No. 23-7423

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Glenn Francis

Petitioner,

V

Thomas Scarantino, et al,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit

---

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Glenn Francis

Pro Se counsel of record

2901 Fig Ct

Palm Harbor, FL 34684

Ph: 727-777-3946

Counsel for the United States of America

Elizabeth Prelogar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

STATUTES

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Rule 44.2, Petitioner Glenn Francis respectfully petitions for rehearing of this Court's June 17th, 2024, Order denying my petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

The Petitioners case presents an ideal vehicle for determining legality and the amount of time a Pro Se litigant must remove immune defendants from a 42 statute 1983 civil suit. I claim the Atlanta Appellate Judges violated Canon Rule 2A. I was represented by Ben Buck of Ben Buck Law Firm in Tampa. He failed to enter as my attorney to the Court causing my case to be dismissed by the 11th Circuit District Court of Tampa on 02/17/2022. This forced Judge Mary S. Scriven to allow my case to continue on appeal for violating Rule 60 (b). This made me pay for an appeal in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta. My case was accepted in April of 2022. My complaint dated 04/24/2022 told the Court I wanted to take ten defendants off my case. Then after three complaints showing I removed ten defendants; I realized the Court failed to remove the defendants. Therefore, I put in an add/remove motion on 04/24/2023 along with a request to amend a complaint. The Appellate Court failed to remove the defendants after another 180 days from this motion, causing me to file a Writ of Mandamus. Canon 3 states a Judge must perform their duties diligently. The Appellate Judges were aware of the ineffective counsel by Ben Buck. They were aware of my attempt to remove 10 defendants in my complaint in April of 2022 and failed to remove them. The Atlanta Court had a copy of the contract I had with Ben Buck. They were aware of six recent bad reviews I presented to them showing three bad reviews of Ben Buck having done this same thing to three other people. Once granted my right to appeal, my first action was to inform the Appellate Court to remove ten defendants. Twenty months later they used immune defendants they would not remove as the reason to dismiss my case. This is a clear Canon 3 violation. They say I had plenty of time to remove defendants on pages 8 and 9 of their opinion. This is factually wrong. I was not aware that Ben Buck never entered as my attorney. Ben Buck lied to the Court by stating he emailed me a termination letter. I informed the Appellate Judges that this was a lie and asked the Judges to force him to produce the email showing he emailed a termination letter. I informed them that he stated this after the 15 days that Judge Scriven had given him to reply as to why he never entered as my attorney. I documented my call to the Atlanta Appellate Court telling them he did not report his lying answer to the court till after the 15-day time limit. Since I had to continue as a Pro Se litigant, my first complaint informed the Atlanta Appellate Court to remove ten defendants. I argue that the Atlanta Appellate Judges violated Canon Rule 2 (A). To say in the opinion that I had time to remove

defendants/respondents when they knew my attorney was ineffective, and my first complaint showed I tried to remove ten defendants, is a misinterpretation of the fact. As a Pro Se litigant, I thought I had to put the defendants on the lawsuit thinking they were under the color of law and only the government would be liable to pay me. I did not know this made them liable or I would have only sued the United States of America from the start.

Once the Appellate Court ruled to dismiss my case, I found that the FISA Court released a memorandum and order stating that all FISA warrants on criminal cases between 2016-2020 were no good because the FBI failed at the low bar to show evidence of foreign intelligence or state a reason why they would find evidence of a crime. I found this new evidence after Atlanta dismissed my case. This presents an extraordinary circumstance that should compel the Supreme Court Justices to rehear my case. It proves I was arrested with an illegal warrant. If a Judge fails at their duty to remove defendants when I tried the first chance I had to remove ten defendants, then this is a Canon 2A and Canon 3 violation because they had knowledge of relevant circumstances of my attempt to remove defendants as soon as I was forced to be a Pro Se litigant from ineffective counsel that these Judges were aware of. Rule 44.2 authorizes a petition for rehearing based on "intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or...other substantial grounds not previously presented." Failure of the Judges to do an in camera ex-parte look at the affidavits and orders to get FISA warrants for an illegal two years and ten months when I clearly documented many times that I want them to do this per the Statute 50 U.S. Code Statute 1806 (f) once again violates Canon Rule 2(A) and 3 A(4)(a). This is a clear violation of their duties per the law and would have shown intervening circumstances that the FBI failed at the low bar to get the FISA warrants used to incarcerate me. The new evidence I showed to the Supreme Court from the FISC released through the ODNI on April 21st, 2022, would have been apparent in an ex-parte review if the Atlanta Appellate Court Judges or Tampa District Judges would have done their duty. Once again showing Canon violations.

