

No. 24-34

---

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

Ricky-Dean Horton,

Petitioner,

v.

PG&E CORPORATION and  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Respondents.

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

---

**PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

Ricky-Dean Horton  
*Petitioner in Sui Juris (pro se)*  
2401 Waterman Blvd., Ste 4A-242  
Fairfield, California 94534  
Phone: 707-249-0227

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
Table of Cited Authorities.....	i
Supporting Rule for Rehearing.....	1-2
Arguments in Support of Granting my Petition for Rehearing .....	2-6
Conclusion.....	6-7
Certificate of Good Faith.....	7

## TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

### Constitution of the United States

Article III Sections 1-2 .....	2
Constitutional Oath and Judicial Oath.....	3-4
1 <sup>st</sup> Amendment .....	4

### Acts of Congress

Judiciary Act of 1789.....	3
Judiciary Act of 1925 (43 Stat. 936) .....	4

### Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 2072(b) .....	5
---------------------------	---

### Rules

Supreme Court Rule 44.....	1, 7
----------------------------	------

### **Supporting Rule for Rehearing**

My Petition for Writ of Certiorari was declared as denied on October 07, 2024 by Scott S. Harris, Clerk (Scott).

In the letter Scott stated that "The Court" entered the Order, however the Court cannot enter an order since The Court is a fictitious name of a legal venue wherein my Petition is filed.

There was no accompanying order with the letter from Scott.

There is no order available to download and review on the Supreme Court's website under my case 24-34.

Without an order signed by any of the Justices presiding on the Bench of the Supreme Court, the denial of my Petition may be considered FRAUD upon my case and petition.

I, Ricky Dean Horton, do not consent to my Petition for writ of Certiorari to be denied by a fictitious name, or Scott.

I am now petitioning the Justices presiding over my Petition for Writ of Certiorari for a "Rehearing" under Supreme Court Rule 44.2 (although there is no evidence or record of a hearing having ever taken place, or evidence of an order that was ever filed denying my petition).

I do not consent to any reviewing panel, or any entity or group of any kind, to deny my original Petition for writ of Certiorari filed on or around July 12, 2024.

This Petition for Rehearing exposes intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented and consisting of an error of law.

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF REHEARING  
TO GRANT MY ORIGINAL PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

**1. This is an “Article III” court.**

Article III Sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America [circa 1787] and the Constitution of the United States government [circa 1871] (collectively “the Constitution”) both summarize that, *“The judicial Power of the United States [the 50 states of the Union] shall be vested in one supreme Court, . . . and shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, [and] the laws of the United States [the 50 states of the Union], under their authority . . . to controversies to which the United States [Government] shall be a party. . .”*

- a. The sovereignty of the State resides in the people thereof.
- b. An Article III court is one that was created by the States pursuant to the Constitution.
- c. I, Ricky Dean Horton, am the petitioner, and I am one of the sovereign people of California.
- d. My Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed on or around Jul 12 2024 was filed by me, in my sovereign capacity, in this supreme Court.
- e. The United States federal government is a party to this petition since my appeal has alleged wrong—doing of Judge Dennis Montali presiding as a Federal Judge in a Federal Bankruptcy Court.

- f. The justices presiding over my Petition in this Court not only have Jurisdiction pursuant to Article III of the Constitution, but have a duty under the Constitution and the Judiciary Act of 1789 to hear and rule on my appeal filed on or around July 12, 2024, even though my appeal was filed in this court as a Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

## **2. The Constitutional Oath and Judicial Oath**

is required to be taken by each justice of the Supreme Court of the United States under the requirements and laws made pursuant to the Constitution. The oaths are documented on the Supreme Court website found in this URL as of October 24, 2024:

<https://www.supremecourt.gov/about/oath/oathsofoffice.aspx>

The combined Constitutional and Judicial oath is reproduced herein as follows:

*" I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_ under the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."*

- a. A denial of my appeal through a petition for Writ of Certiorari is a violation of both the

Constitutional Oath and Judicial Oath taken by the Justices presiding on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States of America by violating my unalienable and naturally endowed rights guaranteed to be protected under the terms and conditions of the Constitution.

- b. Denying an appeal petition from one person while at other times accepting an appeal petition from another person violates the judicial oath by showing respect to one person over another person, for any reason, thus NOT administering justice without respect to persons.

