

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE: LINDA ANN WRIGHT-PETITIONER

vs.

UNITED STATES ET AL., -RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS
TO THE THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

LINDA ANN WRIGHT, PRO SE
300 ELIZABETH DRIVE, APT. 3108
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15220
412-722-3326

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Judge Ranjan Abused his discretion in § 1915(2)?
2. Whether it was possible to achieve due process, when there are three jurisdictions causing catastrophes of death and two refusing to Reopen cases that caused the harm?
3. Did Case No. 2:15-cv-00214-J need to exist? Or was it the U.S. Courts Violating the Fourteenth Amendment: Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses, by allowing retaliation for California Case DR090936?
4. Was the illegal entry into the petitioner's property at 4579 Cummings Road, Eureka CA., a Violation of the Fourth and Eighth Amendments: illegal search and seizure, and other laws?
5. Whether the CA3, should have Required a new Judge and Case, due to violations of 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1)(5)(iv)? And corrected the errors in the Order?
6. Should California and Texas U.S.D.C. Judges have Recused themselves in the Request to Reopen Cases?
7. Has the U.S. Courts Discriminated against the petitioner, since Supreme Court Case No. 10-9095, in their dispositions?
8. Whether the petitioner has been discriminated against by the Veterans Affairs Administration for 50 years, in determining eligibility in her ratings, and privileges?
9. Is it time to Repeal 38 U.S.C § 511(a), for Violating 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3), in issuing a fifty percent rating for loss of reproduction organ, and willfully denying Military Sexual Trauma, by means of Fraud?

10. Whether the Supreme Court of the U.S. erred in Closing Case No. 16-9258, which led to the illegal theft of my property, respondents operating on my carotid artery, **furtherance** of Violating 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3); and my father to be locked in Kirkland Court Nursing Home, until his death 2019?
11. Did the CA3 participate in **furtherance** of Violations of 42 U.S.C. 1985(3), by allowing for Ninth Cir. Court of Appeals Case No. 15-16288 to be followed by PAWD U.S.D.C. Case 21-01152; which is clearly in Violation of the Eight Amendment: dignity?
12. Why wasn't Cases CAND Case:14-03008-CRB; or TXND Case: 15-00214-Z Investigated for Fraud

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear on 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:

Mark t. Caloyer, Esq.	John C. Conti, Esq.
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith	Dickie McCarney & Chilcote
One PPG Place	Two PPG Place
28 th Floor	Suite 400
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222
412-250-7308	412-281-7272
<u>mark.caloyer@lewisbrisbois.com</u>	<u>jconti@dmclaw.com</u>
Kelly B. Cullen, Esq.	Laura S. Irwin, Esq.

Dickie McCamey & Chilcote
Two PPG Place
Suite 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
412-392-5629
kcullen@dmclaw.com

Office of the U.S. Attorney
700 Grant St.
Suite 4000
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412-644-6995
Laura.Irwin@usdoj.gov

Hailey F. Warden-Rodgers, Esq.
Office of the U.S. Attorney
700 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412-644-7409
usapaw.ecfappeals@usdoj.gov

Jeffrey J. Wetzel, Esq.
Dickie McCamey & Chilcote
Two PPG Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
412-281-7272
jwetzel@dmclaw.com

Linda Ann Wright, Pro Se
300 Elizabeth Drive
Apartment 3108
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220
412-722-3326
1Lawrightone@gmail.com

RELATED CASES

Linda Wright v. USA, et al., Third Circuit Court of Appeals Case No 22-1164

Wright v. United States, et al., PAWD Case No. 2:21-cv-01152-NR

Wright v. United States, et al., PAWD Case No. 2:21-cv-00713-NR

Wright v. United States of America, Texas, California, et al., TXND Case No. 2:15-cv-00214-Z

Linda Ann Wright v. United States, et al., CAND Case No. 3:14-cv-03008-CRB

Wright v. United States of America, et al., 15-16288 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Dec. 8, 2015

American Express v. Linda Wright, CAND Case No. C 11-04492-WHA

Linda Ann Wright v. American Express, et al., Case No. C11-04492-WHA

Linda Ann Wright v. Petra Kuhfahl, et al., CAND Case No. 09-5752-SBA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 1, 2

JURISDICTION 3, 38.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS 2, 3.

STATEMENT OF CASE

- I. This Case is a Civil Rights Case 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), with Violations Due Process and Equal Protection.
- II. Judge Ranjan Abused his Discretion, 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2); With prejudice.
- III. Denied Due Process and Equal Protection by U.S. Courts, as a Black Woman, Veteran.
- IV. Third Circuit Court of Appeals, should have corrected all the errors of the Case, before Affirmation;
- V. United States of America, et al., was allowed discriminate against petitioner for over Ten years, in Violations of 42

U.S.C. § 1983, 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)

VI. Repeal 38 U.S.C. § 511(a), Violates Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses to the United States Constitution

ARGUMENTS

- I. Whether the Veterans Affairs Decision Letter showed actual conspiracy under 42 U.S.C. 1985(3)?
- II. Petitioner was Denied Due Process and Equal Protection, U.S. courts. Appendices A—D.
- III. The District Court Abused its Discretion by first denying, then awarding *in Forma Pauperis*, to allow for 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2), *See* Video of Conference.
- IV. Case No. 1152 had at least two entries left; petitioner had to use Amended Complaint to input data into *ECF*, *See Dkt. 17*, Second Amended Complaint; 0713, was DISMISSED.
- V. This Complaint was **not res judicata**; the misinformation of the ORDER, Dkt. 25, e.g., Statute of Limitations: *See* St. Clair Hospital Admission Date: 06/10/2019; John H. Wright, Died 2019;
- VI. Sovereign Immunity: “Does not shield a government official where she has “violated a statutory or constitutional right that was clearly established...;” Does this apply to Linda, John & Mae?
- VII. Whether John, Mae, and Linda Wright should have been classified as prisoners of the state, while being illegally held in Nursing Homes, by State Actions?

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 36, 37.

CONCLUSION

INDEX TO APPENDIX

Appendix A, Orders: Justice Alito’s through Judge Ranjan.

Appendix B, Evidence of Fraud, Violations of Due Process

Appendix C, Power of Attorney signed by John H. Wright,

Appendix D, Evidence in support of Reopening Cases and *in Forma pauperis* Owed Amounts.

TABLES OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby</i>	3
<i>Griffin v. Breckenridge</i> , 403 U.S. 88 102 91 S.Ct.....	32
<i>Hughes v. Pair</i> , 46 Cal. 4 th 1035, 1050	11
<i>Lichtenstein v. University of Pittsburgh Med. Ctr.</i>	3
<i>Liteky v. United States</i> , 510 U.S. 540 1994	30
<i>Minarsky v. Susquehanna County</i>	6
<i>Reiche v. Howards</i> , 566 U.S. 658, 664,132 S.Ct. 2008,	3
<i>Rhodes</i> ,452 U.S. at 347, 101 S.Ct. 2392	28
<i>Schmidt v. Skolas</i> , F.3d 241 (3d Cir. 2014) aware of injuries.....	23

<i>Thomas v. Tice</i> , 943 F3d 145, 149 (3d Cir. 2019)	29
<i>Trop v. Dallas</i> ,.....	30
<i>United States v. Greenough</i>	18
<i>Bishop v. Wood</i> ,.....	16
STATUTES AND RULES	2, 3
28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1)	
38 U.S.C. § 5107	

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that an extraordinary writ of mandamus issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[X] For the cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States appears at Appendix A to the petition and is a STAY, Justice Alito, DENIED.
[X] reported at Supreme Court of U.S.;

The opinion of the In re Linda Ann Wright, appears at Appendix A, to the petition CLOSED by Justice Kennedy (Ret.)
[X] reported at Supreme Court of U.S. Case No. 16-9258

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A, to the petition Linda A. Wright v. United States, et al.
[X] reported at Third Circuit Court of Appeals, Case No. 22-1164

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A, to the petition Linda Wright v. Defendants and Does
[X] reported at Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Case No. 16-10308

The opinion of the United States district court appears at
Appendix A, Linda A. Wright v. USA., et al., Case No. 21-01152
[X] reported at PAWD U.S. District Court. DENIED.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at
Appendix A, Linda Ann Wright v. USA, et al Case No. 15-00214,
[X] reported at NDTX U.S. District Court. DENIED.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at
Appendix A, Wright v. United States Case No. 14-cv-03008-CRB,
[X] reported at CAND U.S. District Court. DENIED.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S. 1651

[] For cases from **state courts**:

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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution	26
Fourth Amendment	26
Eighth Amendment	25, 26, 27,28

Fourteenth Amendment	2, 5, 6, 8, 14, 16, 21
28 U.S.C. § 453, Oath of every justice or judge	30
28 U.S.C. § 455	3, 10, 15, 19, 21, 30, 32
28 U.S.C. § 1346	31
28 U.S.C. § 1651	2,
28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(b)(1)(2)(3)	4, 9, 28
38 U.S.C. § 511(a).....	20, 21
38 U.S.C. § 5107	30, 32
42 U.S.C. § 1983	19
42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)	2, 5, 6, 8, 14, 16, 21, 26, 30
A0 440	2
Rule 20	2
Rule 21	2
Rule 22	2
Rule 23	2
Rule 32	2
Rule 33	2
Rule 34	2
Rule 35	
Rule 40.....	Cover
F.R.A.P. 4(c)	11
F.R.A.P. 4(i)	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2)	9

STATEMENT OF CASE

After fifty years of pain and suffering, the petitioner has again been denied Equal Protection and Due Process by the United States Courts.

