



No. 24-1

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

IN RE YEHORAM UZIEL

---

On Petition For An Extraordinary Writ Of Mandamus To The  
United States Court of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit  
("USCA9")

---

Petition For An Extraordinary Writ Of Mandamus

---

YEHORAM UZIEL  
Self-represented litigant  
19329 Bryant Street  
Northridge CA 91324  
[yehoram@soligen.com](mailto:yehoram@soligen.com)  
(h) 818-885-1258  
(c) 818-943-2693

---

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

This petition seeks restoration of Petitioner' right to a fair trial by impartial tribunal; and relief from USCA9 judicial discriminatory misconduct to deprive a self represented litigant of access to litigate, including imposition of cruel and unusual punishment without due process of law.

(1) Whether Petitioner is entitled to an Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus to litigate his FEDERAL Court cases against the State of California<sup>1</sup>?

(2) Whether Petitioner is entitled to an Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus to USCA9 to enforce with strict scrutiny, compliance with 28 USC §§ 455, in order to protect Petitioner' Constitutional right of fair trial before an impartial tribunal?

(3) Whether Petitioner is entitled to an Extraordinary Writ of mandamus to USCA9 to vacate 20-55554, 21-56306, 21-56303 and remand 2:19-cv-01458 and 2:21-cv-0730 to trials before new judicial officers at the US District Court of the Central District of California.

(4) Whether Petitioner is entitled to an Extraordinary Writ of mandamus to prohibit the use of Rules of Courts or Federal Rules of Civil Procedures ("FCRP"), without substantive due process of law, to deprive litigants from their constitutional rights to: free speech, right to counsel, due process and fair and speedy trial before an impartial tribunal.

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted by Justice Fletcher dissenting opinion, "*/w/*hen faced with the corruption of our legal system, we must start over". *Pizzuto v Blades*, 673 F 3d 100S. 103,1023 (9<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 2012)

## PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The proceeding is an original action in the US Supreme Court pursuant to Rule 20 against USCA9.

## THE PARTIES

Petitioner is Yehoram Uziel, a self represented litigant.  
Address: 19329 Bryant Street, Northridge, CA 91324  
Phone: 818-885-1258 Cell: 818-943-2693  
Email: [yehoram@soligen.com](mailto:yehoram@soligen.com)

Respondent is: United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("USCA9")  
<https://ecf.ca9.uscourts.gov/n/beam/servlet/Transport/Room>

## INTERESTED PARTIES

United States District Court  
Central District of California (Western Division)

District Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald  
District Judge Dale S. Fischer  
Magistrate John E. Mc Dermott

Parties in the original actions in US District Court:

- |    | <u>Defendant:</u>                                                                                                                              | <u>Represented by:</u>                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Superior Court of<br>the State of<br>California for the<br>County of Los<br>Angeles North valley<br>district Chatsworth<br>Courthouse Dept 47. | Sara Lee Overton, Attorney.<br>Cummings McClorey Davis &<br>Acho<br>3801 University Ave. St 560<br>Riverside, CA 92501<br>Phone 951-276-4420<br>Email: <a href="mailto:soverton@cmda-law.com">soverton@cmda-law.com</a> |
| 2. | Melvin D. Sandvig,<br>Judge                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

