

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

ABRAM J. HARRIS,

Petitioner,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION, ET AL.,

Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Abram J. Harris
Petitioner Pro Se
1152 White Sands Drive
Lusby, MD 20657
(240) 750-7636
transportationbull@gmail.com

June 10, 2025

SUPREME COURT PRESS

♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
PETITION FOR REHEARING	1
GROUNDS FOR REHEARING	1
I. Improper Removal and Violation of Due Process	1
II. Newly Discovered Evidence of Government Misconduct	1
III. False Statement to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.....	2
IV. Pattern of Misconduct and Need for Supreme Court Intervention	4
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	5
CONCLUSION: FINAL THOUGHTS	5
EXHIBITS	6
RULE 44 CERTIFICATE	7

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

**REHEARING APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Harris Memorandum of Points and Authorities Rule 2.15(B)(D) Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct (Filed January 18, 2023)..	1a
Letter from Office of Disciplinary Counsel (July 7, 2023)	10a
Letter from DOJ-OIG, Confirming Internal DOJ Departments Were Alerted to Misconduct (January 11, 2024).....	14a
Ausa Lyons’s Email Admitting to Petitioner’s Claims and Acknowledging Potential for Further Claims (May 22, 2024)	16a
Email from Jamilya Osborne Regarding Telephone Call Follow Up (May 24, 2022)	18a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> , 373 U.S. 83 (1963).....	3
<i>Giglio v. United States</i> , 405 U.S. 150 (1972)	3
<i>Mooney v. Holohan</i> , 294 U.S. 103 (1935)	4
<i>Napue v. Illinois</i> , 360 U.S. 264 (1959)	3

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. XIV.....	3
-----------------------------	---

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1)	5
------------------------------	---

JUDICIAL RULES

D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct 3.3.....	3
D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4.....	3
Sup. Ct. R. 44	1

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

Justice Manual § 4-1.410.....	2, 4
-------------------------------	------



PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Rule 44 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, Petitioner respectfully petitions for rehearing of the Court's denial of certiorari in the above-captioned case.



GROUND FOR REHEARING

I. Improper Removal and Violation of Due Process

The original petition raised a fundamental constitutional violation: the improper removal of the Petitioner's claims from state to federal court, which marked the beginning of a series of due process violations. Petitioner, a pro se litigant, was consistently denied a fair opportunity to present the full scope of claims due to government misconduct and misrepresentation throughout the proceedings.

II. Newly Discovered Evidence of Government Misconduct

Following the denial of certiorari, Petitioner obtained and submitted into the record written statements from Assistant United States Attorney Jane M. Lyons confirming two critical facts:

1. That Petitioner submitted a bona fide offer to settle the underlying matter for \$5 million in exchange for a global release of all claims;

2. That AUSA Lyons acknowledged agency review was required but had not secured agency input prior to the matter's closure.

Her written statement included:

There is no need for formality, Mr. Harris. I understand that you are willing to exchange five million dollars for a global release of all claims that you have or could have brought arising out of the events alleged in the complaint. It should not take long for me to get a response from the agency, but it likely will not be before I return from my vacation.

This confirms that the Department of Justice closed or dismissed the matter without obtaining mandatory agency consultation, in violation of Justice Manual § 4-1.410, which states:

“The client agency shall be consulted before any compromise, dismissal, or closing of a case.”

Importantly, this \$5 million offer was not submitted to the Supreme Court but also was not mentioned in the Status Report filed in the D.C. Court of Appeals—demonstrating the government's omission of material facts from the appellate record.

III. False Statement to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

Petitioner submitted a complaint to the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General alleging that AUSA Jane M. Lyons made a materially false statement to the D.C. Court of Appeals. In a filed status report, AUSA Lyons falsely claimed that Petitioner had moved for the recusal of the trial judge. This

statement was objectively false and unsupported by the record.

Petitioner submitted corrective documentation to both the D.C. Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals. Despite this, the matter was inadvertently dismissed by the court. Notably, the DOJ's sole position throughout was to dismiss the case while ignoring the pending settlement offer and the required agency review.

