

In The
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED
STATES**

IN RE: PALANI KARUPAIYAN, Petitioner

**On Petition for Writ of Mandamus,
Prohibition or alternative to
United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit (Dkt 24-1067)**

**APPENDIX-PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION OR
ALTERNATIVE**

Palani Karupaiyan.
Pro se, Petitioner,
1326 W William St,
Philadelphia, PA 19132
212-470-2048(M)

List of Appendix

I. Appendix – A: USCA3’s Opinion for denying petition for Mandamus 4/8/24	1
II. Appendix – B – USCA3’s Order denying Petition for mandamus. 4/8/24	4
III. Appendix – C : USDC- Order granting 45 days extension to Defendant US to Response the complaint. 1/2/2024	5
IV. Appendix-D :Notice of appeal	7
V. Appendix-E: Notice of Petition for mandamus	8

Next page is intentionally left black by
Microsoft word

**I. APPENDIX – A: USCA3'S
OPINION FOR DENYING
PETITION FOR MANDAMUS
4/8/24**

CLD-084 **NOT PRECEDENTIAL**
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 24-1067

IN RE: PALANI KARUPAIYAN, Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States Dist Court for the Dist of New Jersey
(Related to D.N.J. Civ. No. 2:23-cv-20928)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
March 7, 2024
Before: KRAUSE, FREEMAN, and SCIRICA, Circuit
Judges
(Opinion filed April 8, 2024)

OPINION^{1*}

PER CURIAM

Palani Karupaiyan, a frequent litigant, filed
suit in the United States District Court for the
District of New Jersey, related to, *inter alia*, the

^{1*} * This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and
pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

towing of his Porsche Cayenne, in which he had been living; the appointment of United States Supreme Court justices; and what he characterizes as the attempted abduction of his children to the Republic of India.

Karupaiyan would like us to exercise our mandamus authority to provide him with the relief that he seeks in the District Court and more. Specifically, he asks that we order the United States to amend the Constitution in several ways; change how Supreme Court justices, federal circuit and district judges, and some New Jersey state court judges are appointed (and invalidate the appointment of one justice); enact a universal family law; and abolish the Electoral College. He further requests that we order the Republic of India to release his United States citizen children. He also asks us to enter orders against New Jersey to strike down New Jersey's constitution and the New Jersey Supreme Court; move New Jersey municipal judges onto the New Jersey Judiciary payroll; disallow some New Jersey judicial appointments; deposit New Jersey traffic violations fines into the New Jersey treasury; remove his traffic ticket to federal court; and institute a system that allows for jury trials in any New Jersey trial, including municipal hearings on traffic tickets. And he wants us to order Woodbridge Township, New Jersey, to pay him \$295 per day for each day that he is without his Porsche.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1651, we have the authority to "issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of [our jurisdiction] and agreeable to the usages and principles of law." That authority does not extend to entertaining claims brought in the first instance, and issuing writs against states and their officials, or the United States government, let alone other countries like the Republic of India.

Traditionally, we issue such a writ of mandamus only when a district court “has made an error of jurisdictional dimension,” and we use it “to confine an inferior court to a lawful exercise of its prescribed jurisdiction or to compel it to exercise its authority when it is its duty to do so.” See *United States v. Christian*, 660 F.2d 892, 893 (3d Cir. 1981) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). But it is not clear if Karupaiyan asks us to order the District Court or the District Judge to do anything. To the extent that he may be requesting that we order the District Court to grant the relief that he sought there, we conclude that mandamus relief is not appropriate. See *Madden v. Myers*, 102 F.3d 74, 79 (3d Cir. 1996), superseded in part on other grounds by 3d Cir. L.A.R. 24.1(c) (2011) (explaining that a petitioner seeking the writ “must have no other adequate means to obtain the desired relief, and must show that the right to issuance is clear and indisputable”).

For these reasons, the petition for a writ of mandamus is denied.