- |    |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3. | Winget Spadafora<br>&Schwartzberg LLP<br>(WSS)                | Matthew Jason Negrin, Esq.<br>Attorney<br>Baer Negrin and Troff LLP<br>12400Wilshire Blvd St.1180<br>Los Angeles, California 90025<br>Phone : 310-502-8268<br>Email: <a href="mailto:matt@btllp.com">matt@btllp.com</a>       |
| 4. | Gabriel Z. Reynoso<br>SBN 234024                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 5. | Brandon Reif SBN<br>214706                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 6. | Reif Law Group                                                | Michaela Battista Sozio Esq.<br>Attorney.<br>TRESSLER LLP<br>6100 Center Drive St. 1175<br>Los Angeles, California 90045<br>Phone: 310203-4800<br>Email <a href="mailto:msozio@tresslerllp.com">msozio@tresslerllp.com</a>    |
| 7. | Huston<br>International<br>Insurance Group<br>(HIIG)          | Nathaniel S. G. Braun, Esq.<br>Sinclair Braun LLP<br>16501 Ventura Blvd. St. 400<br>Encino CA 91436<br>Phone 213-429-6125<br>Email: <a href="mailto:nbraun@sinclairbraun.com">nbraun@sinclairbraun.com</a>                    |
| 8. | Previn<br>Sathananthan,<br>HIIG Corp. Vice<br>President, Esq. | Michael B. Gelfound, Esq.<br>Selman Breitman LLP<br>11766 Wilshire Blvd. 6 <sup>th</sup> Fl.<br>Los Angeles, C 90025-6546<br>Phone 310-445-0800<br>Email <a href="mailto:mgelfound@selmanlaw.com">mgelfound@selmanlaw.com</a> |

- |     |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9.  | Eric J. Palmer<br>SBN 231207                                  | Brandon S. Reif Esq Attorney<br>Marc S. Ehrlich Esq. Attorney                                                                                                                               |
| 10. | Karl Gerber<br>SBN166003                                      | Reif Law Group<br>1925 Century Park East 1700<br>Los Angeles, California 90067<br>Phone: 310-494-6500<br>Email: <a href="mailto:docket@reiflawgroup.com">docket@reiflawgroup.com</a>        |
| 12. | Mr. Gavin Newsom<br>Governor of the<br>State of<br>California | Darin L. Wessel<br>Office of the Attorney General<br>600 W. Broadway St. 1800<br>San Diego, California 92101<br>Email: <a href="mailto:darin.wessel@doj.ca.gov">darin.wessel@doj.ca.gov</a> |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                    |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Questions Presented.....                                                                                           | 1      |
| The Parties.....                                                                                                   | 2      |
| Table of authorities.....                                                                                          | 6      |
| Contentions in support of the Petition.....                                                                        | 7      |
| Introduction.....                                                                                                  | 8      |
| Opinions Below.....                                                                                                | 12     |
| Jurisdictional statement.....                                                                                      | 13     |
| Constitutional & statutory provisions involved.....                                                                | 14     |
| Statement of case.....                                                                                             | 15     |
| Reasons for granting the writs.....                                                                                | 18     |
| 1. Granting of this writ will be in the aid of the Court's<br>appellate disciplinary jurisdiction.....             | 18     |
| 2. Exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the<br>court' discretionary powers.....                       | 18     |
| 3. Adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or<br>from any other court.....                            | 19     |
| 4. Granting the writ will be a perfect opportunity to set<br>enforcement standards beyond civil jurisprudence..... | 20     |
| 5. Mr. Uziel is entitled to relief.....                                                                            | 21     |
| 6. The Claims are meritorious and not procedurally barred.....                                                     | 21     |
| 7. Mr. Uziel should be allowed to present witnesses.....                                                           | 22     |
| <br>CONCLUSION.....                                                                                                | <br>23 |
| Certificate of compliance.....                                                                                     | 26     |
| Certificate of electronic service.....                                                                             | 27     |
| <br>Appendix A: Case # 21-56303 Uziel v. Newsom.....                                                               | <br>I  |
| Appendix B: Case # 21-56306 Uziel v Superior Court et al.....                                                      | IV     |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

US Constitution Amendment I  
US Constitution Amendment XIV  
US Constitution Amendment VIII  
US Constitution Amendment V  
US Constitution Amendment VI  
Code of Conduct of United States Judges

### Statutes

- 28 USC § 455 – Disqualification of justice, judge or magistrate judge of the United States
- 18 USC § 872 - Extortion by officers or employees of the U.S.
- 18 USC § 242 – Deprivation of rights under color of law
- 18 USC § 1512 (2) (b) – Tampering with a witness, victim or informant
- 18 USC § 371 Conspiracy to defraud United States
- 42 USC §1983 Civil Action for Deprivation of rights