3. ANY act or law of Congress including, but not limited to, The Judiciary Act of 1925 (43 Stat. 936), also known as the Judge's Bill or Certiorari Act, shall NOT be construed to relieve the justices presiding on the bench in the Supreme Court of the United States of America of their duty and responsibility to review each and every appeal through a petition for writ of certiorari (including mine), and if any law made by Congress is construed to allegedly allow the US Supreme Court Justices, or anyone, to deny my petition for Writ of Certiorari, then that law or act of Congress is nullified "ab initio" by the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment to the US Constitution which declares,

*"Congress shall make no law . . . [of] the right of the people . . . to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."*

- a. The justices presiding on the bench of this Supreme Court of the United States of America has no constitutional authority to deny my petition for a redress of my grievances of the actions or decisions of the lower courts under the

justices of this Court's jurisdiction, authority and control.

- b. The justices on the bench of this Court each have a duty and responsibility under the Constitution to review every appeal, including mine, when filed in this Court through a petition for writ of certiorari.
- c. Congress has no constitutional authority to make a law that could be construed as to give anyone authority, whether a reviewing panel, or the Supreme Court Justices themselves, to deny my Petition to the Government for a redress of my grievances.

4. The law is clear as declared in 28 USC § 2072 . . . *"(b) Such rules shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect."*

Regardless of the where the rules, procedures, statutes, codes, or any other written directives are found throughout the laws made in pursuant to the Constitution, the justices presiding in this Court shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right, including mine.

5. As previously declared and exposed within the court records of my case, every court below has denied me of my right to a hearing. As declared in my lower court filings and in my original petition for writ of certiorari, there is no constitutional authority to deny a sovereign, or any person, of their right to be heard.

6. I, Ricky Dean Horton, a living sovereign man and one of the people of California, will NOT, knowingly or unknowingly, consent to any man-made rules or legislation that would deny me of my inherent and constitutionally protected rights, nor deny me of my substantive and natural rights, which includes my right to have my Petition for Writ of Certiorari heard and the merits ruled upon by the justices presiding in this Supreme Court of the United States of America, nor do I consent to any reviewing panel, or any party whatsoever, that may be assisting the justices, to deny my petitions.

### CONCLUSION

This Justices presiding in this Supreme Court of the United States of America has no authority to deny this Petition for Rehearing and must recognize the controlling laws under the Constitution.

There is no constitutional authority for anyone or any group of people to have denied my original petition for Writ of Certiorari filed on or around July 12, 2024.

In the interest of upholding the integrity, sanctity, and honor of this Supreme Court of the United States of America, the denial of my original Petition for Writ of Certiorari must not only be reconsidered, but in conjunction with the laws of the Constitution, the Justices in this Court must honor their Constitutional and Judicial Oath and to realize that there is no Constitutional authority or discretion to deny my original Petition filed on or around July 12, 2024, and are thus obligated to review the alleged unjust actions by the judicial actors in the courts below, and to remand my case and claim back to the lower



courts to provide a remedy to me of their abhorrent unlawful actions and gross constitutional violations against me, a sovereign man and one of the people of California.

The parties could then begin the process of seeking a remedy for the alleged liability of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for the electrocution to the death of my brother, Rory Nelson Horton.

Respectfully submitted, in truth and law, this 28th Day of October 2024.

*Ricky Dean Horton*

Ricky-Dean Horton  
*Petitioner in sui juris*  
 2401 Waterman Blvd.,  
 Ste 4A-242  
 Fairfield, California 94534  
 Phone: 707-249-0227




---

### CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2, I, Ricky Dean Horton, certify that this petition for rehearing complies with the restrictions of Supreme Court Rule 44 and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Dated October 28, 2024

*Ricky Dean Horton*

Ricky Dean Horton, sui juris

No: 24-34

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Ricky Dean Horton,  
Petitioner

v.

PG&E CORPORATION and  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company,  
Respondents

I hereby certify that on October 29, 2024 I caused to be mailed, in the United States mail, to the parties named below 3 copies of a true and correct copy of the PETITION FOR REHEARING.

KELLER BENVENUTTI KIM LLP

ATTN:

Jane Kim, David A. Taylor, Thomas B. Rupp  
Attorneys for PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
425 Market Street, 26th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (415) 496-6723  
Fax: (650) 636-9251

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on the 29th day of October, 2024.

  
Ricky Dean Horton  
Petitioner