On April 11, 2023, I experienced Severe swelling, and pain throughout my body. I called 911 and was taken to the Emergency Room at Presbyterian Hospital. I was treated and not given a room, I was not treated for the swelling and was being processed out the following morning, when I asked what about the swelling the Doctor said, "I don't know what that is." I was kept another day and sent home with oxygen.

I was so shaken by this I called the Management of Presbyterian; I had the necessary documents and insurance. I Filed a Motion in Case No. 22-1164, Dkt. 54 Third Circuit, to which the Panel had stated "DOCUMENTS in support of Appeal filed by Appellant Ms. Linda Ann Wright." Second Filing Dkt. 55, Letter Filed Hospital Breach of Contract and Conspiracy; which was prompted by the Veterans Decision Letter, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (U.P.M.C.), St. Clair Hospital, AMVET, Butler VAMC, Doctor Michael Rosen, Mordecai Smith, Pittsburgh VAMC, SFVAMC, St. Joseph Hospital, et al., Filing a Fraudulent Decision to continue to deny the petitioner her privileges

and rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), the Fourteenth Amendment: Due Process. Thus 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2).

“A dispute is genuine if a reasonable trier-of-fact could find in favor of the nonmovant.” *Lichtenstein v. University of Pittsburgh Med. Ctr.*, 691 F.3d 294, 400 (4d Cir. 2012) (citing *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 252, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986)) “We deny summary judgment if there is enough evidence for a jury to reasonably find” for the nonmoving party. *Minarsky*, 895 F.3d at 309.

Instead of awarding the Privileges that I had earned, the U.S.A., et al., decided to Discriminate Against me, malign my character, manipulate my Medical Information The Veterans Affairs has tried to **control every aspect of my life, e.g. Income, Medical Care; Fifty (50) years of deceit and Neglect, pain and suffering.** I have been a virtual prisoner of the United States, et al., my inability to have children; and an Error in Doctor Arlene Bradley’s Doctor’s Notes, about pregnancy.

In 2010 I submitted documents to the Supreme Court of the U.S., Case No. 10-9095, IN RE: Linda Ann Wright v. Nancy Craig, et al., evidence showed then that there was a conspiracy to violate my Civil

and Constitutional rights. I was unaware of the over a decade long abuse that I would endure, for trying to get the privileges and rights due me. 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3), ***Furtherance:***

On May 27, 2021, in looking at documents submitted into my files at the Pittsburgh VAMC and Doctor Michael Rosen placed in my files several lies and libelous statements, e.g. herpes, hepatitis C, Property taken for not paying taxes, etc., that the United States, et al., tried to keep from the Court Case 21-cv-01152-NR. *See Case No. 22-1164, Dkt. 29, 48,* ¹Cindy Chung, Laura S. Irwin, Respondents Attorneys exclusion of:

Michael Rosen, Doctor for Military Sexual Trauma (MST), placed in my Veterans Medical Records at the Pittsburgh VAMC, numerous lies and character assassination printed on May 27th, 2021; Doctor Mordecai Smith, from the Veterans Intake Center, with AMVETS, [UPMC 01/20/2020] Filed a Fraudulent DECISION, Dated 06/28/2021, which I never received. My Income has been affected by these activities since

¹ Third Circuit Court of Appeals Judge, now; was U.S. Attorney for Fed. Defendants, Docket 29, (31 pages of Misinformation). *See Status Conference Video.*

²2000. U.S.A. et al., and financial institutions have systematically prevented my just income. *See* CA3 Case No. 22-1164, Dkt. 58, No Attorney's Fees; Wells Fargo, Texas and CA. App. C & D

See Arlene Bradley, MD Compensation and Pension 2007, where petitioner was authorized to receive Compensation for Military Sexual Trauma; but was fraudulently disrupted by USA, et al., State of CA. et al., (Medical Board of CA. 2007); in comes Michael Rosen, MD., USA, et al., CA. et al., AMVET, St. Clair, Butler VAMC...; in ***furtherance*** of the conspiracies that began and continues from California Case DR090936, which was **REMOVED** from State Court in California to U.S.D.C., CAND Case Number 3:09-c -5752-SBA; by perjured testimonies by two Veterans Affairs Attorneys: Coleen L. Welch and Richard P. Geib, allowing for the Court to determine that "Plaintiff had not Exhausted all Administrative remedies." PAWD Case 21-01152, Court Repeats. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1).

See Rebuttal App. C.

Violating 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)

² Pre-Dates 38 U.S.C. § 511(a), and has been continuously Denied, majority in letter and defendants/ respondents.

EXHAUSTING ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

PAWD Case No. 21-cv-01152-NR

“Plaintiff Linda Ann Wright, proceeding pro se, brings a variety of claims against a host—hundreds—of defendants.” Judge Ranjan, Page 1, paragraph 1.

Answer: Petitioner has tried to Reopen the Cases in Texas and CA.

These Defendants were recruited by U.S.A., et al., California, et al., and Texas, et al., mainly the Dept. of Justice: CA Case No. DR090936. Re-Occurring defendants, with add-ons, not one defendant prosecuted.

See Presbyterian (2023), (2021) AMVET, Dr. Mordecai Smith, Dr. Michael Rosen, (2022) Butler VAMC, In-Home Care, Defendants added since moving to Pennsylvania. Violations of Equal Protection Clause.

HISTORY

³(61 Defendants) *See* CAND Case 14-cv-03008-CRB, **Dkt. 184**, 06/24/15, “Wright’s allegations in the Amended Complaint seem to center on Various claims that she [“has experienced COINTELPRO,

³ Stated by Judge Charles R. Breyer, Sua Sponte.

firsthand,”] which she states is a ⁴“Domestic Counterintelligence [sic] Program.”], *See* Ninth Circuit, Case No. 15-16288

My Mother was being abused to death, Father abused to death, locked in Nursing Homes. *See* Veterans Decision Letter 06/28/21, Presbyterian Hospital, **Dkt. 55**, PAWD 1152-NR. Petitioner has documentation on all that she claims? *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009). Does not cover criminal activities by “State Actors.”

01152-NR

Judge Ranjan: Page 2, paragraph 1, “November 30-December 2, 2021. *ECF 17; ECF 23; ECF 24*, These operative complaint(s) appear identical and brings the same **claims** and allegations—” [Petitioner was instructed to use complaint forms to input defendants into system.]

“Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(2), however, the Court must dismiss the case if it is *frivolous* or **fails to state a claim** on which relief can be granted.” December 1, 2021, Status Conference, 6th Case Closed.

⁴ Served in Army Security Agency. Patriot Act.

Petitioner's Answer: 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3), Wrongful Death, Fraud, Real ⁵Property theft, Violation of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, illegal search and seizure; Fourteenth Amendment, Violating Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses. *See* Judge Ranjan "The Court has no doubt that Ms. Wright feels sincerely and strongly about her case. Nonetheless, after carefully reviewing Ms. Wright's allegations, the Court must dismiss her claims." Ms. Wright has filed a number of complaints in this case most of which appear largely identical in all material respects⁶ ...; Citing *Gibson v. Susquehanna Township Authority*, 2021 WL 5768472, at *2 (3d Cir. Dec. 6, 2021) (per curiam), and *Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 108 (3d Cir. 2002).

Petitioner's reply: *Minarsky v. Susquehanna County*, 895 F.3d 303, 309 (3d Cir. 2018) "We exercise plenary review over the grant or denial

⁵ While suffering a stroke Texas and California worked in concert to take my properties. Operation on my Carotid Artery, instead of Lymphedema Diagnosis? "This is far from Ms. Wright's first attempt seeking relief through federal courts. Ms. Wright filed similar suits in federal court in California and Texas seeking justice." Bias from judge;

of summary judgment and apply the same standard the district court should have applied.”

Plaintiff's response, each time I had to input information into the *ECF* systems it would erase entries, in Case No 2:21-cv-713, there was a need to apply another Complaint just to input Defendants information. Which made it seem like the plaintiff was unable to function. I was happy that Case No. 0713 was gone. That Case was Closed. The plaintiff had *ECF* experience, Federal Filings.

Case No. 2:21-cv-1152, went smoothly until the status conference, *where there was an abundance of misinformation*⁷, that allowed for confusion on the Court's part. I asked the Court ⁸What about the Parties who did not return the Summons? The Judge replied, “Default Judgments!” a few days later this Case was ⁹Closed with at

⁷ See Cindy Chung, Dkt. 29, “Instant Complaint.” St, Clair E.R. June 10, 2019.