### Rules:

Federal Rules of Civil Procedures Rules 8, 11, 12  
USCA9 Rules of Court

### Publications:

1. The Authority of the Court and the Peril of Politics  
September 14, 2021 By Justice Stephen Breyer
2. Presumed Guilty: How the Supreme Court empowered the Police and subverted Civil Rights  
By Professor Erwin Chemerinsky August 24, 2021
3. Get Trump: The Threat to Civil Liberties, Due Process and Our Constitutional Rule of Law  
By Prof Emeritus Alan Dershowitz March ,14 2023

## CONTENTIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION

Pursuant to Rule 20, Yehoram Uziel respectfully petitions the Supreme Court of the United States ("SCOTUS"), for extraordinary writs of common law to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("USCA9") to overturn USCA9' dispositions, and remand 2:19-cv-01458 and 2:21-cv-0730 to trials before impartial tribunals at the Central District of California.

Whereas USCA9: (i) violated Petitioner' civil rights to free speech, due process, right to counsel and rule of law; and (ii) intentionally failed to comply with the standards of review of appeals; and (iii) violated US laws and the canons in the Code of Conduct of United States Judges.

The writs shall:

- (i) Prohibit deals between government counsels and federal judges, to circumvent substantive due process of law to deprive government opponents from equal access to litigate Causes of Actions against the Government; and
- (ii) Mandate compliance, with strict scrutiny, with 28 U.S.C. § 455 and with the Canons of the Code of Conduct of United States Judges; and
- (iii) Remand 20-55554, 21-56306 and 21-56303 to de-novo jury trials at the US District Court.

To balance the scales of justice in this proceeding, Petitioner intends to present testimonial arguments of the Honorable Stephen Breyer, Alan Dershowitz and Erwin Chemerinsky.



## INTRODUCTION

*"The core of the rule of law is that no one, even a president or a former president, is above the law."*<sup>2</sup>

The "blindfolded statue of the American lady justice holding balanced scale" mandates every American judicial officer to impartially and diligently balance the scales of justice in the proceedings that he presides over. (i.e. not allow any bias toward any litigant, regardless of the litigant's judicial weight or available resources).

In "Presumed Guilty" Prof. Chemerinsky outlines a pattern, stretched over decades, of "secret deals" between Judges and prosecutors to weaponize the judicial system, target legal opponents and subvert their civil rights.

Prof. Alan Dershowitz describes how recent secret deals have weaponized the judicial system to target legal opponents: *"Some of the means being advocated and employed challenge the very constitutional foundations of our liberty: due process, right to counsel, free speech and the rule of law"*<sup>3</sup>. In reference to Judges' compliance with the Code of Conduct of United States Judges, Prof. Dershowitz continues: [Judges, including those] *"who have been suspicious of prosecutors....have suddenly become their most ardent supporters, advocating even more aggressive and repressive tactics — so long as they are directed at "getting" their opponents.....They [judges] deny that they ... apply an immoral double standard in their rulings because"* [self represented litigant - in this case] *"are different, which justify a different standard. They are righteous in their willingness, indeed eagerness, to bend or even break the constitution in order to thwart*

---

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Erwin Chemerinsky San Francisco Chronicle August 16, 2023

<sup>3</sup> Harvard Professor Emeritus Alan Dershowitz "Get Trump: the Threat to Civil Liberties, due process, and Our Constitutional Rule of Law ISBN: 978-1-5107-7781-1

*what they regard as dangerous*"<sup>4</sup> [legal challenge to actions taken by government' agents.]