The Supreme Court shook up Section 1983 jurisprudence in its recent opinion in Thompson v. Clark 596 US____(2002). In Thompson the petitioner sued for damages against the officers that arrested him. Like me he alleged several claims for violations of his constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. Statute 1983 including one for "malicious prosecution" purportedly under the Fourth Amendment.

After examining history, the majority issued a simple holding "to demonstrate a favorable termination of a criminal prosecution for purposes of the Fourth Amendment claim under statute 1983 for malicious prosecution, a plaintiff need not show that the

criminal prosecution ended with some affirmative indication of innocence. A plaintiff need only show that his prosecution ended without a conviction." I was denied exculpatory evidence that would show my innocence. The FBI has my computers with proof of all sales and authorizations and contracts with call centers in their possession. Judge Timothy Corrigan threatened sanctions for Brady violations. This is moot because I was not convicted, and I never had a trial. This is a clear 4th Amendment violation.

The Judges in Atlanta knew of many extraordinary circumstances in my case. They knew I was arrested by the FBI without jurisdiction. All my alleged fraud was through TD Bank. This is a Canadian Bank. I showed a case, Bank of Nova Scotia v. United States, 487 U.S. 250 (1988), that the FBI only has the right to take the money out of accounts from Canadian Banks with branches in the United States. The FBI was found not to have jurisdiction to arrest because they have no jurisdiction over Canadian Banks. They know the FBI did a fraudulent investigation by using FISA warrants from March of 2016 to January of 2019. They know I stated this is against the law Title III Omnibus Act of 1968 18 USC Statute 2510 et seq. This is Canon 1, 2(A), and Canon 3 violations by the Appellate Judges.

The constitutional argument to rehear my case is that the Appellate Judges ignored my instant attempt to remove immune respondents as my first entry as a pro se litigant on 04/24/2022. Then, the Judges denied me due process by stating I had plenty of time to remove the immune respondents when they never removed the respondents for 20 months. Therefore, I have been denied access to the courts or due process. I have never had my right to a jury. I have never been convicted. A grand jury was used to incarcerate me. This guarantees me a right to a jury trial in either my criminal case or my 1983 case. This is a clear due process violation Canon 2 (A) for not complying with the law and a Canon 3 violation because the Judges did not do their due diligence.

By the Appellate Court ignoring my motion to remove respondents for an extended period of time, the delay is a procedural violation that has prejudiced my case. A 20-month delay is unreasonable and unlawful and to say I had time to remove them when Ben Buck of Ben Buck Law Firm in Tampa refused to enter as my attorney by lying to the Court, and I sent the proof to the Court, should grant me a rehearing. I have stated the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 14th Amendments violations in my case. I have never had my day in Court. I will once again put in a motion to remove respondents for a fifth time if I must.