⁸ Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(3), “you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ...; “If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you...;”

⁹ See U.S. Attorney Cindy Chung statement Ex Parte Communication “Before the district court, the U.S. Attorney's Office appeared on behalf of Federal Defendants...;” “The district court dismissed Wright's suit *sua sponte* pursuant to § 1915(e)(2) before service was perfected on any Federal Defendant in accordance with Rule 4(i)...;” “See Fed. R. App. P 4(c)(3) (providing that court appoint U.S. Marshal or another person to make service if plaintiff is authorized to proceed *in forma pauperis*).” “Federal Defendants, therefore, did not appear or participate in the District Court proceedings.

least two filings left. Since 0713 was closed. I kept copies of the malfunctions.

Court Page 1, footnote 2: "This is far from Ms. Wright's first attempt seeking relief through the federal courts." "Ms. Wright filed similar suits in federal court in California and Texas, seeking justice. Leagues away now in Pennsylvania, she again brings suit in federal court."

The Court is suggesting that plaintiff enjoyed participating in litigation. 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1), personal bias from Court.

HISTORY

TXND Case No. 2:15-cv-0214-J, **Dkt. 134**, 06/13/2016,
MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING ALL OF THE
PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS ASSERTED IN THIS LAWSUIT.

"The Court has earlier granted motions to dismiss filed by all defendants, save two (Tyrone Wright and Kevin Wright), which collectively sought dismissal of all of the claims asserted by *pro se* Plaintiff Linda Ann Wright." Page 1. [Footnote 2, The Court notes that the additional dismissal grounds as asserted by the Defendants are

meritorious, specifically including the pled immunity from punitive damages defense and the insufficiency of Plaintiff's service of process, which insufficiency—while pointed out to the Plaintiff was never cured.]

1. John H. Wright, Jr., was locked in Kirkland Court Nursing Home (illegally 2013-2019), *See* Michael Kaitcer, Attorney Guardianship, I Paid over three thousand dollars and he did not protect my father's interest. Dates: September-October 2013, he allowed John to be sent to Allegiance Behavioral Hospital, by Joyce Course. Never saw my father again. *See* Bills, Airline Tickets, Email: Kaitcer. ¹⁰Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.
2. Mae B. Wright was dead after being locked in Lone Tree Convalescent in California (illegally), was sent to Sutter Delta Hospital, in CA., Operated on her Liver, while on heavy blood thinners; Died. The ROI changed to Do Not Resuscitate, illegally. ProTransport, was paid to bring her to my home. *See* Ambulance Bill, 5/26/2015. ¹¹She died January 15, 2016. Surgery ¹²Maimed

¹⁰ Wrongful Death, Elder Abuse

¹¹ Wrongful Death, Elder Abuse

¹² Dkt. 161-10, pgs. 3,4, 9, Mae Wright was taken to a Defunct Hospital, where Doctor Weiland, Operated on her foot against my written Complaint and maimed her 23 March 2015, with Sharon B. Drager, William Chen, Mae Francine Holmes,

her. Have Video, of her deformed foot, and deteriorating health and welfare. Confined. *See App. B, In forma pauperis.*

3. Going through the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, for CAND Case 03008-CRB, Paid for Documents to be Mailed, CA9 Case No. 15-16288, was not done, *ECF* would not except. TXND, **Dkt. 125** Requested an Investigation why the mail was not Delivered on time, because there had been patterns of [Mail, not showing up to destination five times, during Case (CAND 03008)]. **Dkt. 127,** ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INVESTIGATION, "Plaintiff request this court to investigate why her appellate pleading was untimely filed. March 17, 2016, DENIED; [Sua Sponte, in CA Case No. 03008-CRB.] Court accuses plaintiff of misconduct; instead of due diligence.

4. Ninth Circuit Case No. 15-16288, ORDER. "The amended complaint, which describes **unrelated events** that span over forty years...;" "38 U.S.C. 511(a)...;" "Accordingly, appellees' motions for summary affirmance of the district court's judgment

State of California, Edmund Brown Jr., Kamala Harris, Alta Bates Hospital, Violated 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) privileges denied protecting my family and me.

are granted because the questions raised by the appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument,” ECF?

5. During Case TXND 00213-J, Plaintiff Requested of the Court assistance in Saving my Mother’s Life; property, and an Autopsy, Dkts. 100, Injunction Relief; 12/22/2015; 101, Injunction
¹³Restraining Order; 103, Injunction State of CA 12/30/2015; 107, Injunction to Secure Mae and Effects. 01/12/2016; **01/15/2016 Mae Wright was dead, Operated on her liver.**
¹⁴Judges Barbara MG Lynn, Sydney L. Fitzwater, Matthew J. Kacsmarck, upheld this Case and its rulings; even though John H. Wright should have been released to my charge as Power of Attorney, in 2013. *See* Power of Attorney, Notarized in Amarillo, Texas. *See* Judicial Misconduct Complaint Nos. 05-20-90002 –05-20-90004, Fifth Cir. Court of Appeals, and Case No. 16-10318. “Lack of Jurisdiction,” “Appeal Denied.” 12/08/2016. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1)

¹³ Later used by USA, et al., State of CA. Humboldt County Tax Collector, to take my Home and property while suffering from stroke, *See* App. B. John Barthlomew.

¹⁴ Along with Ken Paxton, Greg Abbott, Rick Perry, were made aware by me.

6. Linda Ann Wright was in the St. Joseph's Affiliated Nursing

¹⁵Home where surgery on my carotid artery while I was a stroke victim; while fighting for my life, these parties SFVAMC, U.S.A. et al., the State of CA., et al., Wells Fargo, et al., Coast Central Credit Union, Nancy K. DeLaney, et al., Michael Morrison, et al., with John Barthlomew placed on my property that I owed "Back Taxes." Retaliation for the lawsuits that I Filed and was Denied. There was no Court action in this seizure of my property; this was Fraud, *See Appendix C, and In forma pauperis. Bishop v. Wood*, 426 U.S. 341, 345-347, 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) provides that if conspirators "do ... any act in *furtherance* of ... such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property,... may" recover damages, § 1985(3).

Answer from petitioner: this showed the Court's actual lack of review of this case and the California and Texas Cases, which were to be Multi-District Litigation with the Cases Reopened; and several Causes of

¹⁵ Defendant/ Respondent with long history of damaging my body, e.g. Hysterectomy, Gall bladder, non-diagnosis of pelvic relaxation and losing the specimen, and using the Court to deny compensation; operated on my carotid artery.

Action, that happened during Case. *See* Veterans Decision Letter, App.

A & C

See Supreme Court Case 16-9258, Closed Former Justice Anthony Kennedy, 15 November 2017; While in April 2017-December 23, 2017, ¹⁶Coast Central Credit Union, Wells Fargo Contractor Larry Doe, Humboldt County Residents, invaded my property with dogs. Raining and Black Mold in my Home, petitioner leased a Storage Container, from Humboldt Waste Management, to move out. My Sister on Dialysis was illegally Evicted from her house, by Maria Rainwater, Edmund Brown, Jr., State of CA., ¹⁷Isabell Rivera & Ray Schnibben, 2017; [Georgio Herrera, 2019], November 2017, On December 23, after the November 15, 2017, DECISION, Supreme Court Case No. 16-9258; Petitioner emailed a long-time friend right before my Stroke. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress. *See* App. C, Email.

¹⁶ Larry Deridder, Ericksen Arbuthnot, American Modern Home Insurance, Allstate Auto; Humboldt County, et al., State of CA., et al., Tax Collector John Bartholomew including participants Nancy K. Delaney, Michael Morrison, et al., St. Joseph Hospital, et al., American Modern Insurance, et al., Arbuthnot, participated in Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3); Fraud; Retaliation; Grand Theft of Real Estate and property, Libel and Slander.

¹⁷ I had to Pay for Annette, Children and Grandchildren to get hotel rooms until my funds were depleted, two days before Christmas, and my babies were homeless and hungry. Last thing I remember, before I woke up in Nursing home, with property taken.

While living in Pennsylvania, I had to send plane tickets for my sister and her family to leave California; the family of nine living in my apartment for months, because Maria Rainwater, Section 8, refused to send Certificate. January 20, 2020, I was hospitalized, when I came home my family was gone. They had no money to leave. \$12,000.00.

CASE NO. 1152

At this point I had spent over Ten thousand Dollars, in court fees and filings. No Default Judgment which showed me the one sided proceeding this Case was. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), There was an Abuse of Discretion, because of the Court's actions, language and lack of decorum, and errors. The decision to Rule with prejudice, was just that. This was supposed to be Multi-District Litigation, between California, Texas and Pennsylvania. "whether a reasonable person knowing all the facts would conclude that the judge's impartiality might be reasonably questioned." *United States v. Greenough*, 782 F.2d 1556, 1558, (11th Cir. 1986)

Arguments: Malfunctioning equipment should not be the cause of Dismissing a Case. List of Parties seemed to have surprised the Courts. A Multi- District Litigation would have solved any questions; with

defendants under oath. 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1), Court abused its discretion.