Prof Dershowitz concludes: "*Our Constitution promises the equal protection of the law and prohibits bills of attainder*"<sup>5</sup> [which permit judges] "*to punish a party without first going through trial process.*"

Our legal system recognizes self-represented litigants as members of a protected class of litigants, thereby constitutionally entitled self-represented litigants to strict scrutiny of Judges (equal) application of the laws, prohibiting bias to benefit represented litigants. That includes allowance to state sufficient facts to establish their Causes of Action. Self-represented litigants are also exempt from arguing legal precedents.

To maintain the integrity of the judiciary, it is the obligation of USCA9 to ensure protection of self represented litigants from judicial discrimination, and assure self-represented litigants uninterrupted access to present evidences and to obtain jury verdicts.

According to Justice Breyer<sup>6</sup> "*The Constitution, indeed law in general, applies to those who are not popular just as it applies to those who are popular*". Justice Breyer acknowledges that self-represented litigants although unpopular litigants have the same right to counsel, due process, free speech, and the rule of law as more popular represented litigants.

Justice Breyer continues: "*The Court earned its authority by making decisions that have, over time, increased the public trust*". The standard of judicial decision making upon which Judges are measured is the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

---

<sup>4</sup> Id.

<sup>5</sup> Such as FRCP 8, 11, 12b(6)

<sup>6</sup> Justice Stephen Breyer quotes from the 2021 Scalia Annual lecture at Harvard Law School.

In reviewing disputes between litigants from different classes of litigants the Equal Protection Clause mandates USCA9 to apply strict scrutiny in their standard of review of appeals.

Presiding over USCA9 appeals requires absolute trust of every appellant in the presiding Circuit Judge.

USCA9 review of petitioner' appeals, did not constitute compliance with equal application of the law; USCA9 failed to keep the scales of justice balanced.

USCA9 in order to "justify" dispositions with no hearing, was digging to find crimes<sup>7</sup>.

USCA9 permitted the Government to tamper with evidence, and used its authority to intimidate to deter by imposition of cruel and unusually exorbitant fines.

The power to decide which evidence is allowed to be considered by a jury, as well as the power to "instruct" a jury which evidence to consider, or ignore, provides enormous judicial power to a presiding Judge.

It requires from the Appellate Court unfettered obligation to protect the proceeding on appeal from tampering with evidence. For that purpose, federal law<sup>8</sup> guarantees that no judicial officer, whom impartiality is in question, can preside over any judicial proceeding.

Justice Breyer: *"one way to promote better understanding on how the judiciary really works" [is to demonstrate] "how judges adhere to their oath and how they try to avoid considerations of politics and popularity"*

Petitioner preys for SCOTUS to follow Ret Justice Breyer advice to assure that America is ruled by law, not by lawyers<sup>10</sup>. SCOTUS has legal and moral obligations to discipline U.S. Judges who fail to adhere to the canons in

---

<sup>7</sup> allegedly committed by Appellant

<sup>8</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 455

<sup>9</sup> Id. Also or appearance of impropriety

<sup>10</sup> acting in conflict with the law

order to guarantee “*better understanding on how the judiciary really works*”.

For that reason SCOTUS should apply its discretionary powers to enforce strict scrutiny on United States Judges refusal to “*adhere to their oath*”<sup>11</sup>.

SCOTUS must also review the USCA9’ “reliance” on Rules of Court and FRCP to dispose appeals.

The purpose of the FRCP is “*to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action and processing*”<sup>12</sup> FRCP Rules 8&11 govern the mandatory representations that a party must certify to the court when filing a paper; as well as the Court authority to accept or power to strike the filing.

FRCP Rule 12 governs judgment on the pleadings. It requires Plaintiff to state claims “Plausible to the Court” in order to avoid the striking of his complaint against a government official.

Only SCOTUS can compel USCA9 to explain its dispositions of Uziel’ appeals in view of the undisputed evidence to USCA9 refusal to allow hearings in these appeals.

---

<sup>11</sup> Id.