**II. APPENDIX – B – USCA3’S
ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR MANDAMUS. 4/8/24**

CLD-084

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

No. 24-1067

IN RE: PALANI KARUPAIYAN, Petitioner

**On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States Dist Court for the Dist of New Jersey
(Related to D.N.J. Civ. No. 2:23-cv-20928)**

**Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
March 7, 2024**

**Before: KRAUSE, FREEMAN, and SCIRICA, Circuit
Judges
ORDER**

PER CURIAM:

This cause came to be considered on a petition for writ of mandamus submitted on March 7, 2024. On consideration whereof, it is now hereby

ORDERED by this Court that the petition for writ of mandamus be, and the same is, denied. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of the Court.

DATED: April 8, 2024

**III. APPENDIX – C : USDC-
ORDER GRANTING 45 DAYS
EXTENSION TO DEFENDANT
US TO RESPONSE THE
COMPLAINT. 1/2/2024**

**U.S. Department of Justice
United States Attorney
District of New Jersey Civil Division**

**PHILIP R. SELLINGER
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY**

*Angela E. Juneau
Assistant United States Attorney
970 Broad Street, Suite 700
Newark, NJ 07102
direct: (862) 240-2409
angela.juneau@usdoj.gov*

Jan 2, 2024

Via Electronic Filing
~~Hon. André M. Espinosa
Martin Luther King Bldg. & U.S. Courthouse
50 Walnut Street , Newark, NJ 07102~~
Re: Karupaiyan v. United States, et al.,
Civil No. 23-20928-ES-AME

Dear Judge Espinosa:

I am the Assistant United States Attorney assigned to represent the United States in the above-captioned case. I respectfully write to request an extension of time to respond to the Complaint in this action.

Plaintiff served the U.S. Attorney's Office with the Complaint on October 17, 2023. The United States sought a two-week extension from the Clerk's Office,

which gave it until January 2, 2024, to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint. Because of multiple competing deadlines, however, I will require additional time to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. Accordingly, I respectfully ask the Court to grant an additional 45 days, or until February 16, 2024, to file its response. *Pro se* Plaintiff has declined his consent to this request.

Thank you in advance for considering this request.

Respectfully submitted,
PHILIP R. SELLINGER
United States Attorney

By: *s/ Angela E. Juneau*

ANGELA E. JUNEAU

Assistant United States Attorney

cc: Palani Karupaiyan, Plaintiff *pro se*
(palanikay@gmail.com)

The requested extension of time to respond to the Complaint is granted. SO ORDERED.

/s/ André M. Espinosa

~~ANDRÉ M. ESPINOSA, U.S.M.J.~~ Dated: Jan 2, 2024

IV. APPENDIX-D :NOTICE OF APPEAL

Palani Karupaiyan et al , Petitioner(s) v. United States et al, Respondent(s)	In the United States Dist Court For NJ Docket 23-cv-20928 – ES-AME
---	---

Notice of Appeal.

Palani Karupaiyan (name all parties taking the Appeal) Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit from the order

ORDER (ECF-14) that granted extension
(Describe the order) entered on Jan 2, 2024 (state the date the order was entered).

(s) K.Pazhani
Attorney for Pro se, Palani Karupaiyan

Date: Jan 05 2024
Extension ORDER granted for US dated Jan 2 2024 ECF-14 is attached

**V. APPENDIX-E: NOTICE OF
PETITION FOR MANDAMUS**

Palani Karupaiyan et al , Petitioner(s) v. United States et al, Respondent(s) 1	In the United States Dist Court For NJ Docket 23-cv-20928 - ES-AME
--	---

**Notice of Petition for Mandamus,
prohibition or alternative.**

Palani Karupaiyan (name all parties taking the petition) Petition to the United States Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit from the order

ORDER (ECF-14) that extension granted
(Describe the order) entered on Jan 2, 2024 (state the date the order was entered).

(s) K.Pazhani
Attorney for Pro se, Palani Karupaiyan

Date: Jan 05 2024
Extension ORDER granted for US dated Jan 2
2024 ECF-14 is attached.