This Case was about Fraud, Wrongful Deaths, Conspiracies, Discrimination, Botched and Unauthorized Surgeries, Human Rights Violations, Abuse of Authority, Grand theft of Real Property. It was also 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), Violations of Equal Protection and Due Process under the Fourteenth Amendment; Fourth Amendment: Illegal search and seizure; to the United States Constitution; these Issues could not be achieved without the Texas and California Cases Reopened. § 1985(3).

3:14-cv-03008-CRB

2018, While I was fighting for my ¹⁸life, from Black Mold and Criminal Trespass on my property of over Twenty years; The Humboldt County Tax Collector and the State California Posted a fraudulent ¹⁹Tax Bill on my property, took my Property, Truck and Car at 4579 Cummings Road Eureka, California 95501. See App. B, Photos, and C.

¹⁸ In Nursing Home, St Joseph Hospital, et al., intruded and illegally took my Home, Truck, Car and other property without court action.

¹⁹ Coast Central Credit Union, Wells Fargo (CA), Eureka Veterans Clinic, USA, et al.,

Tax Collector, Rebuttal Evidence Mortgage Statement and Letter from Broker. *See App. B.*

The plaintiff Filed to Reopen CAND Case No.14-03008-CRB, since the defendants of that case were still active in Violating my rights and privileges; meanwhile in Texas Case No. 15-00214-J defendants were active keeping my disabled father illegally in an Abusive Nursing Home, that should have released him in ²⁰2013, the State of Texas had kept him alone until his death, then ships his remains to ²¹California. Texas tore down my birth home in 2019, in Amarillo, Texas.

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress. Retaliation.

2:15-cv-00214-Z, 2019

PAWD 1152-NR

See App. A Department of Veterans Affairs DECISION, Dated: 06/28/2021, which shows that the Contact with defendants from Case No 3:14-cv-03008-CRB, on this form alone shows petitioner's contact

²⁰ See Amarillo PD, actually stating that I had to contact Kevin; who was never Power of Attorney, See Power of Attorney Signed with a Notary Public in Amarillo, discrimination against me and causing my father to suffer until he died.

²¹ Shipped to the Defendants who conspired with the USA, et al., CA, et al., TX, et al.,

with the Veteran Affairs since 1979, yet the Court Stated that my Issues were 38 U.S.C. § 511(a). The Court continues to support his Decision by Declaring *res judicata*, which has nothing to do with the Cases that I submitted. The Complaint was based on the times before and after the Closing of Cases in Texas and California, the plaintiff had Requested Reopening both, due to **new evidence and illegal activities** in both Jurisdictions.

Judge Ranjan “Ms. Wright cannot re-litigate these already-adjudicated claims.” Answer from plaintiff all the Issues of this Case came before or after the Closings.

New Evidence and the continuous barrage of assaults on me personally, my health and the laws of this land. *See Appendix B, 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1).*

APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY

STATUTE_OF_LIMITATIONS

After Supplying the Court with a Writ of Habeas Corpus, from plaintiff's Filing with the Supreme Court of the U.S. Case No, 19-8766, which contained a Chronological History of the Plaintiff's Court Filings.

The Court selectively chose the Decisions in TX and CA, not the Motions submitted by the petitioner. The Only person with “Standing,” I tried to get my father out of Texas, he had signed two Powers of Attorneys, and Texas refused to honor the Documents. *See Amarillo Police Report at Kirkland Court Nursing Home, Appendix B.*

Page 2, Paragraph 3

“More specific obstacles also apply. For example, to the extent Ms. Wright seeks review or challenges veterans’ benefits determinations, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over such claims. 38 U.S.C. § 511(a); *Ibrahim v. U.S. Dep’t of VA*, 779 F. App’x 1010, 1011(Mem.) (3d Cir. 2019).” “That is Ms. Wright previously filed similar actions in federal court...;” Judge Ranjan.

28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1), prejudged my complaint, with the assistance of defendant Attorneys in the conference.

“Ms. Wright alleges that she suffered **various** injuries in ²²2018, after she moved to Pennsylvania.” Judge Ranjan, Page 3, Second Paragraph.

²² Colonoscopy in Pittsburgh VAMC, *See* Swelling, Presbyterian, UPMC. St. Clair

“To the extent any tort claims are based on these injuries in claims, see Pa. C.S.A § 5524, as Ms. Wright did not bring suit until August 2021.” Judge Ranjan. *Schmidt v. Skolas*, F.3d 241 (3d Cir. 2014)

Plaintiff’s Reply: *See* Veterans Affairs Decision, 2021, Pittsburgh.

“The applicable statute of limitations is also a bar to Ms. Wright’s claims.”

No, Ms. Wright suffered a Stroke²³ in 2018, and Saint Joseph Hospital, CA., performed surgery on my ²⁴Carotid Artery, after several prior surgeries resulted in life-threatening injuries that I am still recovering from; and never compensated for. *See* Reopen Cases: 3:14-cv-03008-CRB, 02/18/2021, **Dkt.197**, DENIED and 2:15-cv-00214-J, 03/03/2020, **Dkt. 144, 147** both DENIED. This Case 2:21-01152-NR was to be a Multi-District Litigation. Plaintiff had realized that there

²³ After My Mother’s Death, Denial of SCOTUS Case No. 16-9258, the Black Mold and raining in my Home *See* Exhibits D & E, Former Justice Anthony Kennedy, become Complicit, Denying my Veteran Status and Allowing Texas and CA Cases to continue with my Father still held in Texas; My Sister Annette being Abused, Homeless, and a Dialysis Patient, (Died 15 November 2022).

²⁴ Went to Emergency Room St. Clair Hospital 2019, Follow-up Colonoscopy and Artery, Neglect, conspiracy to coverup my true medical damage, with U.S.A. et al.,

was continuous, illegalities in every Case that had been issues of Judicial Misconduct, that were never addressed, or DENIED, e.g., John H. Wright's ²⁵Nursing Home Incarceration (2013-2019), Falsifying Admittance Documents, Denial of Marriage Status, his Death, Shipping his Remains to California, etc., Upheld by United States Courts, ²⁶Kevin, Tyrone had No Standing, TXND Case I had ²⁷Standing, however was DENIED²⁸, the ability to protect my parents. Both of my parents are dead, with no Accountability; *See Rhodes*, During Case 01152-NR, my ²⁹sister died. Violating the Declaration of Independence, of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, petitioner fought to keep her family. *See* Amarillo Police Depart. Case Summary 5/09/2013, I called for health and welfare.

DUE DILLIGENCE

1996-2024

²⁵ 2013-2019, where he died and was shipped to CA, Who Ordered this?

²⁶ Kevin & Tyrone are half siblings, seen 5 times, in my life, they brought deception, Elder Abuse and Wrongful Death, Orchestrated by USA, et al., Texas, et al., CA, et al., Wells Fargo, et al.,

²⁷ The only Power of Attorney, the Police Officer Denied me access to my father.

²⁸ Denied Standing by Judge Mary Lou Robinson (Deceased), after my stroke, *See* App. D

²⁹ **Furtherance** 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) Use of family members to cause disruption and turmoil, USA, et al., States of California, Texas and Pennsylvania

Plaintiff had Filed in the Supreme Court of the U.S., Writ of Mandamus, In Re Linda Ann Wright, Petitioner, Case No. 16-9258, March 19, 2017, Closed November 15, 2017; DENIED VETERANS STATUS; Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) Privileges; Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; [28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(1)(b)(1)(2)] retired.

Allowed for the Fifth Cir. Case 16-10318, to further Deny my Appeal; which kept my father locked in the Nursing Home until his death. *See Exhibits in Section D.*

Moving to Pennsylvania, Filing to Reopen Cases in Texas and California; I had submitted Petitions to the Supreme Court of the U.S., Cases No. 19-8766 and 19-8767, to try and get Accountability for the carnage that had been inflicted on me and my family continuously, with no accountability.

After the Colonoscopy at the Pittsburgh VAMC, In 2019, after going to ³⁰St. Clair Hospital's Emergency Room and being neglected. I Filed a

³⁰ I have had adhesions, a botched Colonoscopy, and numerous life-threatening ailments since, the colonoscopy and with numerous test, I was sent home with Miralax; it come to my attention the Hospitals and the VA Hospitals were hiding my true injuries and Illnesses. *See* Presbyterian Hospital, Pittsburgh VAMC 58, CA3

Complaint with the Pennsylvania Attorney General's Medical Complaint unit, and St Clair Hospital, nothing was done, I Exhausted All Administrative Remedies, there and with the Veterans Affairs. *See* Veterans Decision, and App. D, Pennsylvania Attorney General Complaint. U.P.M.C. conspired with Others to supply fraudulent information into petitioner's medical records; and to cover up the actual damage done to my colon, carotid artery, and to continue St Joseph's history of non-compensation. § 1985(3).