Malicious prosecution with an illegal FISA warrant has come to light after the Appellate Court's decision. This is an extreme new fact showing the FBI used an illegal FISA warrant, and I should have never been arrested. It is a Fourth Amendment violation under

Statute 1983. The Supreme Court has clarified that to demonstrate a favorable termination of a criminal prosecution for purposes of a Fourth Amendment claim under Statute 1983, a plaintiff need not show that the criminal prosecution ended with some affirmative indication of innocence. A plaintiff need only show that his prosecution ended without a conviction. I was not convicted and had no trial. Judge Scriven ruled civil conspiracy in my competency proceedings. This was used to deny me due process and a trial by jury. I was not convicted, and the warrant was illegal as the FISC and ODNI has showed, and I have informed the Supreme Court of this. I have been denied an amicus curiae brief.

It has been determined by the Supreme Court in Taylor v. Riojas 592 U.S., that officers were not entitled to qualified immunity because they should have known they were denying rights under the constitution. This decision is important because it is the first time the Court has relied on the obviousness of a constitutional violation to overturn qualified immunity regardless of case law on point. The obviousness of constitutional rights being denied should grant me a rehearing. 2016 FISA cases where all over the news as being no good. Everyone knows this and I am a victim of the weaponization of the U.S. government against U.S. citizens. Obviousness of no conviction or a trial, should compel a rehearing.

I instantly stated as my first response to the 11th Circuit District Court of Tampa's Order stating immunity as reason to dismiss my case, that my counsel was ineffective and gave all the information to prove it and was granted an appeal under Rule 60 (b). Then, my first course of action as a pro se litigant was to state I was amending and removing 10 defendants. After three complaints showing I removed 10 defendants, I found an add/remove motion form online and attempted to remove ten defendants for a fourth time. It is almost impossible to find the add/remove form online. Therefore, my earlier attempts should have been acknowledged by the appellate court. When Judge Amanda Arnold Sansone said she was worried about the length of the investigation to the FBI agent Tina Rep and the U.S attorney Rachel Jones because she knew you are not allowed to use FISA warrants for two years and 10 months and then the transcripts were altered to cover this up and I was denied the audio wave file to prove it and I have a witness named Josh Cantrell to prove it, it is obvious that Tina Rep and Rachel Jones knew they denied my right under the Title III Omnibus Act of 1968 18 U.S.C. statute 2510 et seq. Plus, the warrant was derived illegally as the FISC and ODNI have documented on a memorandum and order that I showed to the Supreme Court as new and extraordinary circumstances to continue my case. Obviously, I do not care to sue these people for liability. I thought I was only suing them under the color of law. My ignorance of the law is no excuse, and I am aware of this now, but it is true. I never went to law school. This is why I want to remove the last two

respondents. However, I listed all the constitutional rights these two denied me and I believe they knew that they were denying me my 4th, 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendment rights. I have been denied my right to prove it. Denying a civil trial is a 7th Amendment violation.

Trump v. United States case in the Supreme Court and its implications have showed the complexity that could influence my case as to determine absolute immunity of the FBI agent Tina Rep and U.S. attorney Rachel Jones. My rehearing should be allowed and discussed when the Supreme Court gets over its recess in October. I still prefer to remove the respondents, but if the court rules I cannot remove them, then they should determine if lying to get a FISA warrant and doing an illegal investigation and retaining people 31 months with no evidence and withholding exculpatory evidence falls under absolute immunity.

Let me list some of the cases and laws and statutes that were due process violations, and show it was a malicious prosecution.