As a result of this misrepresentation, the DOJ Office of Inspector General referred the matter to the Director of the DOJ Accountability Office and the Executive Office for United States Attorneys (EOUSA) for further investigation.

This false statement constitutes a potential violation of Rule 3.3 of the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct (Candor Toward the Tribunal), as well as Rule 8.4 (Misconduct), and had a prejudicial effect on the Petitioner's access to a fair process.

Relevant case law includes:

- *Napue v. Illinois*, 360 U.S. 264 (1959): A conviction obtained through the use of false evidence, known to be such by representatives of the State, must fall under the Fourteenth Amendment.
- *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972): A new trial is required if the false testimony could in any reasonable likelihood have affected the judgment of the jury.
- *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963): Suppression by the prosecution of evidence favorable to the accused violates due process

where the evidence is material to guilt or punishment.

- *Mooney v. Holohan*, 294 U.S. 103 (1935): The prosecution's deliberate deception of a court and jurors by the presentation of known false evidence is incompatible with the rudimentary demands of justice.

These precedents collectively support Petitioner's position that prosecutorial misconduct and the DOJ's procedural violations require this Court's intervention.

IV. Pattern of Misconduct and Need for Supreme Court Intervention

The cumulative effect of:

- DOJ's violation of internal procedures under Justice Manual § 4-1.410;
- AUSA Lyons's false statement to the D.C. Court of Appeals;
- The inadvertent dismissal of Petitioner's case despite a pending \$5 million offer;
- And the referral of misconduct by the DOJ's Office of Inspector General;

... demonstrates a pattern of serious procedural and ethical violations. These violations rise to the level of due process denial and demand supervisory review by this Court.



PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

- Grant rehearing of the denial of certiorari;
- Vacate the lower court judgment tainted by misrepresentation and procedural error; and
- Remand for further proceedings consistent with principles of justice, fairness, and government accountability.



CONCLUSION: FINAL THOUGHTS

Getting the case to final judgment would be a victory, but the greater question is whether it would be real justice for the Supreme Court to trust a Defendant who admitted via email that they participated in the underlying claims, thereby violating 28 U.S.C. § 1346 (b)(1) regarding liability, lack of due care, and negligence.

Petitioner submits that true justice would be served if this Court used its discretion to review the Department of Justice's decision, especially in light of the \$5 million settlement offer referenced and acknowledged by AUSA Lyons.

One point of agreement between the Solicitor General as Respondent and the Petitioner is this: Due Process must be honored for a United States Citizen. It would be highly unconstitutional to provide such

protection to undocumented individuals while denying it to a law-abiding U.S. Citizen like Petitioner.

The Petitioner has met all elements on the merits, and it would be unjust to ignore the new evidence and misconduct now fully presented.



EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1: Docket entry and status report where the District Court accepted a false statement made by AUSA Lyons. Exhibit 2: Correspondence with DOJ-OIG, confirming internal DOJ departments were alerted to misconduct. Exhibit 3: AUSA Lyons's email admitting to Petitioner's claims and acknowledging potential for further claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Abram J. Harris
Petitioner Pro Se
1152 White Sands Drive
Lusby, MD 20657
(240) 750-7636
transportationbull@gmail.com

June 10, 2025

RULE 44 CERTIFICATE

I, ABRAM HARRIS, petitioner pro se, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

1. This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.

2. The grounds of this petition are limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

/s/ Abram Harris
Petitioner

Executed on June 10, 2025

REHEARING APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Harris Memorandum of Points and Authorities Rule 2.15(B)(D) Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct (Filed January 18, 2023)..	1a
Letter from Office of Disciplinary Counsel (July 7, 2023)	10a
Letter from DOJ-OIG, Confirming Internal DOJ Departments Were Alerted to Misconduct (January 11, 2024).....	14a
Ausa Lyons's Email Admitting to Petitioner's Claims and Acknowledging Potential for Further Claims (May 22, 2024)	16a
Email from Jamilya Osborne Regarding Telephone Call Follow Up (May 24, 2022).....	18a

**HARRIS MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES RULE 2.15(B)(D) RESPONDING
TO JUDICIAL AND LAWYER MISCONDUCT
(FILED JANUARY 18, 2023)**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ABRAM J. HARRIS

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
(FMCSA)-(DOT)

Case No. 22-cv-02383

Before: Trevor N. MCFADDEN,
United States District Judge.