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges>

### OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW

- (1) US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
  - a. Uziel v Superior Court of the State of California et al.  
Case No. 21-56306 cert denied July 25, 2023
  - b. Uziel v Newsom No. 21-56303 Cert denied 7/25/2023.

### RELATED PROCEEDINGS

- (2) U.S. Supreme Court
  - a. Uziel v Superior Court of the State of CA NO: 21-1147
- (3) US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
  - a. Uziel v Superior Court of the State of California et al.  
Case No. 20-55554
- (4) US District Court for the Central District of  
California (Western Division – Los Angeles)
  - a. Uziel v Superior Court of the State of California et al.  
Case No. 2:19-cv-01458-DSF-JEM
  - b. Uziel v Newsom, Case No.2:21-cv-07320-MYF-AFM

## JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Mr. Uziel invokes the Court jurisdiction under:

- All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C §§ 1651, authorizes the Supreme Court to issue "all writs necessary or appropriate in the aid of the respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usage and principles of law."
- 28 U.S.C §§ 1254(1) provides that "[c]ases in the courts of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court .... [b]y writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree."
- The date on which USCA9 decided case No. 21-56306 is July 3, 2023
- The date on which USCA9 decided case No. 21-56303 is July 5, 2023
- An extension of time within to file this petition on or before November 30, 2023 was granted by Justice Kagan on October 5, 2023.
- On April 17 2024, following two rejections of petitions for a writ of certiorari, and two applications for leave of court to file petitions for writs of certiorari, Ms. Rashonda Garner on behalf of the honorable Scott S. Harris wrote:  
*"You are informed that a petition for a writ of certiorari is not pre-requisite to filing a petition for an extraordinary writ of mandamus. As a petition for extraordinary writ is an original action in this Court, there is no deadline for the time to file."*

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

### Constitutional Provisions

This case involves the First, Fifth, Sixth, Eight and the Fourteen Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

### Federal Statutes

28 USC § 455 – Disqualification of justice, judge or magistrate judge of the United States

18 USC § 872 -- Extortion by officers or employees of the United States

18 USC § 242 – Deprivation of rights under color of law

18 USC § 1512 (2) (b) – Tampering with a witness, victim or informant

18 USC § 371 -- Conspiracy to defraud United States

42 USC §1983 --Civil Action for Deprivation of rights

## STATEMENT OF CASE

Petitioner prays for SCOTUS to recognize the exceptional circumstances that warrant the exercise of SCOTUS' discretionary powers to balance the scale of justice in a dispute between the State of California and a self represented litigant.

In these instances, Government counsels and U.S. Judges abused their litigation privileges to dismiss plaintiff verified complaints without due process of law, in conflict with U.S. law. If refusing to allow a litigant access to the judicial system is not considered as appearance of bias (impropriety) – What is?

Denying the right for a fair and speedy trial against the Government is not different than prosecuting a former President without stating crimes in the allegations against him. In both cases the presiding judges exhibited appearance of impropriety and lack of impartiality. Such judicial conduct diminishes the Rule of Law, ruins the justice system, which ruins the country.

SCOTUS must prohibit illegal deals between Federal Judges and Government attorneys intended to subvert Petitioner' constitutional rights to free speech, right to counsel, due process of law, equal protection of the law, the right to a fair (and speedy) trial by impartial tribunal.

For over 5 years, District & USCA9 refused to treat Petitioner as an equal litigant, with equal rights. USCA9 also refused to protect petitioner from cruel and unusual punishment imposed by U.S. Judge without hearing, or discovery of any fact.

In 2019 Uziel filed in California Federal District Court Case No. 2:19-cv-01458-DSF-JEM; in 2021 Uziel filed new and unrelated Case No.2:21-cv-07320-MYF-AFM



seeking jury trials against judicial and executive agents of the State of California.

In both instances, Defendants' counsels reached secret deals with District and Magistrate Judges to: (i) exempt Defendants from compliance with FRCP rules 8 and 11; and (ii) strike Uziel's papers, for the sole purpose to prohibit Uziel from any possible access to litigate his cases.