FAIR TRIBUNAL

CAND Case No. 3:14-cv-03008-CRB, Dkt. 24, 09/04/14, WELLS FARGO MOTION TO DISMISS, October 10, 2014: Margaret M. Schneck, "Plaintiff alleges Wells Fargo allowed \$2,000 in other funds to be taken from the father's account and also contends that she has a claim to these same funds." "Plaintiff's standing³¹ to make a claim on behalf of her father is unclear as he appears, based on her pleading, to

³¹ *See* Wells Fargo POA, Linda Ann Wright, and the Fraudulent One Produced by USA, et al., California, Texas, Including then, Asst. Attorney General Ken Paxton

be living and not ³²conserved.” “Wells Fargo’s compliance with a mandatory withholding order from a taxing authority is not actionable as a matter of law.” B. “Wells Fargo Should Be Dismissed From This Action Because Mandatory Compliance With ³³Tax Withholding Orders Is Not Actionable.” Page 5, paragraph 2, “Even if Wells Fargo allowed \$2000 to be stolen from the father’s account, he appears to be alive and residing in a rehabilitation center.” [201 Total Document Entries in Case] *See TXND Dkt. 100 & 101, Injunctive Relief³⁴ Dkt. 193, 197,*

REOPEN

It has always been the petitioner position that this was an illegal act, conspired and performed by The States of California and Texas, and U.S.A., et al., to justify money³⁵ being removed from his Account; as well as his Illegal incarceration at Kirkland Court Nursing Home, resulting in his death (2019). My Power of Attorney was ignored.

³² *See* Michael Kaitcer, Attorney for John H. Wright’s Guardianship, App. E

³³ That Tax was the Illegal withholding by the Board of Equalization in CA., taking money out of a Texas Account. I had bought plane tickets, Attorney fees and supported John and Mae Wright, for decades.

³⁴ State of CA, Edmund Brown, Jr., USA, et al., Coast Central Credit Union, et al., Wells Fargo, SFVAMC, St. Joseph Hospital, et al., Humboldt CTY, and Texas, were in the process of taking my property in Texas and CA. *See* Tax Collector

³⁵ Since 2010, as stated in S.Ct. Case No. 10-9095, Money was not allowed to flow to me, See CA3, “Attorney’s Fees Denial.”

With the Power of Attorney, signed by John H. Wright, Jr. July 22, 2013, Notarized in Amarillo, Texas, by Taleta Townsend, *See Marriage License (John and Mae), Admittance Report, App. D.*

TXND Case No. 2:15-cv-00214-J-BB, RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME. [148
Document Entries in Case] Shows that the State of Texas participated
in this cause of action to deny access to my father.

KEN PAXTON, Attorney General of Texas, Dkt. 38, *See Dkt. 146*, to
REOPEN Case, DENIED. Gregg Abbott was over D.A.D.S, when I
communicated with him, a Letter and emails, phone calls, about
releasing my dad. *See Amarillo Police Report*, Friday May 24th, 2013, I
called for a welfare check on my father, I had not heard from him. The
Officers broke down the door and called the Ambulance; that was the
beginning of Eleven years of absolute torture and pain and suffering;
although I tried to keep in contact, Texas kept moving my dad. *See*
Rhodes, 452 U.S. at 347, 101 S.Ct. 2392, (indicating that conditions of
confinement, "alone or in combination, may deprive 'inmates' of
minimal civilized measure of life's necessities).

Retaliation v. Qualified Immunity Eight Amendment

Footnote 4, Page 4, Judge Ranjan

[“This is not to mention the issues of immunity that attach to some defendants, the lack of diversity jurisdiction as to some defendants, and the ³⁶**failure to exhaust administrative remedies.**”]

“Qualified Immunity does not shield a government official where she has “violated a statutory or constitutional right that was clearly established at the time of the challenged conduct.” *Reiche v. Howards*, 566 U.S. 658; 644, 132 S.Ct. 182 L.Ed. 2d 985 (2012). *Thomas v. Tice*,

“(Ms. Wright) clearly has grievances. [S]he believes that [s]he has been wronged by numerous individuals and entities across decades.”

“..But the Court is not the *Justice League*. It cannot swoop in and address wrongs, real or perceived, wherever they appear.” “It is, instead, a court of limited ³⁷jurisdiction that can only hear defined categories of cases.” Judge Ranjan. *See St. Clair Hospital 2019.*

³⁶ U.S.A. et al., administrative remedies have been exhausted since 1996; health issues date back to 1973; *See Email to SCOTUS*, December 4, 2023.

³⁷ In the Court’s jurisdiction, *See Doctor’s Notes from Doctor Rosen*, at the Pittsburgh VAMC, printed on May 27, 2021, and Department of Veterans Affairs Letter Dated:06/28/2021, where each violated 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), and other laws.

See the basic concept of the Eighth Amendment, on the next page.

The Court treated the petitioner a Black Woman of over seventy years as a person who believes in fantasies and that the court was a place of frivolous antics. Abuse of Discretion and Bias. Violation of Eighth Amendment. *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S.

FACTS

FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment, of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The Eight Amendment

“The basic concept underlying the Eight Amendment is nothing less than the dignity of man.” *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 100, 78 S.Ct. 590, 2 L.Ed.2d 630 (1958) (plurality opinion)

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

42 U.S.C. §1983

“Every person, who under the color of any statute ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or Territory or District of Columbia, subjects or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United

States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law."

42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)

Griffin v. Breckenridge, 403 U.S. 88 102 91 S.Ct.

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise on a highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of laws, or of equal privileges, and immunities under the laws [and] in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engage therein do or cause to be done any act of **furtherance** of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property or deprived of having or exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators."

Case No. 2:15-cv-213-J, 12/22/15 Dkt. 99-1, Pages 1-6, Showed Letter from Roseburg VAMC, had scheduled petitioner for a Compensation and Pension Examination on **June 25, 2007**, Dr. Arlene Bradley Examined me for Military Sexual Trama, and found that I had suffered since 1973. Veterans Affairs Administration Willfully, continued to deny my privileges as a Veteran who served Honorably.

42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3)

DECISION DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS 06/28/2021

1. Evaluation of dysthymic disorder with symptoms of anxiety;
³⁸**post-traumatic stress disorder** which is 100 percent disabling is continued.
2. Evaluation of total hysterectomy, which is currently 50 percent disabling is continued.
3. Evaluation of irritable bowel syndrome
4. Evaluation of plantar callosities, and blisters
5. Service connection for dermatitis is denied.

³⁸ Never Rated with Post Traumatic Stress; VA Never re-visited GYN effects; nor hips or legs; *See* Veterans Decision 2002, No mention of post-traumatic stress!

6. Service connection for **leg condition second to stroke is denied.** Service connection for **Leg** condition second to stroke or secondary to stroke is denied..
7. Service connection for stroke is denied.
8. Service connection for thigh condition second to stroke is denied.
Service connection for thigh condition second to stroke is denied.

*See Veteran Decision 2000, and 2002, See Doctor Eisenhart's Notes. All of these issues should have been **Awarded** in 2000; and in 2021 these Defendants are participating in Fraud, and Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3). See Colonoscopy in Pittsburgh and Hysterectomy in St. Joseph Hospital (2007); the Reason Doctor Arlene Bradley's Notes were hidden.*

[See Doctor Rosen, Pittsburgh and Butler VAMC's, Veterans INTAKE, UPMC, et al.,] 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1), "A condition of that waiver is that suits be filed within the statutory time limits." Under the FTCA

See Page 6, where the Conspiracy started with the U.S.A., et al., State of California, San Francisco VAMC, Doctor Kim S. Ervin, Sheila Cullen, St. Joseph Hospital, et al., The Eureka Veterans Clinic, et. Al., 04/23/07; and continued into Pittsburg Pennsylvania in (2019-present)

42 U.S.C. § 1983; 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3); *See Writ of Habeas Corpus 19-8766, Supreme Court Case.*

28 U.S.C. § 453

Each justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing their duties of his office: "I _____ do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and so equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as _____ under the Constitution and the laws of the United States. So, help me God."

28 U.S.C. § 455(a)(b)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) (i, ii, iii) (c)(1)(2)(3)

Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

38 U.S.C § 5107 (03/02)

- (a) **Claimant Responsibility:** Except as otherwise provided by law, a claimant has the responsibility to present and support a claim for benefits under laws administered by the secretary.
- (b) **BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT:** The Secretary shall consider all information lay and medical evidence of record in the case before the Secretary with respect to benefits under laws administered by the by the Secretary. When there is an approximate balance of positive and negative evidence regarding any issue material to the determination of a matter, the Secretary shall give the benefit of the doubt to claimant.

Under California law intention infliction of emotional distress requires "extreme and outrageous conduct by the defendant with the intention of

causing, or reckless disregard of the probability of causing, emotional distress., *See Hughes v. Pair*, 46Cal. 4th 1035, 1050

COMPENSATION

1. For Fifty years I have been unable to bear children, because of MST, and to Slander, Defame, Libel my name; deny my rights and privileges, compensation, Medical diagnoses, and treatment, for fifty years. \$50,000,000.00, from U.S.A. et al., The State of California, et al.,
2. St. Clair Hospital, Presbyterian, U.P.M.C., et al., St. Joseph Hospital. et al., San Francisco VAMC., Pittsburgh VA Regional Office, et al., AMVET, et al., The State of California, et al., Medical negligence / Conspiracy, Compensation Five Million Dollars.
3. Wrongful Deaths of John, and Mae Wright: State of Texas, State of CA., U.S.A., et al., Sutter Delta, Lone Tree, Kirkland Court, Greg Abbott, Ken Paxton, Edmund Brown Jr. Kamala Harris, Betty T. Yee: Compensation Ten Million Dollars.
4. Intentional Infliction Emotional Distress, U.S.A. et al., States of CA. and Texas, \$50,000,000.00, Total.