1. Dukes v. Ads Alliance Data Sys. 2005 US Dist. Lexis 61172. This case I documented showed that FISA surveillance over two years is illegal, and the case was dropped, and the defendant was released from custody. I wasn't.
2. Harris v. Thompson, 698 F. 3d 609. I wrote this on 12/07/2020 and it shows a 6th Amendment violation by never showing me exculpatory evidence or any evidence at all. I should have been released with prejudice. I wasn't released.
3. United States v. Fernandez, 618 supp. 2d 62. This case showed Barker v Wingo is a 6th Amendment violation after 23 months with no trial. I documented this case in December 2020, and I should have been released. I wasn't.
4. Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514. I put in requests for this case law many times to the court and in certified mail to my court appointed attorneys and to U.S. attorney Maria Lopez and in court docs. I answered the four prongs, and the government never answered the reason for delay of trial. This is a 6th Amendment violation, and I should have been released. This is Canon 2(A) and Canon 3, 3(A) violations by Senior Judge Steven Merryday who disappeared as my judge.
5. Bail Reform Act of 1984. 18 U.S.C. statute 3142 (g) shows the Court is expected to weigh all factors. The Court clearly did not do this and illegally denied me bail. Judge Merryday stated excludable delay after 10 months of my incarceration. This is a Canon 1, 2(A), and Canon 3 violations because he knew all the evidence was inadmissible due to the fraudulent investigation by the FBI using FISA warrants from March of 2016 to January of 2019. This is over the 2-year time limit in which you can use FISA, and all evidence is inadmissible. So, Judge Merryday

committed Canon violations by keeping me incarcerated unconstitutionally and denying my right to a speedy trial under false pretext. He also knew the FBI did not have jurisdiction to arrest me because all my charges are from wires through TD Bank which is a Canadian Bank. Plus, he could see the applications and orders if he would have done an in camera ex-parte review per 50 U.S.C. Statute 1806 (f) that I asked him to do and asked the Appellate Judges to do. I documented all of this and pointed out obvious ineffective counsel. He kept me incarcerated and denied my constitutional rights.

6. Habeas Corpus was granted and I did not receive a full and fair evidentiary hearing in court, or at a trial because I never had one, or in a collateral proceeding. The Federal Court of Habeas Corpus must hold an evidentiary hearing. Plus, it is the law to have an evidentiary hearing once a Federal Judge issues a 1983 form to sue. Judge Scriven sent me the form to sue. This is a Canon 2(A) and 3(A)(4) violations by Judge Merryday and the Appellate Judges because I never had an evidentiary hearing or an in camera ex-parte review.
7. Brady v. Maryland U.S. 83. I asked to be released for this case law and Judge Timothy J. Corrigan threatened sanctions for Brady violations. Once again, I have been denied this constitutional right because no exculpatory evidence or discovery has been shown to me and they kept me incarcerated for 31 months.

CONCLUSION

Many dangerous precedents could be set if you do not find in favor of my Habeas Corpus that led to a 1983 case. Our government would now be allowed to weaponize the FBI to use an illegal FISA warrant for an illegal 2 years and 10 months, then arrest an innocent elderly man without jurisdiction over Canadian banks. The FBI is now allowed to share raw intel to the Postmaster General to shut down your corporation with no proof of a crime. The FBI is allowed to share raw intel to Homeland Security, and they come to your home without a national security issue. The FBI is now allowed to come to your home with IRS agents and a swat truck and a battering ram for fraud that you didn't commit and take your computers that showed you did not commit a crime and withhold this exculpatory evidence from denying a citizen of the United States his basic right of a jury trial. The OIG is now allowed to weaponize the judicial system to a degree that ends up denying an innocent 64-year-old man of compensation after wrongful incarceration. Plus, they are allowed to defame you by putting you illegally on a government terror watchlist so they can lie to the FISC to get an illegal FISA warrant to illegally arrest an innocent man who never broke one law in his entire life. A federal judge named Sansone in the 11th Circuit Tampa Division is

