AMOUNT OF RENT TO MAGISTRATE COURT. WITH EXCEPT EMAIL FORWARD TO ATTORNEY CREEL TO DISCUSS LESSEN RENT FOR DISABLE PLAINTIFF.  
ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGES ENCLOSED FORMS 1-8 LETTER DATED 03/22/2021 DATE OF BOND HEARING 03/29/2021 AND 03/29/2021-04/05/2021 PHONE RECORDS.

The Constitutional Laws of the United State of America. Therefore it is against the Laws for Attorneys to misrepresent

Their Clients by use of - to fabricated lies or to just tell a Lie, "NO I HAVE NOT RECEIVE." Withholding truth in their hearts against their best interest for their clients to satisfy self and others as a United States Attorney serving self.

Client Brenda Dawson Battle, Disable suffering with a Debilitating Disease. Poverty Stricken, facing homelessness Legally dealing with Two separated Entities both bonded by one common bond, to take my home HUDSumter Housing Authority InterMark Mgmt Evergreen Villas and their illegal FORM Exhibit F.

Is it against the Constitutional Laws of the United States of America for Attorneys to lie under sworn oath in the court room Attorneys law office on the phone with clients?

03/29/2021 Nevertheless it is against the Constitutional Laws of the United States of America for Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle Disable client of Defendant Attorney Creel to lie to her withhold a legal binding Affidavit with her signature. 03/29/2021-03/30/2021 NEVERTHELESS: IT IS AGAINST THE LAW FOR ATTORNEY CREEL TO LIE WITHHOLDING A LEGAL BINDING AFFIDAVIT COURT ORDERED AND LIED TO HIS CLIENT Disabled Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle .

(8)x1

## LEGAL OATHS

ISSUES: DISCRIMINATION IS IN THE LAWS OF UNLAWFUL ABIDERS WHO TAKE SWORN OATHS TO

UPHOLD CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS SO WRITTEN THEREOF. But I say no all are liars.

According to the Constitution of the State of South Carolina Defendant Attorney Creel took a sworn oath duly qualified

to exercise his legal duties of the office to which he has been appointed, that he will to the best of his ability discharge those duties and will preserve protect and defend the Constitution State of South Carolina and of the United States. Defendant Attorney Creel Oaths; faithfulness competence diligence

good judgement and prompt communication to protect his clients, Disable Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle states Attorney Creel make a false statement lies under his sworn oath 8 DAYS, he never received and ordered Judgement. Defendant Attorney Creel's Legal Professionalism as a Constitutional State Bar Attorney were to employ his Legal purposes to maintain first assign Attorney-Client dedicated causes; take care of his clients needs First. Therefore, confide of such great Financial Issues Disable Plaintiff's Rent should be or have been consistent Attorney-Client privileges within his trust and honor and the moral principles of his legal field profession a sworn oath; He will never seek to mislead an His Clients, opposing party, the judge or jury by a false statement of fact or law; did so and in doing so Disable Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle was put in a financial Burden for Eight Days and in the midst 8 days uncertain waited needing to take required medicine; Trusting relying on my Attorney to do that which was of greater importance 03/31/2021-04/05/2021 contact me to discussing Motion to Lessen Rent.

Disable Plaintiff was mislead by Defendant Attorney Creel in and outside the Court of South Carolina LAWS, lied to and dismiss and close without knowledge in his LAW OFFICE a place of Legal Law Practices.

Defendant Attorney Creel lied had no interest in defending Disable Plaintiff to keep her home. He started troubling me to sign and Submit Form CDC even email to me after I read understood the entirety of the Form I Stated to Attorney Creel I will not sign show guilt and I am not guilty.

(8)X2

# LEGAL OATHS

FACTS: 03/29/2021 DEFENDANT JUDGE GRIFFIN JUDGMENT MOTION TO LESSEN RENT DISABLE PLAINTIFF TO PAY FULL LEASE RENT TO MAGISTRATE COURT. EMAIL FORWARD TO ATTORNEY CREEL TO DISCUSS.

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGES ENCLOSED FORMS 1-8 LETTER DATED 03/22/2021 DATE OF BOND HEARING 03/29/2021 AND 03/29/2021-04/05/2021 PHONE RECORDS.

03/29/2021 Attorneys actually do lied to their clients hoping they don't get caught. most impose consequences for their illegal actions to be in disciplinary hearing before the State Bar. Answering to illegal Sanctions, A Penalty against him which he did not enforce. His integrity Truth Honesty and his Legal Oath to his clients tell the truth. Disable Plaintiff

prove defendant Attorney Creel lied never receive Legal Binding Judgement from of Magistrate Clerk Court Karen. Statute of Limitation against The Legal Laws in South Carolina obeying legal Sanctions. Lied to Disable Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle under a legal oath and withheld a legal Judgement in his Law Office so ordered by Defendant Judge Griffin.