**Memorandum of Points and Authorities
RULE 2.15(B)(D) Responding to
Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct**

Plaintiff Abram J. Harris as Pro se files motion R.2.15(B) A judge having knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question regarding the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate authority.

(D) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a

violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct shall take appropriate action.

Abram J. Harris Pro se
1152 White Sands Dr.
Lusby Md. 20657
(P) 240-750-7636
transportationbull@gmail.com

1/5/2023

STATEMENT

Plaintiff Abram J. Harris states that on 1/5/2023 (AUSA) Jane Lyons provided untruthful documents to the DISTRICT COURT OF COLUMBIA Civ. No. 22-CV-0547. The documents state that Plaintiff Abram J. Harris filed a recusal on this Honorable Court UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA Civ. No. 22-CV-02383 for Honorable Judge Trevor N. McFadden, which is clearly a false statement. The Plaintiff Abram J. Harris filed a recusal on Defendant (AUSA) Tepe, (please see ECF. No. 10). Also, the Defendant has stated that this C. No. 22-CV-02383 has already been removed which is another false statement. This case is still pending for settlement.

The Plaintiff is asking this court to take into consideration that the misconduct of being untruthful is not only very damaging but also disrespectful, to the Plaintiff and to this Honorable Court. See exhibit (AB-1)(AB-2) The Plaintiff is requesting, Full Judgement

for Gross Negligence and Punitive Damages. However, the Defendant could have easily brought (FMCSA) agent Jeanette Boulware, (FMCSA) agent Sam White and (AUSA) Johnson in court to give a sworn testimony on all allegations that the Plaintiff has stated. Failing to do so leads to suspicion of guilt. The Plaintiff is asking this court to please set the record straight for the Defendants that this Honorable Court is in Full Control. Defendant (AUSA) Jane N. Lyons violates the DC Bar R. 8.4: (a)(b)(c)(d) Misconduct (a) Violation or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another; {Which is the Plaintiff Abram J. Harris}. (b) Commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects; {Submitting} a false statement to the DISTRICT COURT OF COLUMBIA APEALS which could be viewed as a criminal act. When Defendant said, {Quote} Harris filed an amended complaint and moved unsuccessfully for the recusal of the assigned United States District Judge and other relief. The amended complaint filed by Plaintiff Never mentioned or thought regarding a recusal of any Judge only Recusal for (AUSA) Johnson see (ECF) No. 5. (c) Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; Defendant (AUSA) Lyons was clearly being dishonest and very deceitful. (d) Engage in conduct that seriously interferes with the administration of justice; (e) State or imply an ability to influence improperly a government agency or official;

Defendant (AUSA) Lyon's motive is to slander and interfere with a decision to the DISTRICT COURT OF COLUMBA APPEALS. The Plaintiff states that

28 U.S.C. 4101(1)(2) Defamation was violated inside of the misconduct. (1) Defamation—The term “defamation” means any action or other proceeding for defamation, libel, slander, or similar claim alleging that forms of speech are false, have caused damage to reputation or emotional distress, have presented any person in a false light, or have resulted in criticism, dishonor, or condemnation of any person. (2) Domestic court.—The term “domestic court” means a Federal court or a court of any State.

FACTS OF TRUTH

The Plaintiff shows this Honorable Court that in real time, errors from Defendant (AUSA) and (FMCSA) so that this Honorable Court hold both Defendants accountable. Both agents (FMCSA) Boulware and White, participated in Gross Negligence with the continuance by Defendant (AUSA) Johnson and (AUSA) Lyon’s disregard or respect of law. The Plaintiff mentions to be fair to both (AUSA) Defendant (FMCSA) did not provide any defense for the (AUSA) to defend. (AUSA) resulted to common behavior in filing a dismissal and used untruthful tactics. When (FMCSA) could have provided a witness to defend all allegations that this court can now see all statements made by Plaintiff are true.