allowed to deny your bond for a non-violent crime with no evidence to support detention. This is a Canon 1, 2(A), 3 violations. She knew the FBI investigation was illegal and still denied bond. Plus, a precedent is now set that the government is allowed to deny you a speedy trial and in fact they are allowed to deny you a trial altogether. The government is now officially allowed to commit civil conspiracy in your competency proceeding to intentionally declare you incompetent so they can illegally keep you in jail so they can continue to get $325 a day from the taxpayers so they can fill up their prisons for profit while denying your civil rights. Yet another precedent is set by denying me a jury. The government is now allowed to put you in jail for 31 months and never produce any evidence at all and still deny you compensation after threatening you with 190 years in jail. The cost of freedom can be high, but it must stop with our most precious of all rights that makes this country great, a right to a jury trial. The government can wait 10 months after you asked for speedy trial 4 times to state excludable delay for voluminous discovery. Judge Merryday in 11th Circuit Tampa Division is allowed to state this while he knows all the illegal FISA evidence was inadmissible. He knows the government did not inform me FISA evidence was going to be used against me per statute 1806 (a)(b). This is a Canon 1, 2(A),3 violations. The government is now allowed to deny you your right to call witnesses at your right to have a Sell hearing within one year of your competency hearing. A precedent is now set that the Appellate Court Judges in Atlanta do not have to respond to motions which is a Canon 1, 2(A), 3 violations. By not responding to a pro se litigant trying to remove defendants the first day he was forced into being a pro se litigant and then saying he had plenty of time to remove immune defendants are false. The Judges know that Ben Buck of Ben Buck Law Firm never entered as my attorney and lied about sending me a termination letter. So, they know I tried to remove defendants literally the first day I became a pro se litigant. To use this lie that I did not try to remove immune defendants in a timely fashion is factually incorrect. I tried to remove defendants on my first day. For the three Judges to not do their job by removing the defendants and then using immunity as the only reason to continue to deny my petition, is Canon 2(A), and Canon 3 violations for not responding to my motions to remove defendants. A precedent is now being set that the government can put a fraud conviction on a background check company called Checkr and label you as a terrorist on truthfinder.com years after you have been released from jail, despite both being lies, and they can do this to this day knowing this is a lie. Then the Judges deny In Forma Pauperis motions knowing they are the ones allowing these lies to keep you De-Banked with destroyed credit as a fraud with no conviction and keeping you from making a living. A precedent is now set that you do not get in front of a Judge within 48 hours of Writ of Habeas Corpus being accepted despite the law stating you must. Not only can the

government now deny you this right, but they can also wait 6 more months and bring you in Court and declare they are letting you out of jail as incompetent despite Judge Scriven having already ruled civil conspiracy in my competency proceedings. Hence, Judge Sean P. Flynn knew I was not incompetent and still would not rule dismissed with prejudice as I asked. This is a Canon 1, 2(A), 3 violations. The government is now allowed to deny you the witnesses you wanted at the 2nd competency hearing and the questions you wanted answered at that hearing and all the questions and people I wanted to depose at that hearing, are all listed in plain sight for all these judges to read. By denying my right to call witnesses, Judge Sean P. Flynn of the 11th Circuit Tampa Division committed a Canon 1, 2(A), 3 violations. He also knows a 2nd competency hearing is called a Sell hearing. He knows you must have a Sell hearing according to Sell v. United States 539 U.S. 166 within one year of the 1st competency hearing. He knows this was over 6 months too late. This is a Canon 3 violation of due diligence. Judge Thomas Barber of the 11th Circuit of Tampa continued the lie of me being incompetent knowing all these rights being denied and Habeas Corpus being granted, yet he continued the lie of my incompetency claim knowing I asked for a new public defender and a hearing to determine my compulsory rights were being denied under statute 347.5 and he knows I was denied this constitutional right. He knows I was denied speedy trial by my four Barker v. Wingo 407 U.S. 514 motions never being responded too by the government that by law must state a reason for delay. Then he lets me out of jail as incompetent knowing it's a lie and dismisses my case without prejudice. This is a Canon 1, 2(A), 3 violations. The government is now allowed to share raw intel if my case is not heard. The government can now spy on you illegally using FISA warrants over 2 years and 10 months despite the "wiretap" law known as the Title III Omnibus Act of 1968 18 U.S.C. Statute 2510 et seq., stating 2 years is the time limit on targeting an American illegally with FISA surveillance or all evidence is inadmissible. The government is now allowed to try to entrap you with fraudulent sales with CHS'S or CI'S and then deny you a trial to depose the witnesses to prove it. The government is now allowed to deny you counsel for two years. The government is now allowed to ignore the 7th amendment despite Federal Judge Mary S. Scriven ruling in my favor of Habeas Corpus and sending me the 2255 and 2241 and 1083 forms to sue. Once again breaking the law as written. So, my case is setting many new precedents. The 4th, 5th, 6th,7th and 14th Amendments are now allowed to be ignored by Judges and prosecutors and attorneys and wardens and the FBI, IRS, OIG, Homeland Security, Postmaster General and Pinellas County Sheriff's office after sharing raw intelligence illegally to target an American illegally and using an illegal FISA warrant and an illegal search and seizure and an illegal fraudulent investigation by the FBI as stated in Habeas Corpus ruling without jurisdiction and knowing