04/05/2021 Magistrate Clerk of Court Karen stated to Plaintiff Brenda Dawson Battle: "Attorney Creel lied to you I personally called and ask for his Email address and email your Judgement Motion to Lessen Rent." 03/29/2021-04/05/2021 Attorney Creel lied in a way that was hurtful my urgency to discuss my rent great importance not to lose my home because of my debilitating disease and COVID 19 he violated my Human Lights as his Client as United States Senior Citizen and his Legal obligations as a United States Attorney sworn oaths to uphold Bar Laws of State of South Carolina.

03/29/2021-03/30/2021 Stated to Disable Plaintiff, he never received the Motion to Lessen Rent.


03/31/2021-04/05/2021 Plaintiff requested 03/30/2021 Defendant Attorney Creel to contact once he receive to discuss lessen rent Plaintiff's rent \$31.00-\$445.00.

Defendant Attorney Creel is a law abiding attorney. even if he did not lie in a court of law he did so lie not only to his client however indirectly to Magistrate Court Clerk of Court Karen. May I add: "Had I not return to the Magistrate Court 04/05/2021 to speak with Defendant Judge Griffin I would never have known Defendant Attorney Creel Illegal truth. Lies."

END OF STATEMENTS: SWORN THIS 2ND DAY OF MARCH 2023.

*Brenda Dawson Battle* 2 march 2023  
Brenda Dawson Battle

*Mary Oliver Wolfe* exp. 4-15-29



(1.)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITIONS.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
1 FIRST STREET, NE  
WASHINGTON, DC 200543

HONORARY JUDGES

THE QUESTION REASONS FOR GRANTING MY PETITION ARE LEGAL DEFINED AND WITHIN THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

BEING A UNITED STATES SENIOR CITIZEN OF SOUND MIND NOT HAVING A LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO SHOW LEGAL CAUSE FOR MY PETITION

THEREFORE, UPON THE LEADERSHIP AND GUIDANCE OF OUR HOLY GHOST IN PRAYER TO HELP ME GET TO THIS POINT OF THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

AS TO GETTING COMPLETELY THROUGH MY LEGAL ORDEAL

TRULY THE PETITION WAS A LEGAL CHALLENGE AND AT THIS POINT OF UNDERSTANDING THE PETITION FOR WRIT MY LEGAL KNOWLEDGE WAS FORCE TO LEARN NOT ONLY HOW BUT WHY.

TO THE CONSTITUTION LAWS OF DISCRIMINATION, DISABILITY REMISSION ILLEGAL HOUSING EVICTIONS NO SUBSTANTIATE PROOF TO EVICT.

I BEGAN SEARCHING FOR LAWS TO SHOW TO THE APPOINTED JUDGE(S) WHO WILL HEAR MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE AND MAKE

THEIR DECISION BASE UPON LEGAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE LEGAL LAWS OF MY CASE.

HUMBLY I ASK THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES TO VIEW MY QUESTIONS, STATEMENT AND REASONS FOR GRANTING MY PETITION.

TWO YEARS I HAVE WORKED THIS DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE HAVING MANY DOORS CLOSED AND MANY NO'S AND THE MORE I WAS

TOLD NO THE MORE I PRESS AGAINST THE NEGATIVE INFLUENCES PRAYED AND CONTINUE MY DISCRIMINATION LAWSUIT SETTLEMENT CASE TO THE ITS END.

MY LEGAL PURPOSES FOR GRANTING MY PETITION AS FOLLOWS:

( 1. ) DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION:

In 1988, Congress passed Amendments to the Act which expanded the law to prohibit discrimination based on disability or on family status.

804F1 804F2 AND 818 OF TITLE VIII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1968 AS AMENDED BY THE FAIR HOUSING ACT OF 1988; SECTIONS 31-21-40(6);-

31-21 (7) AND 31-21-80 OF THE South Carolina FAIR HOUSING LAW, AS AMENDED

Discrimination occurs when the civil rights of an individual are denied or interfered...

Sec. 12101 note: Findings and Purposes of ADA Amendments Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-325, §2, Sept. 25, 2008, 122 Stat. 3553, provided that:

Discrimination does not have to be direct to be unlawful

When can discrimination be justified? unlawful discrimination under the Equality Act 2010

These characteristics are: Age and Disability.

NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD

I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.

**(2.) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

**(2.) TENANT AND LANDLORD RIGHTS:**

**EVICIONS WITH OUT SUBSTANTIATE PROOF TO EVICT INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS EVICTED TENANT WITH OUT SUBSTANTIATE PROOF.**

**HOUSING DISCRIMINATION**

(see S.C. Code Ann. § § 27-40-710(B) and 27-37-10(B)). The article Eviction Notices for Nonpayment of Rent in South Carolina.

If the tenant does not fix the violation within 14 days, then the landlord can go to court and file an eviction lawsuit against the tenant (see S.C. Code Ann. § 27-40-710(A)).

The tenant should always ask for a time-stamped receipt if paying rent late (see S.C. Code Ann. § 27-40-710(B)). **TENANT WAS NEVER LATE WITH RENT.**

(see S.C. Code Ann. § § 27-40-610, 27-40-630, and 27-40-640).

(see S.C. Code Ann. § 27-40-710(A)).

