

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
NO. 23-7586

CHRISTOPHER E. BROWN,
PETITIONER.


✓

UNITED STATES,
RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

I, the Petitioner Christopher E. Brown hereby petitions this Honorable Supreme Court of the United States for rehearing and review on the order that was entered by the Court on October 7, 2024, denying Petitioner's writ of Certiorari, and said petition is being presented by the Petitioner in good faith and not for delay showing. This Honorable Court as follows:

(See) U.S. Constitution - Amendment XIV, §1
No State shall deprive any person, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.



Rehearing Ground(s)

①

The validity of the Appellate Court for the Eleventh Circuit's finding is what is being drawn in to question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, & Laws of the United States, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, by affirming the District Court's grant of Summary Judgment on Appellant's Complaint. This proceeding presents a question of exceptional importance because it involves an issue on which the panel decision conflicts with the authoritative decisions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule #56(a) and also 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(A)(i) See also 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(3)(C)(3)(i)(i) and the Constitution of the United States: Amendment #7.

②

The Magistrate Judge's finding in (DC #71) filed 2/8/22 is in clear error because the correct application of the law was not applied when it comes to (see) 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(3)(C)(3)(i)(i) because the magistrate judge was supposed to enter his judgment in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (see) Rule #56(a). The clear error was granting Summary Judgment for the Appellee after the fact of declaring within the very same Document that the Appellee with her being the moving party for Summary Judgment did not satisfy her initial burden to demonstrate that no genuine issue of material fact remains in this case when it comes to the extent of the Appellate finding (see) DC #71 - Page 9 of 15 Second Paragraph.

Continued

③

The Senior Judge in his "De Novo" determination 2 (DAC #75) Filed on 3/25/22, was clearly erroneous because the correct application of the law was not applied 2 when it comes to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)(i) because it says that the Judge of the Court may reconsider any pretrial matter where it has been shown that the 2 magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or 2 contrary to the law in which was shown and filed by Appellant in (see) DAC #74, Objections. But the 2 Senior Judge still accepted and adopted the Magistrate Judge's recommendations (DAC #71). Appellees Appendix is missing my Objections (DAC #74) Filed, 3/17/22, in which is in violation of FRAP Rule 30 (1)(B)(C)(D)(d) Format of Appendix.

SIGN: Christopher Bacon
DATE: 10 / 29 / 24

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
NO. 23 - 7586


CHRISTOPHER E. BROWN,
PETITIONER.

✓

UNITED STATES,
RESPONDENT.

I am an inmate confined in an institution. Today I am depositing the: "PETITION FOR REHEARING" in this case in the institution internal mail system. First class postage is being prepaid by me or by the institution on my behalf.

I declare under penalty of perjury
that the foregoing is true and correct.
(See 28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621)



SIGN: Christopher Brown
DATE: 10/29/24

BROWN v. Kern, NO. 22-11201

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS
AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I hereby certify that the following persons and entities may have an interest in the outcome of this case:

Alexander, Rodney H., Assistant Attorney General & Counsel for Appellant;

Brown, Christopher, Appellant;

Carr, Christopher M., Attorney General Counsel & for Appellee;

Cusimano, Ellen, Assistant Attorney General Counsel for Appellee;

Kern, Ashley, Appellee;

Lapostoff, Thomas A., United States Magistrate & Judge;

Lawson, Hugh, United States District Judge;

Pinkston, Pope, Loretta, L., Deputy Attorney General Counsel for Appellee;

Rosenbaum, Robin, S., United States Circuit Judge

Teeter, Susan E., Senior Assistant Attorney & General Counsel for Appellee.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on: October, 29th, 2024
filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the
INSTITUTION INTERNAL MAIL SYSTEM and also mailed a 2
COPY of the foregoing via regular U.S. mail to:

Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Verification Certificate

This Certificate is to verify to this Honorable Supreme Court that the grounds stated within this "Petition For Rehearing" are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial grounds not previously presented.

Sign: Christopher Brown
12/8/24