5. Property at 4579 Cummings Road, Eureka CA. was illegally taken five years ago, with all my assets. Five Million Dollars. U.S.A. et al., State of CA. St. Joseph Hospital., John Barthlomew, and Others.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Since 1996, the U.S. Courts have denied me Due process and Equal Protection from discrimination and abuse of process, allowing for the rampant destruction of my life, and reputation to continue for “Decades.”

I have supplied material facts in each Case that I participated in, only to be ignored and maligned by the Courts, with innuendos and distortions, which has been costly, to my health wealth and family, e.g. injuries and deaths.

I have proven that the U.S.A. et al., the State of California, et al., the State of Texas, et al., and Others have harmed me; yet not one Court has excepted my documents a fact, instead ridicule has been issued, with Discretions of judges, always against this injured party.

The United States Court of Appeals has so far departed from the excepted and usual course of judicial proceedings.

It is with this information I invoke 28 U.S.C. 1651(a), to aid the of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or any other court.

I Request a Pro Bono Attorney, due to my physical and mental deterioration, and my limitations in law.

CONCLUSION

The petition for an extraordinary writ of mandamus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Ann Wright

Date: March 26th 2024

Word Count 7276

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
APPENDIX

APPENDIX A ORDERS

1. Justice Alito, STAY DENIED
2. CA3 Recall MANDATE STAY
3. PER CURIAM
4. Relocation of John H. Wright, 23 April 2019
5. 16-9258 Closed
6. 16-9258 Denied Veteran Status, Extension
7. Memorandum Order 21-01152_NR
8. CAND 14-03008-CRB, Reopen DENIED
9. Decision Letter VA 06/28/2021
10. CA5 16-10318, DENIED Jurisdiction.
11. 15-00214-Z, Reopen DENIED.

APPENDIX B, Evidence of Fraud and Violating Due Process.

1. Mae Wright's Death Certificate
2. Wells Fargo Denying Fraud
3. State of California Illegal Tax on John H. Wright in TX.
4. Wells Fargo "Required Deduction."
5. State of CA Taxpayer Withholding, (Fraud)
6. Transport one Ambulance Bill to bring Mae to my home.
7. FRAUDULENT Tax Bill, John Barthlomew, Tax Collector
8. Sign Posted on my property; in Nursing Home (Stroke)
9. Final Sellars Statement, after the Violation of my property.
10. Letter from Lauren Smith, in Hospital Room.
11. CA DMV, Illegally Removed my truck from property.
12. Certification of Mae and John Wright's Marriage.
13. Texas tore down my Birth Home, I would not Sell.
14. CA DMV Receipts.

APPENDIX C

1. Summary Husband and Wife Insurance Benefits
2. Record of Marriage, John and Mae Wright
3. Fraudulent Resident Admission Record, Kirkland Court
4. Mae Wright's Death Certificate, Liver Biopsy on Blood thinner
5. Annette Holmes" Death Certificate, Dialysis Patient Removed.
6. Linda Ann Wright's Birth Certificate, Home of Record, ARMY.
7. Change of Address for John H. Wright, Jr., never made it there.
8. Welfare Check on my Father, APD, Refused to allow me to check and told me, to check with Kevin.
9. Original Resident Admission Record, Linda A. Wright, and Mae Emergency Contact, See Power of Attorney.
10. Clerk's Certificate of Name Search, Verifying Marriage.

APPENDIX D

1. Power of Attorney for John H. Wright's
2. Amarillo Police Department Health and Welfare Check, Petitioner called and has not seen my father since, Died 2019.
3. St. Clair Hospital, Emergency Room Visit
4. Summons in a Civil Judge Closes Case after Service to Parties
5. Consumer Complaint Pennsylvania Attorney General Health Dir.
6. Statement from Agent Carrie E. Wilson, February 27, 2020.
7. UPMC Mercy Bill, after going to St. Clair

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 22-1164

Linda Wright,
Appellant

v.

USA, et al

(W.D. Pa. No. 2-21-cv-01152)

Present: MCKEE*, SHWARTZ and MATEY, Circuit Judges

1. Motion filed by Appellant to Recall Mandate and to Stay Mandate.

Respectfully,
Clerk/amr

ORDER

The foregoing is DENIED.

By the Court,

s/Theodore A. McKee
Circuit Judge

Dated: October 24, 2023
Amr/cc: All counsel of record

*Judge McKee assumed senior status on October 21, 2022.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT**

No. 22-1164

LINDA ANN WRIGHT,
Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; STATE OF TEXAS;
THE U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE PENNSYLVANIA; ALEX KOZINSKI; NEAL
KATYAL; BARBARA BOXER; BONNIE S. GRAHAM; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS; SYLVIA MATTHEWS BURWELL; ARNOLD RUSSO; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES; PATRICK ORY; ANDREW
SAUL; KILOLO KIJAKAZI; TOM WHEELER; ROBERT GATES; DANIEL
DEWSNUP; ERIC SHINSEKI; KATHLEEN SEBELIUS; DAVID SPIVEY; RICHARD
P. GEIB; ERIC HOLDER; KARLA KERLIKOWSKE; JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO;
SAN FRANCISCO VA MEDICAL CENTER; COLEEN L. WELCH; KENNETH
SWASEY; TELLA WILLIAMS; ULRIKE WILLIMON; MARIA RAINWATER;
JENNIFER VANDERMOLEN; DONALD E. KOENIG; PA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
OFFICE; CARRIE E. WILSON; SAINT CLAIR HOSPITAL, ET AL; THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA; OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL CA; JEFFREY R. VINCENT;
XAVIER BECERRA; EDMUND BROWN, JR.; KAMALA HARRIS; BETTY T. YEE;
CA BOARD OF EQUALIZATION; MARTINEZ VA HOSPITAL; ELIZABETH
MARTINEZ MAHAN; MAE FRANCINE HOLMES; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF INSURANCE; MEDICAID OF CALIFORNIA; MEDICAL BOARD OF
CALIFORNIA; KAREN L. SMITH; KRISTINA D. LAWSON; OAKLAND VA
REGIONAL OFFICE; SUPERIOR COURT OF COURT HUMBOLDT; JOHN L.
BURRIS; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY; KEN PIMLOTT;
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF VEHICLES; JEAN SHIOMOTO; MEDTRONIC
SPRINT FIDELIS; LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NUEN; DAVID S. WEILAND; EAST
BAY CARDIOLOGY; PROTRANSPORT1; KINDRED MEDICAL HILL
REHABILITATION; KINDRED REHABILITATION SAN LEANDRO; HARNETT
CHOPRA; MAE FRANCINE HOLMES; VALE REHABILITATION; SHEILA
CULLEN; DOCTORS HOSPITAL; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CORONER;
WILLIAM WALKER; RONALD M. SATO; OTIS ROUNDS; WILLIAM W. CHEN;
ALTA BATES SUMMIT MEDICAL CENTER; CASA ADOBE SENIOR
APARTMENTS; MARIA FUENTES; UNITED INSURANCE COMPANY; U.S. POST
OFFICE-EUREKA; U.S. POST OFFICE-SAN PABLO; TEXAS ATTORNEY