NOTE

So, this court must be made aware, Added Amended (ECF) No. 26 needed to be added for the statement that (AUSA) Tepe made about false allegations regarding statements made by the Plaintiff of (FMCSA) agent Sam White who did call Dr. Lawrence Shombert, and did Slander Plaintiff Abram J. Harris. The phone

records are proof. In addition, the IRS is about to put a Levey on the Dr. Shombert for unpaid taxes throughout the years, which the loan of 3.5 million for the initial investment including loss wages that has taken place and still taking place for over the past four years that is ongoing loan that defaulted because of the fraud by the (FMCSA), the IRS needs to see a (ECF) filing for Plaintiff verification of proof so a fair arrangement can be made. Plus, this Honorable Court needs to know that statements made by the Plaintiff are backed up by documents, that prove all statements are true. Unlike the Defendants, presenting no type evidence or witnesses that the Defendants do have access to, choose not to because it would clearly prove the Plaintiff's truths. The Defendant chooses not to defend their none defense which end up to be words of Jibber Jabber.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff wants to court to know that, Plaintiff has the most up respect for this Honorable Court, this court has allowed Due process to take place which every American is entitled to. Plaintiff ask this court to award Full Judgement of 105,000,000.00 dollars in the behave to the Plaintiff Abram J. Harris. Plaintiff must stress, never at anytime intended to disrespect this court and apologizes for any misunderstanding of past filings.

/s/ Trevor N. McFadden
United States District Judge

**APPELLEE'S STATUS REPORT
(JANUARY 5, 2023)**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT OF APPEALS

ABRAM J. HARRIS,

Appellant,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,

Appellee.

No. 22-CV-0547
(CAB1867-22)

Appellee, the United States Department of Transportation, respectfully provides this status report as directed in this Court's October 7, 2022 Order.

Since removal of this matter to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on August 11, 2022, Harris filed an amended complaint and moved unsuccessfully for the recusal of the assigned United States District Judge and other relief.¹ The United

¹ Harris has also filed an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against the Assistant United States Attorney who filed the notice of removal in this case. That case was filed as *Harris v. Johnson*, Civ. A. No. 22-3154 (TNM), and the United States was substituted as the defendant under

States Department of Transportation (“Department”) has moved to dismiss the amended complaint, and its motion is ripe for resolution.

In the instant matter, on November 8, 2022, Harris moved the Court for certain relief. Harris has also directed correspondence to the Court that has been placed on the docket. The Department has not responded and will not be making substantive filings in this case because removal to the federal court prevents this Court from proceeding “unless and until the case is remanded.” 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW M. GRAVES
United States Attorney

/s/ Jane M. Lyons
JANE M. LYONS, DC BAR #461737
Assistant United States Attorney
601 D Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 252-2540
Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov

Dated: January 5, 2023

the Westfall Act; a motion to dismiss this case as frivolous and an abuse of judicial process is also pending.

[PROPOSED] ORDER
(JANUARY 5, 2023)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ABRAM J. HARRIS

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
(FMCSA)-(DOT)

Case No. 22-cv-02383

Before: Trevor N. MCFADDEN,
United States District Judge.

UPON CONSERATION of Plaintiff's Motion to Grant and the entire record Herein, and for good cause shown it is hereby

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's Motion to Grant is GRANTED FULL JUDGEMENT OF 105,000,000.00

ORDERED that Defendant's Misconduct leads to investigation for disciplinary action against Plaintiff GRANDED

ORDERED that Plaintiff Motion to Grant is GRANTED, and that it is further

ORDERED that the Complaint (ECF No.1,5, and 11, 12,14, 20) is Granted with Prejudice.

Reh.App.9a

SO, ORDERED this ____ day of ____, 2023.