Furthermore, in case #2:19-cv-01458 the Magistrate, entrusted to impartially preside over pre-trial discovery of the facts, became so angry with Uziel' filings, that without any hearing, or evidence to wrong doing, explicitly threatened to punish Uziel if Uziel "continues" to file motions, request hearings (or challenge the Magistrate' impartiality).

Each and every "minute order" disregarded Uziel' stated evidence and blocked Uziel from access to conduct discovery to prepare for a trial. In both instances no hearing was ever allowed and both cases were dismissed without defendants' answers to the allegations.

USCA9 sat on the appeals for years, refusing to allow Uziel any hearing. Finally, without review of any evidence, USCA9 affirmed the discriminatory dismissals of both cases. Empowered by USCA9' inaction to protect due process, or demand impartiality, the Magistrate imposed exorbitant fines on Uziel "aimed to deter Uziel" from pursuing further legal action to defend his right to pursue equal application of the law.

Now, more than four years Petitioner, without recourse, without evidence of any wrongdoing, is facing cruel exorbitant fines imposed only because Petitioner insisted on his right to approach SCOTUS for relief.

SCOTUS is Petitioner' court of last resort. By presenting expert witnesses testimonials Petitioner wishes to establish that United States and California

State Judges abused their judicial powers repeatedly and systematically, misused of Rules of Courts and Procedures in conflict with the law and with their oath. Petitioner cannot obtain adequate relief in any other form or from any other court.

### Legal Argument

#### The facts

1. USCA9 failed to protect a litigant from discriminatory judicial misconduct of United State Judges.
2. USCA9 failed to comply with the standard of review in both appeals.
3. USCA9 held that Federal Judges have no obligation to comply with 28 USC § 455.
4. USCA9 abused its judicial powers to affirm illegal deals between Federal Judges and Government counsels who tampered with evidence and with witness declarations.
5. USCA9 Justices arbitrarily decided to deny hearings (or "oral arguments") prior to disposition of appeals.
6. USCA9 knowingly and intentionally deprived litigant (Uziel) from his constitutional rights to free speech, due process, right to counsel, the right to a fair and speedy jury trial, the rule of law, and protection from Government' imposition of cruel and unusual punishment.
7. USCA9 dispositions give grounds to this petition pursuant to 42 USC §1983.

**USCA9 violated US Laws.**

1. The secret deals between Defendants and the District Court violate 18 USC § 872, 18 USC §1512 (2)(b) and 18 USC § 371.
2. The refusal of federal judicial officers to self disqualify from these proceedings violates 28 USC § 455.
3. USCA9 mandated dispositions violates 28 USC § 455, 18 USC § 242, 18 USC § 1512 (2) (b) 18 USC § 872, and 18 USC § 371.

**REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRITS**

1. **Granting the writs will be in the aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction.**

SCOTUS has the appellate jurisdiction over USCA9, and a rare opportunity, to discipline USCA9' judicial conduct.

From each disposition it becomes apparent that USCA9 and the Courts below defied their neutrality by intentional violation of 28 USC §455.

It is also apparent that USCA9 Circuit Judges violated the oaths to adhere to the Canons. USCA9 Circuit Judges ignored their judicial obligation to prevent the Government from filing papers that violate FRCP Rules 8 and 11.

USCA9 rulings establish sufficient evidence essential to establish a cause of action for SCOTUS to exercise its discretionary powers to enforce the Canons and prevent mishandling of federal procedures.

2. **Exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of SCOTUS discretionary powers.**

Since 2019 all the District and Circuit Judges, defying challenges to impartiality, prevented Petitioner from access to litigate verified claims against Government agents.

As seen recently in the Trump case, the judge impartiality matters.

The circumstance of this petition where the conduct of so many US judges defy challenges to their impartiality without any review of the refusal to self disqualify creates judicial anarchy and represents exceptional circumstance.