of precedence mentioned about the Joel Treuhaft case no: 8:17-cv-00220-RAL-AEP of him not being incarcerated with the exact same complaint as mine and he stole 111k and it was on ABC local news. Then deny speedy trial or any trial at all and deny counsel and intentionally declare people incompetent and deny showing any evidence at all and still deny bond for 31 months for a non-violent crime for an elderly man that has never broken one law in his life with no evidence of a crime. The 8th Amendment was violated with no bail and excessive pretrial incarceration. These precedents that are now being set by denying me compensation per the 5th amendment, will destroy our democracy and validate the lowest approval rating of the alleged two-tiered justice system in history. Please allow my rehearing and please compensate me per the 5th amendment. I am willing to negotiate a fair amount of compensation. Let's save our democracy! Let's save our constitution! No one should be denied a trial! It's the law! Habeas Corpus cannot be suspended by law without a jury trial. This is the only remedy I have to get my life back. I am not a terrorist or a fraud. I ask the Supreme Court to rehear my case and finally hold the FBI accountable for the greatest abuse of power in U.S. history as stated by the late Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity. The obviousness of rights violations is numerous and documented. Here is a list in chronological order of rights violations and corruption and conspiracy by the government.

1. January 2016, the FBI wires up Leo Corrigan to entrap me with fraudulent sales.
2. March 2016, the FBI and IRS come to my home with 16-20 agents with a battering ram and swat truck and large guns at 6:00 am with an illegal FISA warrant.
3. April 2016, FBI and IRS go to my CPA's business and take all my tax information.
4. May 2016, Homeland Security comes to my home knowing my case has no national security issues and admits it.
5. 2016 to January 2019 the FBI, OIG, IRS, Homeland Security, Postmaster General and Pinellas County Sherriff's Office all receive illegal raw intelligence to perform an illegal 2 year and 10-month FISA surveillance investigation with no probable cause.
6. October 2018, Postmaster General cuts off my corporation mail and puts me out of business with no evidence of a crime or probable cause.
7. October 2018 to January 11th, 2019, the FBI tries to set me up again with Thomas Fortman with 25k of fraudulent sales.
8. January 2019 the Pinellas County Sherriff's Office arrested me and takes my cell phone without reading me my Miranda rights and I get bond denied illegally.
9. July 2019, I write the Court informing them I know they used a FISA warrant illegally and that I want a speedy trial and I sent certified mail to my attorney asking for a speedy trial and new bond hearing stating factual changes and to do four motions.
10. August 2019, I asked to fire my counsel for being ineffective.