GENERAL OFFICE; SCOT M. GRAYDON; KEN PAXTON; GREG ABBOTT; RICK PERRY; ERIN NEALY COX; TAleta TOWNSEND; ALLEGIANCE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; CITY OF AMARILLO; CITY OF AMARILLO; AMARILLO POLICE DEPARTMENT; AMARILLO BUILDING DEPARTMENT; BRYAN SCOTT MCWILLIAMS; GWEN GONZALES; KIRKLAND COURT REHABILITATION; JOYCE COURSE; JACQUELINE S. COOPER; JOHN DZIK; KEVIN WRIGHT; GORDON K. WRIGHT; YOLANDA CALDWELL; TIMOTHY M. DORTCH; KIRKLAND COURT NURSING STAFF 2013-PRESENT; MICHAEL KAITCER; NORTHWEST TEXAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM; MITZI S. MAYFIELD; KEVIN WRIGHT; BSA REHABILITATION; THOMAS E. CREEK MEDICAL CENTER; RODNEY GONZALEZ; CHAD LOGAN; LEONARD & LYDE; REDWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE; MARIA WINTERS; AMERICAN MODERN HOME INSURANCE; JOSEPH J. MINIOZA; SAMANTHA POWERS; ANDREW P. SCLAR; NATHANIEL LUCEY; ERIKSEN ARBUTHNOT; AMERICAN EXPRESS CORPORATION; THE MOORE GROUP; HARVEY MOORE; RAMIN MAHAMI; BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNOR; EDMOND GARABEDIAN; SONYA DEVORAH PASKIL; PALMER LOMBARDI & DONOHUE; ROBERT L. BACHMAN; CHETNA VORA; BRETT DAVID WATSON; DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS; THE ARBORS REHABILITATION; JOSEPH MARK PARSONS; NANCY K. DELANEY; KEVIN WRIGHT; MOBILITY SOLUTIONS AMARILLO; J. SELMAN; JEFF GEARHART; NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION; WELLS FARGO USA; STEVEN L. HOARD; KEVIN WRIGHT; TYRONE WRIGHT; MARGARET MARIE SCHNECK; LARRY "DOE"; JOHNATHAN HINDERS HINDERS; WELLS FARGO BANK-AMARILLO; EQUIFAX CORPORATION; RICHARD SMITH, CEO; MEPCO FINANCIAL; JAIME PAUL DREHER; KELLY LUIS POPE; AT&T CORPORATION; JOHN STANKEY; RANDALL STEPHENSON; AT&T EUREKA-CA; COAST CENTRAL CREDIT UNION; LARRY DERIDDER; AMELIA FAIRBANKS BURROUGHS; NANCY CRAIG; BRIAN OGDEN CRAIG; KIM S. ERIVN; THE EUREKA VETERANS CLINIC; PATRICIA FITZGERALD; PETRA KUHFAHL; MICHAEL MORRISON; THOMAS J. RYDZ; KUSUM STOKES; JANSSEN MALLOY; NEEDHAM MORRISON; CROWLEY & GRIEGO REINHOLSEN; MITCHELL BRISBOIS DELANEY & VRIEZE; NANCY K. DELANEY; JOHN VRIEZE; CLERK OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSESSOR; HUMBOLDT COUNTY BUILDING PERMITS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY SHERIFFS; JOHN BARTHOMOLEW; SAINT JOSEPH HOSPITAL; SAINT JOSEPH REHABILITATION; THE ARBORS REHABILITATION-TEXAS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT; JILL DUFFY; MECHANICS BANK; PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CORPORATION; WILLIAM D. JOHNSON CEO; JP MORGAN CHASE; ALTICE COMMUNICATIONS; DEXTER GOEI, CEO; SUDDENLINK COMMUNICATIONS-EUREKA CA; S. LEE MERRITT; RAY SCHNIBBEN; GIORGIO HERRERA; SUTTER DELTA HEALTHCARE; IRINA KOLOMEY; LONE TREE CONVALESCENT, ET AL; ALLSTATE INSURANCE CORPORATION; THOMAS WILSON, CEO; TIM STOREY-EUREKA CA; THE ARBORS

REHABILITATION; JOSEPH MARK PARSONS; CHARLES EDWARD MOSS; NW TEXAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM, MITZI S. MAYFIELD; MICHAEL H. LOFTIN; KEVIN WRIGHT; THOMAS E. CREEK VA MEDICAL CENTER; RODNEY GONZALEZ; CHAD LOGAN; MOBILITY SOLUTIONS AMARILLO; DUSTY J. STOCKARD; J. SELMAN; SHARON B. DRAGER; IRINA KOLOMEY; ST. CLAIR HOSPITAL

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 2:21-cv-01152)
District Judge: Honorable J. Nicholas Ranjan

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
July 7, 2022

Before: MCKEE[†], SHWARTZ, and MATEY, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: July 14, 2023)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se appellant Linda Ann Wright appeals from the District Court's order dismissing her lawsuit with prejudice after screening it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). We will affirm the judgment of the District Court.

Wright filed this action in August 2021 against the United States, the States of California and Texas, certain federal agencies and officials, and a multitude of other

[†]Judge McKee assumed senior status on October 21, 2022.

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

public officials and private individuals, seeking tens of millions of dollars in damages and other relief. Wright's complaint and amended complaints catalogued a vast inventory of grievances, many unrelated to each other, from events during her and her deceased parents' lives. Much of her case echoed prior litigation she pursued against many of the same defendants in California and Texas.[†] She claimed jurisdiction in the Western District of Pennsylvania under diversity of citizenship and federal question jurisdiction for alleged violations of the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution; 18 U.S.C. §§ 153, 241, 242, 371, 1503, 1951; and 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2),(3). See ECF Dkt. No. 17 at 3.

In December 2021, the District Court granted her motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Before defendants were served with her most recent amended complaint, the District Court screened the case under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), which requires dismissal of an in forma pauperis action that "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted," "seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune," or is frivolous. Id. The District Court considered Wright's latest complaint in the case under those criteria and concluded that "dismissal with prejudice [was] appropriate, as Ms. Wright's claims suffer[ed] from a range of fatal deficiencies," the most obvious being that the complaint

[†] See Wright v. United States, No. 3:14-cv-3008, 2015 WL 3902798, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 24, 2015); Wright v. United States, No. 2:15-cv-0214, 2016 WL 1070838, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2016). She recently sought, unsuccessfully, to reopen those cases. She has also filed Supreme Court actions which, she admits, concern some of the same grievances. In 2021, Wright filed another lawsuit in the Western District of Pennsylvania, but it was essentially identical to this one and she agreed to close it. See No. 2:21-cv-713.

failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. D. Ct. Mem. Ord. at 2. The District Court identified other obstacles, including that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over Veterans Affairs (VA) benefit claims, that she could not bring civil claims to enforce the criminal code, and that res judicata and the applicable statute of limitations barred her claims. Id. at 2-4. Wright filed this timely appeal.[§]

We have jurisdiction over this appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We exercise plenary review over the sua sponte dismissal of a complaint under § 1915(e). See Dooley v. Wetzel, 957 F.3d 366, 373 (3d Cir. 2020). In order to avoid dismissal, a complaint must meet the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), and “contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Talley v. Wetzel, 15 F.4th 275, 286 n.7 (3d Cir. 2021) (cleaned up).^{**} We review a court’s dismissal with prejudice for an abuse of discretion. See Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp., 293 F.3d 103, 108 (3d Cir. 2002).

We discern no error in the District Court’s dismissal of Wright’s complaint. First, we agree that, despite Wright’s many efforts, the second amended complaint (ECF Dkt. No. 17 plus attachments, and what are essentially duplicate filings at Nos. 23 and 24)

[§] To the extent that Wright includes new allegations in her appellate filings, we will not address them here because they are not properly before us. See Simko v. U.S. Steel Corp., 992 F.3d 198, 205 (3d Cir. 2021).

^{**} Under Rule 8, an allegation must plain enough “to give the adverse party fair notice of the claim asserted so as to enable him to answer and prepare for trial,” and it cannot place “an unjustified burden on the court and the part[ies] who must respond to it because they are forced to select the relevant material from a mass of verbiage.” Salahuddin v. Cuomo, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir. 1988).

does not state a claim upon which relief may be granted, even affording it the most generous construction, see Dooley, 957 F.3d at 374. As the District Court noted, the second amended complaint lacks factual allegations with respect to many named defendants. D. Ct. Mem. Ord. at 2. The balance of defendants has been left to guess the specific factual nature and the legal basis of her claims against them, such that they are unable to properly answer or prepare for trial. See Salahuddin, 861 F.2d at 42. Generally, Wright alleges that she has been the victim of botched medical treatments going back decades, that she and her deceased parents were denied medical and appropriate respite care, that the Department of Veterans Affairs denied benefits owed to her, and that various entities wrongfully took possession of her property. See ECF Dkt. Nos. 17 at 4, 17-3 at 1-12. But to proceed, her complaint must do more than broadly describe interactions with a disparate group of entities over a twenty-plus year period without identifying actions by specific defendants that support a facially plausible claim for legal relief. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). At a minimum, she has not alleged facts sufficient “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citing 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1216, pp. 235-236 (3d ed. 2004), for the proposition that the complaint must provide more than facts that “merely create[] a suspicion of a legally cognizable right of action”).

We further note that Wright’s named causes of action are largely not viable as presented in her complaint. Wright’s attempts to raise civil claims to enforce sections 153, 241, 242, 371, 1503, and 1951 of the Federal Criminal Code fail because the statutes

she cited do not create a private cause of action. See Leeke v. Timmerman, 454 U.S. 83, 85-86 (1981) (explaining that a private party has no right to compel the enforcement of criminal laws). Wright's claims seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1985 and alleging tortious action must comply with the applicable state statute of limitations for personal injury claims; the claims alleged in Pennsylvania before August 30, 2018, are barred under the two-year statute for personal injury claims. See 42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 5524; Bougher v. Univ. of Pittsburgh, 882 F.2d 74, 79 (3d Cir. 1989); Schmidt v. Skolas, 770 F.3d 241, 249 (3d Cir. 2014) (complaint is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim on statute of limitations grounds when that defense is apparent on the face of the complaint).^{††}

Finally, the District Court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Wright's action with prejudice because we agree that it would be futile to allow her to file yet another amended complaint. See Fletcher-Harlee Corp. v. Pote Concrete Contractors, Inc., 482 F.3d 247, 251 (3d Cir. 2007) (noting that a district court must offer amendment when dismissing for failure to state a claim "unless doing so would be inequitable or

^{††} As the District Court decided, Wright's lawsuit faced a variety of other problems, too. For example, a substantial part of Wright's allegations is barred under res judicata principles in light of her prior litigation in federal courts in California and Texas, see D. Ct. Mem. Ord. at 2. On appeal, she tacitly conceded this point because she did not deny repeating those claims in this lawsuit but instead argued that the prior cases were not litigated before fair tribunals. See Notice of Appeal at 10; Appellant's Informal Brief (C.A. Dkt. No. 15) at 9. Also, insofar as her action concerned disputes over VA benefits, the District Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction, see ECF Dkt. No. 17-3 at 6-7. See 38 U.S.C. § 511. Of course, Wright also cannot overcome the substantial bar to her claims that the sovereign immunity doctrine presents in light of the many federal and state defendants named in her action. See D.J.S.-W by Stewart v. United States, 962 F.3d 745, 749 (3d Cir. 2020); Kimmel v. Florida Bd. of Regents, 528 U.S. 62, 72-73 (2000).

futile"). Wright has been afforded ample opportunities to make her case. After at least three attempts, her complaint still suffers from multiple flaws which are fatal to her lawsuit.

