

NO. 23-6905

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PAUL HARRIS

Petitioner,

Vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Respondent.

On Petition for Reconsideration for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

**PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Paul Harris
6129 East Avenue R-12
Palmdale, California 93552
(818) 693-1088

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Where this petitioner cannot read or write nor afford an attorney and was granted Pro Se status, is the petitioner entitled to Equal Treatment and Due Process of law? Here, because petitioner's assistant was not allowed to speak on petitioner's behalf and the court would not appoint a lawyer or a court Interpreter to assist the petitioner in prosecuting his case.

QUESTION: Does Petitioner have a Constitutional Right under the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause to a Fair Trial and participate in said trial by the court's appointment of an INTERPRETER to assist petitioner in understanding and communicating what's being transpired during said trial/ hearing, in order to effectively participate in prosecuting his cause of action ?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
DECISION BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
FEDERAL RULE INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3-4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5-6
CONCLUSION	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>United States vs. Lim,</u> (9 th Cir. 1986) 794 F. 2d 469, 470	5
<u>United States vs. Adalberto Murgua – Rodriguez,</u>	6
(9 th Cir. 2016) No. 14-10400	

OTHER CODES ANDV STATUTES

Court Interpreter's Act of 1978	5
Due Process	5
Fourteenth Amendment/ U.S. Const.	5
Ninth Judicial District	5
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964	5
Equal Justice	6
F.R.A.P. #52(b)	2
Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution	2
28 U.S.C. Rule 1827(D)(1)	2

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Paul Harris respectively requests the RECONSIDERATION of his Petition For Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit.

DECISION BELOW

The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is published at Case No. 23-55664 filed on November 17, 2023, Attached as Appendix A, and the decision by the U.S. Central Court dated July 6, 2023 is attached as Appendix B simply followed the intangible lead set by the lower courts.

JURISDICTION

The Ninth Circuit entered judgment on November 17, 2023, and the U.S. Central District court's decision dated July 6, 2023. This court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254.

FEDERAL RULE INVOLVED

F.R.C.P. #52(b)

Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

28 U.S.C. Rule 1827(D)(1)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner experienced a small bump on his right toe area, and a Doctor at Kaiser performed the surgery of implanting a Fixation Device (containing 5 screws, one screw longer than the other 4). After petitioner's operation, petitioner noticed major swelling and pain. Petitioner returned to Doctor Schacter's on many occasions just to be given a verbal pacifier to be patient. This went on for better than a year where petitioner suffered extreme pain and swelling. When the pain and swelling became unbearable, petitioner obtained a second opinion from different Kaiser-associated doctor name Mr. Tuan Anh Le, DPM. Dr. Le examined petitioner's right foot's big toe area and discovered that the Fixation Device implanted by the respondents Dr. Schacter (defendant in the original lawsuit) had to be removed.

Once Dr. Le removed the implanted Fixation Device ... it was also discovered that Dr. Schacter had 'cut too much bone' in addition to wrongfully implanting a device that would cover up the fact Dr. Schacter Cut Too Much Bone. At the outset of petitioner's Surgery by Dr. Le, petitioner noticed his swelling and pain had tolerantly subsided, allowing petitioner to enjoy some of life's basic needs again. This is when Dr. Le provided petitioner with the Fixation Device used by Dr. Schacter plus a Machine that is supposed to "FUSE" the bones.

The defendant, Doctor Schacter's attorneys in Superior court argued that Petitioner must be held to the same standards of licensed attorneys; this was stated simply to eliminate any reference to Dr. Le who corrected the wrongful implantation of the Fixation Device which intentionally caused Petitioner's case unconstitutionally depriving Petitioner of an assistant to

help him where he cannot read or write and its hard to understand what's going on with his case. It is incredibly unsettling how a non-English Speaking person can receive assistance to understand what's going in their cases through an Interpreter; and how Petitioner was denied the opportunity to allow his assistant to explain to the court that the Doctor who performed the corrective surgery needs to be subpoenaed so that a court will have All the Evidence after hearing Dr. Le's testimony regarding why the Fixation Device (hardware) had to be removed; but Petitioner was not allowed to have his assistant to speak nor was Petitioner provided an Interpreter by the court despite Petitioner's assistant informing the court of petitioner's inability to read or write and needed assistance though the court acknowledged the fact petitioner cannot read or write and needed help communicating and understanding with the court and parties ... the judge decided to deprive the petitioner of his rights under the **Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**, and the court accepted the defendant's version and ruled that despite the court's knowledge of the fact that petitioner cannot read or write or understand the legal language being spoken during the hearing, the court stated that petitioner will be held to the same standards of licensed attorneys and Dismissed the case against petitioner without affording petitioner his Due Process and Equal Protection.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This court should grant Certiorari to ensure that when a person cannot read or write or understand communications during court proceedings, the courts should automatically appoint an assistant/ interpreter where a fundamental interest is at stake and the inability of individuals to understand and or express themselves in English may prevent full and necessary participation in court proceedings. Here, the courts have an obligation to ensure Due Process and Equal Access to the courts, Court Interpreter's Act of 1978 (H.R. Rep. 95-1687 at 1978), and see the court in United States vs. Lim, (9th Cir. 1986) 794 F. 2nd 469, 470, both supporting and holding "A person whose fluency in English is so impaired that it interferes that person's right to confrontation or his/her capacity, as a witness, to understand or respond to questions ... 'has a Constitutional Right to an Interpreter'". Here, the strategy of the defendants was to use the judge in silencing the petitioner and petitioner's assistant to prevent petitioner from mentioning the actual Doctor who based his need to correct the defendant's operation by removing the Internal Fixation Device (hardware) wrongfully implanted by the defendant used his Expert and professional experiences which required **Doctor Tuan Anh Le DPM** to remove the wrongfully implanted hardware, See Exhibit A. This, as can be determined, worked, and the petitioner, (a person who cannot read or write nor understand the communications during court) was deprived of his Due Process rights under the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, see also the Ninth Judicial Circuit which provides spoken language court interpreter to limited- English-Proficient persons in accordance

with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 90.606; stating that "Qualified spoken language court reporters will be Appointed where a fundamental interest is at stake". Thus, it is respectfully requested that this honorable court being the United States Supreme Court, is charged with ensuring All American people the promise of Equal Justice under the law, and thereby also functions as guardian and interpreter of the United States Constitution. In finality, the petitioner was also denied his rights under the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) to accommodations necessary to ensure petitioner's right to a fair trial. Because the lower courts did not properly allow nor apply petitioner his Constitutional rights, United States vs. Adalberto Murguia – Rodriguez, (9th Cir. 2016) No. 14-10400, this court's review is warranted.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Paul Harris respectfully requests that this court issue his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul Harris

Paul Harris in Pro Se

May 13, 2024