11. September 2019 Judge Merryday fires my attorney for ineffectual counsel and personally appoints me Mark O'Brien to take over as counsel. He later excused my first counsel's ineffective ruling to say she recused herself.
12. Mark O'Brien came to see me one time in early September of 2019 for about ten minutes and then I never saw him again for 23 months that he was my attorney.
13. December 5th, 2019, I get a competency hearing to start the obvious cover-up of an illegal FISA warrant and illegal search a seizure and illegal investigation without jurisdiction and a case showing precedence that should have had me released.
14. March 2020, Mark O'Brien gets brought in to court from his wife being held in contempt of court saying she has video of my attorney smoking meth and crack and 11 months of texts ordering illegal drugs. Plus, Judge Merryday is no longer my Judge without notifying me. Did he appoint Mark knowing about his alleged drug problem?
15. November 2020, I got appointed a 3rd attorney named Scott Robbins and I wrote the Judge to tell him not to allow Scott to get rid of my Sell hearing. He got rid of this right and the witnesses and questions I wanted answered are all in Court docs.
16. November 2020 and December 2020, I put in for a Habeas Corpus and added more reasons for Habeas Corpus in December. I was denied my right to appear in front of a Judge within 48 hours per the law once Judge Scriven ruled in my favor of the Writ.
17. December 2020, I put in three case laws that should have had me released. They ignored them all showing obvious conspiracy.
18. May 2021, they finally bring me in court and Judge Flynn releases me as incompetent despite my testimony and despite Judge Scriven having already ruled civil conspiracy in my competency proceedings. He continues the cover-up and conspiracy. His obvious Canon violations should have him under review.
19. August 2021, Judge Barber continues the lie of me being incompetent and releases me from jail knowing I am not incompetent and ignoring my letters asking for him to dismiss with prejudice knowing I informed the Bar of ineffective counsel.
20. October 2021, I sign a contract on contingency with Ben Buck to take my case. He lied to Judge Scriven after the 15 days she gave him to state why he never entered as my attorney and lied saying he emailed me a termination letter.
21. April 2022, Judge Scriven ruled my case can continue to appeal because of rule 60(b). My first course of action was to remove ten defendants in April 2022 and inform the Appellate Court of the ineffective counsel and rights I have been denied.
22. April 2022 to January 2024, the Appellate Judges never removed one defendant in 20 months despite four attempts and used me having defendants/respondents on my case with absolute immunity being the reason to deny my 1983 claim.

23. April 21st, 2022, the FISC and ODNI release a memorandum and Order showing on all criminal cases between 2016-2020, all FISA warrants were no good because the FBI failed at the low bar to get those warrants by not showing evidence of foreign intelligence or state a reason why they would find evidence of a crime.
24. January 2024, Appellate Court denies my In Forma Pauperis motion for my Writ of Mandamus under false pretext.
25. March and April and May 2024, I get my first two attempts at getting my Writ of Certiorari granted by the Supreme Court returned. I tried to get the Supreme Court to review both the District Court Opinion and the Appellate Court Opinion. The 3rd attempt was finally accepted from a phone call from the Clerk and me informing her I was under the page limit because the appendix does not count. She agreed and then asked if I wanted both Opinions reviewed. I explained I already sent in two Writs asking for that and she sent them back. I had no money to eat, so I couldn't do a 4th Writ. I assume my first two were sent back because she was unaware of the page limit rules of what counts and what doesn't. This forced me to take off the District Court review on the accepted Writ because the Clerk was unaware that the appendix does not count against the page limit and our conversation proves this. Please review both Appellate and District Courts Opinions as I asked originally.
26. June 17th, 2024, the Supreme Court denies my 42 Statute 1983 claim despite FISC memorandum and Order released by the ODNI showing my FISA warrant was illegal.
27. July 2024, my petition for rehearing entered praying for compensation per the 5th Amendment and to finally get my day in court. Plus, showing extraordinary circumstances with proof I was arrested with an illegal FISA warrant. Plus, showing many Canon violations from the Appellate and District Judges.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 10th day of July 2024, a true and correct copy of the Petition for Rehearing was served at the following party.

Merrick Garland (United States Attorney General)

U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

I, Glenn Francis, hereby swear these statements are true and correct.

Glenn Francis signed, Glenn Francis 07/10/2024

Pro Se litigant

2901 Fig Ct. Palm Harbor, FL 34684

Ph: 727-777-3946

Email: glennbo7777@gmail.com