In this instance. Federal Courts, with no appearance allowed, in conflict with FRCP Rules 8 & 11 disallowed uncontested verified complaints from the dockets. Federal Courts denied petitioner requests to compel defendants to answer the complaints, assert (if any) defenses and allow discovery of the evidence.

The appearance of tampering with evidence is more judicial impropriety than SCOTUS should ever allow.

A federal Judge warning a litigant not to file motions; or threatening to fine a litigant for filing motions<sup>13</sup>, can't contribute to the rule of law in a proceedings that the judge presides over.

Discrimination against litigants has become the topics of three recent books by Prof. Dershowitz, Prof. Chemerinsky and (Ret.) Justice Breyer.

At the growing heat of debate on weaponizing the DOJ to target Government opponents, this petition presents a rare opportunity for SCOTUS to review compliance with the canons and close the gaps in that Code that permit judicial misconduct.

**3. Adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other Court.**

USCA9 has been unresponsive to any request for hearing and consistently dismissed challenges to the impartiality of Circuit Judges, who arbitrarily decided to

---

<sup>13</sup> without evidence to establish that said motions may be frivolous

rule on their own impartiality<sup>14</sup>, using template statement that Petitioner "is not qualified litigant", or represents a "reasonable person with knowledge of the facts". USCA9 also failed to investigate the merit in Petitioner' challenges.

4. Granting the writ is a perfect opportunity to enforce compliance with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

While SCOTUS Justices enjoy discretion to select cases for review, SCOTUS has an obligation to update the canons and enforce compliance with it through common law writs.

Thus far, USCA9 Circuit Judges exhibited no sign of fear from disciplinary action; only SCOTUS has the power the authority and the responsibility to discipline compliance with the Code of Conduct of United States Judges.

Denying litigant the right to a fair trial is no different than prosecuting a litigant for no legal violation. Both are in conflict with the Constitution, the law and the Code of Conduct of United States Judges.

The rule of law mandates Courts to protect every litigant from incurring excessive litigation resources, to prevent quashing litigants by opponents with more litigation resources. When Circuit Courts decline to uphold, or enforce the canons on the Courts below, SCOTUS has an obligation to step in.

The ethical canons provide guidance on the official duties' performance of US Judges, accordingly:

A Judge should perform his office judicial duties "Fairly, impartially and diligently" and avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety".

---

<sup>14</sup> in conflict with 28 USC §455

To any reasonable person who read the Court' minutes or dispositions, the conduct of USCA9 justices, was neither fair, impartial nor diligent. The dispositions show no evidence of USCA9' attempt to avoid impropriety.

This petition presents meritorious questions about litigant rights.

This petition will enable review with Constitutional law experts such as Ret. Justice Breyer, Harvard law Emeritus Professor Alan Dershowitz and Berkeley Law Dean Professor Erwin Chemerinsky.

**5. Mr. Uziel is entitled to relief.**

Petitioner is entitled to relief. The Constitutional rights of any litigant should never be "negotiable" by excluding the litigant from the proceedings.

Furthermore, every litigant must be allowed to present evidence to establish a cause of action, before a judge decides to purge his complaint. The canons require Judges to apply extra sensitivity to self represented litigants where the balance of justice leans heavily against them.

Tampering with evidence is a federal crime regardless of who is behind it, or whether a judge "allowed the Court" to ignore the evidence. Claims should be only "plausible" to the law, not to a Judge or to a Court. The claim plausibility, must be appealable.

**6. The Claims are meritorious and not procedurally barred.**

All claims in this petition against USCA9 Circuit Judges' conduct are meritorious and neither legally nor procedurally barred. The facts are undisputed.

In three appeals spread over years, not a single Circuit Judge allowed Petitioner to step foot or otherwise appear in a hearing. No challenges to impartiality were

addressed. USCA9 treated Petitioner with no respect to his rights as a ghost litigant.