Honorable Judge Trevor N. McFadden

**LETTER FROM
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
(JULY 7, 2023)**



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

July 7, 2023

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

July 7, 2023

CONFIDENTIAL

Hamilton P. Fox, III
Disciplinary Counsel

Julia L. Porter
Deputy Disciplinary Counsel

Senior Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Jack Metzler
Becky Neal

Assistant Disciplinary Counsel
Caroll G. Donayre
Jerri U. Dunston
Dru M. Foster
Jason R. Horrell
Ebtehaj Kalantar
Jelani C. Lowery
Sean P. O'Brien
Joseph C. Perry
Melissa J. Rolffot

William R. Ross
Traci M. Tait
Cynthia G. Wright

Senior Staff Attorney
Lawrence K. Bloom

Staff Attorney
Arquimides R. Leon
Amanda Ureña
Angela M. Walker

Manager, Forensic Investigations
Charles M. Anderson

Investigative Attorney
Azadeh Matinpour

Abram J. Harris
Sent via email only to: transportationbull@gmail.com

Re: Lyons/Harris
Undocketed No. 2023-U320

Dear Mr. Harris:

We reviewed your disciplinary complaint against Jane M. Lyons, Esquire. You state that your allegations are related to the following cases: (1) *Harris v. Department of Transportation FMSCA*, Case No. 2022-CA-001867-B, filed in D.C. Superior Court, and later removed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia District Court on September 13, 2022, in Case No. 1:22-cv-02383; (2) *Harris v. Johnson, et al.*, Case No. 1:22-cv-03154, filed in D.C. District Court on October 17, 2022, which the court dismissed; (3) *Harris v. Department of Transportation FMSCA*, Case No. 23-5091, filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, which remains pending. You represented

yourself in each of this cases. Ms. Lyons represents the Department of Transportation on appeal before the D.C. Circuit. You included the “Memorandum of Points and Authorities Rule 2.15(B)(D) Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct” that you filed in Case No. 1:22-cv-02383 on January 18, 2023, which sets forth your allegations against Ms. Lyons.

You contend Ms. Lyons engaged in dishonesty and criminal behavior in statements she made to the court, including y by falsely stating that Case No. 1:22-cv-02382 had been removed, and misrepresenting the substance of an amended complaint you filed. You claim that her “motive is to slander and interfere with a decision to the DISTRICT COURT OF COLUMBIA APPEALS.”

We decline further investigation. We do not have evidence supporting your claims. You may wish to consult with an attorney. However, it appears that you withdrew your request for the assistance of a court-appointed attorney, which the court granted. You may raise your concerns in the pending appeal before the D.C. Circuit. We cannot assist you further. If a court finds Ms. Lyons acted improperly, you may send us the written decision for our consideration.

We docket cases for further investigation when the complaint: (1) is not unfounded on its face; (2) contains allegations which, if true, would constitute a violation of the Attorney’s Oath of Office or the Rules of Professional Conduct that would merit discipline; and (3) concerns an attorney admitted to practice law in the District of Columbia. The information you provided does not satisfy at least one of these three criteria.

Reh.App.13a

Accordingly, we decline to open a full investigation of this matter and have closed this file. Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention.

Sincerely,

/s/ Angela Walker

Staff Attorney

**LETTER FROM DOJ-OIG, CONFIRMING
INTERNAL DOJ DEPARTMENTS WERE
ALERTED TO MISCONDUCT
(JANUARY 11, 2024)**



DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

Abram Harris
transportationbull@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Harris:

Thank you for your recent correspondences received on December 30, 2023. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of the Inspector General, investigates allegations of misconduct by employees and contractors of DOJ, as well as waste, fraud and abuse affecting DOJ programs and operations. After reviewing your complaint, we have determined that the matters that you raised are more appropriate for review by other offices within the DOJ. Therefore, we have forwarded your correspondence to:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Professional Responsibility Director
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

U. S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for
U.S. Attorneys General Counsel

Reh.App.15a

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Please direct any further correspondence regarding this matter to these offices.

Of course, if you have information that involves other allegations or issues regarding DOJ employees, contractors, programs or operations, please feel free to submit that information to us.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review your concerns.