What is housing discrimination? Are there housing laws that protect me from discrimination?

In most cases, it is illegal for a landlord or a rental agency to treat you differently in housing because of your race or color, your sex, your religion, your disability,

Housing discrimination is illegal under federal and South Carolina law. The Fair Housing Act (FHA) and SC Fair Housing laws protect you if you are a victim of housing discrimination

**42 U.S. Code Chapter 45 - FAIR HOUSING**

**South Carolina**

**Human Affairs Commission**

**Marvin Caldwell, Jr., Interim Commissioner**

**The Housing Act provides protection for disabled tenants from discrimination and eviction.**

**Disability Discrimination**

**Under the Fair Housing Act, it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of disability in the sale, rental, financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions.**

**South Carolina's Eviction Process**

**this means that the landlord must carefully follow all the rules required under South Carolina law, or the eviction may not be valid.**

**Notice Requirements for Nonpayment of Rent**

**YOU MUST GET NOTICE BEFORE YOU ARE EVICTED**

**Remember: Your landlord must file in court to have you legally evicted.**

**A landlord who wants to evict a tenant for this reason may first need to give the tenant a five-day notice to pay rent.**

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**



**(3.) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION  
LANDLORD REFUSE TENANT INSPECTION OF HOME WITH HOUSING INSPECTOR STATED.**

**South Carolina Code of Laws**

**Unannotated**

**Title 31 - Housing and Redevelopment**

**SECTION 31-21-30**

**Fair Housing Law**

**(4) "Discriminatory housing practice" means an act that is unlawful under this chapter.**

**South Carolina Residential Landlord and Tenant Act**

**SECTION 27-40-440. Landlord to maintain premises.**

**(a) A landlord shall:**

**(1) comply with the requirements of applicable building and housing codes materially affecting health and safety;**

**EVICTIONS EVICTIONS EVICTIONS AND INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS NO  
SUBSTANTIATE PROOF.**

**HARASSMENT BY LANDLORDS**

**The Fair Housing Act defines discrimination as:**

**Specifying preferences for tenants in advertisements**

**Claiming a unit you are renting is unavailable**

**Changing selection standards for different prospective tenants**

**Refusing to rent to someone because they belong to a protected group**

**Setting separate terms for different tenants**

**Terminating a lease due to a tenant's race**

**To put this into perspective, the following are some common examples of racial discrimination.**

**NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD**

**I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN  
TRUTH AND NOT LIES.**

(4.)

#### REASON FOR GRANTING PETITION

MAGISTRATE JUDGE GRIFFIN RETRIED PLAINTIFF FOR THE SAME CRIME NO RENT LATE RENT BACK RENT;  
WHAT ARE THE LAWS CODES SANCTIONS STATUTES what are the illegal laws for a judge to retry a case without evidence?

#### RULE 41

DISMISSAL OF ACTIONS; NON-SUIT

RULE 501 CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT IS ESTABLISH FOR STANDARDS FOR ETHICAL CONDUCT FOR JUDGES

Can a court retry a case?

The defendant can never be tried again for the same crime. This is called "double jeopardy." A finding of not guilty is not the same as a finding of innocence.

It simply means that the jury was not convinced that the defendant was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

INTERMARK MGMT EVERGREEN VILLAS REFUSED TO RENEW LEASE.

If you believe your landlord refused to renew your lease because you made a complaint about his treatment of you or about the conditions of the property, you should talk to a lawyer.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) enforces the FHA, and tenants can file a complaint with HUD or their local fair housing agency if they believe the evidence that they have been discriminated against based on their disability.

In some cases, the landlord may have grounds for eviction that are not related to the disability (such as non-payment of rent or violation of lease terms), and the tenant with mental impairment may still be evicted.

#### DISCRIMINATION HEALTH

civil rights

Overview

A civil right is an enforceable right or privilege, which if interfered with by another gives rise to an action for injury.

#### DISCRIMINATION GOVERNMENT HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS

Pub. L. 104-76, §1, Dec. 28, 1995, 109 Stat. 787, provided that: "This Act [amending section 3607 of this title] may be cited as the 'Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995'."

Short Title of 1988 Amendment

What is the Civil Rights Act for housing discrimination?

The 1968 Act expanded on previous acts and prohibited discrimination concerning the sale, rental, and financing of housing based on race, religion, national origin, sex, (and as amended) handicap and family status. Title VIII of the Act is also known as the Fair Housing Act (of 1968).

volume 42 (called "title 42") of the United States Code. One small part of the ADA is found in title 47 of the United States Code.3) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing, public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;

SECTION 27-40-410. Security deposits; prepaid rent.

28 U.S. Code § 351 - Complaints; judge defined

18 U.S.C. § 242


#### NO DISRESPECT-FOR THE LEGAL RECORD

I BRENDA DAWSON BATTLE IS NOT A ATTORNEY MY ERRORS IF ANY ARE MADE IN TRUTH AND NOT LIES.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brenda Jean Burt", written over a horizontal line.

Date: 22nd December 2023