Unlike SCOTUS, USCA9 has no "discretion" or power to not take an appeal. With no discovery allowed at the District level, USCA9 made the standard of review of Petitioner' appeals a farce.

A judicial officer that refuses a hearing on a challenge to his own impartiality degrade the rule of law and tarnishes the integrity of the judiciary and the trust in the proceeding.

These dispositions warrant ordering the USCA9 Circuit Judges to establish affirmative defenses to their conduct. Only SCOTUS can (and should) cause USCA9 to respond.

7. Mr. Uziel should be allowed to present Expert Witness testimonies in the form of Amici opinions at oral arguments.

Most of the arguments in this petition are based on books and articles written by the honorable Ret. Justice Breyer, Professors Dershowitz and Chemerinsky. Three legal experts with bench and academic experience, and reputation. To balance the scales of justice in this dispute, SCOTUS should allow Petitioner to call on the above esteem witnesses to opine.

## CONCLUSION

Zealous legal representation does not mean a lawyer should strive to "win" a case at all costs.

It is the obligation of appellate Courts to maintain the integrity of the judiciary, avoid judicial bias and prevent striking court cases without substantive due process of law; especially when the plaintiff is a self represented litigant.

Furthermore, impositions of fines on litigants for filing complaints, without hearing or discovery, place question marks on the impartiality of the court and consequently the integrity of the entire judiciary.

After 5 years of judicial extortion there is no alternative to a start from scratch, ordering to vacate all prior rulings and remand the cases to jury trials.

Recently, the indictment and later conviction of former President Donald Trump brought the question of the presiding Judge impartiality and the ethical conduct of the prosecutors to the public eye.

Unless SCOTUS takes a strong and clear position on enforcing the Code of Conduct for United States Judges compliance will never happen. That could sink the public trust in the integrity of the judiciary to a level beyond repair. If canons remain just a page on [uscourts.gov](http://uscourts.gov) the rule of law will demise and with it the USA.

This petition deals with targeting a self represented litigant. It may be "minimal"<sup>15</sup>, but it shows the ugly side of discrimination. The questions presented hereon are the same: how judges and prosecutors have abused the constitutional rights of their opponents.

---

<sup>15</sup> in comparison to similar "famous" cases (of celebrities)



Punishments imposed just for filing a claim, justified as the Magistrate was "just" enforcing FRCP rule 11<sup>16</sup> are unconstitutional, and unreasonable.

Whether such targeting succeeds or fails to escape rebuke from SCOTUS, it is likely to create more dangerous precedents<sup>17</sup> that will lie around with loaded weapons ready to be deployed against litigants about whom it can be argued that the "danger" that they pose "is different". Let there be little doubt that zealous attorneys will seize upon any precedent established where the circumstances allow it. History proves that no presiding judge can be blindly trusted to apply the law neutrally especially when no jury is present.

Thus, only strict scrutiny of USCA9, judicial conduct in every appeal taken by SCOTUS for review could preserve the integrity of the judiciary.

For more than 4 years I have repeatedly been told "you have no chance to be heard, because the legal system is broken". This petition is my last resort to establish that in America only the law rules, and not any the lawyer. It is my last chance to exonerate myself from crimes that I did not commit.

While granting these sparsely granted writs is not my right, I deeply belief that it is a moral and Constitutional obligation of SCOTUS.

The claims in both Uziel v. Superior Court et al, and Uziel v. Newsom are meritorious, and neither are barred by law or rules. All claims fully comply with FRCP Rule 8 and 11 and should never be stricken.

---

<sup>16</sup> Without any evidence that any paper filed by Uziel was defective.

<sup>17</sup> Ashcroft v. Iqbal 556 U.S. 662 (2009), Bell Atlantic v Twombly 550US544 (2007)

Justice requires SCOTUS to mandate USCA9 to vacate all prior rulings and remand both cases to jury trials.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 17, 2024

/s/ Yehoram Uziel

Yehoram Uziel

Petitioner in pro per