For these reasons, we will affirm the judgment of the District Court. Wright's outstanding motions are denied.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 22-1164

LINDA ANN WRIGHT,
Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; STATE OF TEXAS; THE U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE PENNSYLVANIA; ALEX KOZINSKI; NEAL KATYAL; BARBARA BOXER; BONNIE S. GRAHAM; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS; SYLVIA MATTHEWS BURWELL; ARNOLD RUSSO; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES; PATRICK ORY; ANDREW SAUL; KILOLO KIJAKAZI; TOM WHEELER; ROBERT GATES; DANIEL DEWSNUP; ERIC SHINSEKI; KATHLEEN SEBELIUS; DAVID SPIVEY; RICHARD P. GEIB; ERIC HOLDER; KARLA KERLIKOWSKE; JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO; SAN FRANCISCO VA MEDICAL CENTER; COLEEN L. WELCH; KENNETH SWASEY; TELLA WILLIAMS; ULRIKE WILLIMON; MARIA RAINWATER; JENNIFER VANDERMOLEN; DONALD E. KOENIG; PA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE; CARRIE E. WILSON; SAINT CLAIR HOSPITAL, ET AL; THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL CA; JEFFREY R. VINCENT; XAVIER BECERRA; EDMUND BROWN, JR.; KAMALA HARRIS; BETTY T. YEE; CA BOARD OF EQUALIZATION; MARTINEZ VA HOSPITAL; ELIZABETH MARTINEZ MAHAN; MAE FRANCINE HOLMES; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE; MEDICAID OF CALIFORNIA; MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA; KAREN L. SMITH; KRISTINA D. LAWSON; OAKLAND VA REGIONAL OFFICE; SUPERIOR COURT OF COURT HUMBOLDT; JOHN L. BURRIS; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY; KEN PIMLOTT; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF VEHICLES; JEAN SHIOMOTO; MEDTRONIC SPRINT FIDELIS; LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NUEN; DAVID S. WEILAND; EAST BAY CARDIOLOGY; PROTRANSPORT1; KINDRED MEDICAL HILL REHABILITATION; KINDRED REHABILITATION SAN LEANDRO; HARNETT CHOPRA; MAE FRANCINE HOLMES; VALE REHABILITATION; SHEILA CULLEN; DOCTORS HOSPITAL; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CORONER; WILLIAM WALKER; RONALD M. SATO; OTIS ROUNDS; WILLIAM W. CHEN; ALTA BATES SUMMIT MEDICAL CENTER; CASA ADOBE SENIOR APARTMENTS; MARIA FUENTES; UNITED INSURANCE COMPANY; U.S. POST OFFICE-EUREKA; U.S. POST OFFICE-SAN PABLO; TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERA OFFICE; SCOT M. GRAYDON; KEN PAXTON; GREG ABBOTT; RICK PERRY; ERIN NEALY COX; TALETA TOWNSEND; ALLEGIANCE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; CITY OF AMARILLO; CITY OF AMARILLO; AMARILLO POLICE DEPARTMENT; AMARILLO BUILDING DEPARTMENT; BRYAN SCOTT MCWILLIAMS; GWEN GONZALES; KIRKLAND COURT REHABILITATION; JOYCE COURSE; JACQUELINE S. COOPER; JOHN DZIK;

KEVIN WRIGHT; GORDON K. WRIGHT; YOLANDA CALDWELL; TIMOTHY M. DORTCH; KIRKLAND COURT NURSING STAFF 2013-PRESENT; MICHAEL KAITCER; NORTHWEST TEXAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM; MITZI S. MAYFIELD; KEVIN WRIGHT; BSA REHABILITATION; THOMAS E. CREEK MEDICAL CENTER; RODNEY GONZALEZ; CHAD LOGAN; LEONARD & LYDE; REDWOOD FAMILY PRACTICE; MARIA WINTERS; AMERICAN MODERN HOME INSURANCE; JOSEPH J. MINIOZA; SAMANTHA POWERS; ANDREW P. SCLAR; NATHANIEL LUCEY; ERIKSEN ARBUTHNOT; AMERICAN EXPRESS CORPORATION; THE MOORE GROUP; HARVEY MOORE; RAMIN MAHAVI; BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNOR; EDMOND GARABEDIAN; SONYA DEVORAH PASKIL; PALMER LOMBARDI & DONOHUE; ROBERT L. BACHMAN; CHETNA VORA; BRETT DAVID WATSON; DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS; THE ARBORS REHABILITATION; JOSEPH MARK PARSONS; NANCY K. DELANEY; KEVIN WRIGHT; MOBILITY SOLUTIONS AMARILLO; J. SELMAN; JEFF GEARHART; NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION; WELLS FARGO USA; STEVEN L. HOARD; KEVIN WRIGHT; TYRONE WRIGHT; MARGARET MARIE SCHNECK; LARRY "DOE"; JOHNATHAN HINDERS HINDERS; WELLS FARGO BANK-AMARILLO; EQUIFAX CORPORATION; RICHARD SMITH, CEO; MEPCO FINANCIAL; JAIME PAUL DREHER; KELLY LUIS POPE; AT&T CORPORATION; JOHN STANKEY; RANDALL STEPHENSON; AT&T EUREKA-CA; COAST CENTRAL CREDIT UNION; LARRY DERIDDER; AMELIA FAIRBANKS BURROUGHS; NANCY CRAIG; BRIAN OGDEN CRAIG; KIM S. ERIVN; THE EUREKA VETERANS CLINIC; PATRICIA FITZGERALD; PETRA KUHFAHL; MICHAEL MORRISON; THOMAS J. RYDZ; KUSUM STOKES; JANSSEN MALLOY; NEEDHAM MORRISON; CROWLEY & GRIEGO REINHOLSEN; MITCHELL BRISSO DELANEY & VRIEZE; NANCY K. DELANEY; JOHN VRIEZE; CLERK OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSESSOR; HUMBOLDT COUNTY BUILDING PERMITS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY SHERIFFS; JOHN BARTHOMOLEW; SAINT JOSEPH HOSPITAL; SAINT JOSEPH REHABILITATION; THE ARBORS REHABILITATION-TEXAS; HUMBOLDT COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT; JILL DUFFY; MECHANICS BANK; PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CORPORATION; WILLIAM D. JOHNSON CEO; JP MORGAN CHASE; ALTICE COMMUNICATIONS; DEXTER GOEI, CEO; SUDDENLINK COMMUNICATIONS-EUREKA CA; S. LEE MERRITT; RAY SCHNIBBEN; GIORGIO HERRERA; SUTTER DELTA HEALTHCARE; IRINA KOLOMEY; LONE TREE CONVALESCENT, ET AL; ALLSTATE INSURANCE CORPORATION; THOMAS WILSON, CEO; TIM STOREY-EUREKA CA; THE ARBORS REHABILITATION; JOSEPH MARK PARSONS; CHARLES EDWARD MOSS; NW TEXAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM; MITZI S. MAYFIELD; MICHAEL H. LOFTIN; KEVIN WRIGHT; THOMAS E. CREEK VA MEDICAL CENTER; RODNEY GONZALEZ; CHAD LOGAN; MOBILITY SOLUTIONS AMARILLO; DUSTY J. STOCKARD; J. SELMAN; SHARON B. DRAGER; IRINA KOLOMEY; ST. CLAIR HOSPITAL

(D.C. Civ. No. 2-21-cv-01152)

SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING

Before: CHAGARES, Chief Judge, JORDAN, SHWARTZ, RESTREPO, BIBAS
PORTER, MATEY, PHIPPS, FREEMAN, MONTGOMERY-REEVES, and McKEE*,
Circuit Judges

The petition for rehearing filed by appellant in the above-entitled case having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court and to all the other available circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service, and no judge who concurred in the decision having asked for rehearing, and a majority of the judges of the circuit in regular service not having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing by the panel and the Court en banc, is denied.

BY THE COURT,

s/ Theodore A. McKee
Circuit Judge

Date: September 8, 2023
Amr/cc: All counsel of record

* Judge McKee's vote is limited to panel rehearing only.

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**