Sincerely,

Office of the Inspector General
Investigations Division

**AUSA LYONS'S EMAIL
ADMITTING TO PETITIONER'S CLAIMS
AND ACKNOWLEDGING POTENTIAL
FOR FURTHER CLAIMS
(MAY 22, 2024)**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lyons, Jane (USADC)
<Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov>
Date: Wed, May 22, 2024, 5:04 PM
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Write up for settlement
To: Abram Harris
<transportationbull@gmail.com>

There is no need for formality, Mr. Harris. I understand that you are willing to exchange five million dollars for a global release of all claims that you have or could have brought arising out of the events alleged in the complaint. It should not take long for me to get a response from the agency, but it likely will not be before I return from my vacation.

Please have a pleasant evening.

Best,

Jane M. Lyons
Appellate Counsel (Civil)
Civil Division, U.S. Attorney's Office
601 D Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530
Ph: (202) 252-2540
jane.lyons@usdoj.gov

Reh.App.17a

From: Abram Harris
<transportationbull@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 4:53 PM
To: Lyons, Jane (USADC)
<JLyons1@usa.doj.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Write up for settlement

I forgot I will write it up and do more formal writing.

Abram J. Harris

**EMAIL FROM JAMILYA OSBORNE
REGARDING TELEPHONE CALL FOLLOW UP
(MAY 24, 2022)**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Osborne, Jamilya (FMCSA)
<jamilya.osborne@dot.gov>

Date: Tue, May 24, 2022 at 3:23 PM

Subject: Telephone call follow up

To: transportationbull@gmail.com
<transportationbull@gmail.com>

Good afternoon Mr. Harris,

To follow up, we spoke today about your civil matter with FMCSA. I have submitted your information to the parties involved so that they may respond to you. I hope this information was helpful. If you still need assistance, please reach out to me at the contact information listed below. Have a wonderful week!

Thanks,

Jamilya Osborne, Transportation Specialist
Customer Service & Vetting Division
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590
P: (202) 366-5171
F: (202) 366-3477
jamilya.osborne@dot.gov



Supreme Court Press
1089 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 283
Boston, MA 02215
(617) 505-1088
www.supremecourtpress.com
editor@supremecourtpress.com

June 10, 2025

Clerk of the Court
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

Re: *Abram J. Harris v. Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, et al*, Dkt. 24-1029

Enclosed in this package you will find the following documents pertaining to the above captioned matter:

Forty (40) copies of the
ABRAM J. HARRIS PETITION FOR REHEARING

One (1) unbound 8.5" Printout

Certificate of Service

Certified Word Count


\$200 Filing Fee Check

~~Other Comments (if any):~~

Our firm, the Supreme Court Press is document preparer. If there are any questions or concerns, we can be reached at (617) 505-1088.

With warm regards,

The Supreme Court Press



CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

No. 24-1029

Abram J. Harris,

Petitioner,

v.

Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, et al.,

Respondents.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS)
COUNTY OF NORFOLK) SS.:

Being duly sworn, I depose and say:

1. That I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to this action. I am an employee of the Supreme Court Press, the preparer of the document, with mailing address at 1089 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 283, Boston, MA 02215.

2. That, as required by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(h), I certify that the ABRAM J. HARRIS PETITION FOR REHEARING contains 1023 words, including the parts of the brief that are required or exempted by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Lucas DeDeus

June 10, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

No. 24-1029

Abram J. Harris,

Petitioner,

v.

Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, et al.,
Respondents.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS)
COUNTY OF NORFOLK) SS.:

Being duly sworn, I depose and say under penalty of perjury:

1. That I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to this action. I am an employee of the Supreme Court Press, the preparer of the document, with mailing address at 1089 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 283, Boston, MA 02215.

2. On the undersigned date, I served the parties in the above captioned matter with the ABRAM J. HARRIS PETITION FOR REHEARING, by both email and by mailing three (3) true and correct copies of the same by Fedex 2-Day, prepaid for delivery to the following address which the filing party avers covers all parties required to be served.

D. John Sauer
Solicitor General, United States
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Rm. 5616
Washington, DC 20530-0001
(202) 514-2217
supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov
Counsel for Respondents


Lucas DeDeus

June 10, 2025

