

**ORIGINAL**

No. **24-459**

**FILED**  
**AUG 30 2024**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

---

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

---

GORDON CLARK,  
*Petitioner,*  
v.  
SANTANDER BANK, N.A.,  
*Respondent.*

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
Supreme Court of Connecticut**

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

Gordon Clark  
70 Elm Street  
Enfield, CT 06082  
(860) 833-3195  
gordon@christianeconomics.net

*Pro Se Petitioner*

---

**RECEIVED**  
**OCT 22 2024**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In *The Constitution of the United States: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause – 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment*, it states, in its entirety, the following:

*“In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.”*

In *The Constitution of the United States: The Right of Due Process of Law Clause – 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; ...”*

In *The Constitution of the United States: The Right of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection Clause – 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”*

1. The first question presented is whether the aforementioned 7<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments to *The Constitution of the United States* are still *in effect* in the United States, *especially* for *pro se* litigants who cannot afford to hire an honest, competent, and experienced litigator; and if so, was the *pro se* Petitioner *denied* his said *federal* constitutionally protected and inviolate rights to a jury trial, to due process of law, and to equal protection under the law?

Similarly, in the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause – Article IV*, it states, in part, the following:

*“Section 19 of article first of the constitution is amended to read as follows: The right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate ...”*

In the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Due Process of Law Clause – Article XVII*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, ...”*

In the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Equal Protection Clause – Article XXI*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... No person shall be denied the equal protection of the law ...”*

2. The second question presented is whether the aforementioned Article IV, Article XVII, and Article XXI of the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut* are still *in effect* in Connecticut, *especially* for *pro se* litigants who cannot afford to hire an honest, competent, and experienced litigator; and if so, was the *pro se* Petitioner *denied* his said *state* constitutionally protected and inviolate rights to a jury trial, to due process of law, and to equal protection under the law?

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

Lillian J. Clark (deceased October 18, 2020)

*Estate of Lillian J. Clark*

*Pro Se* Petitioner Gordon Clark

(husband of 27 years and widow of Lillian J. Clark;  
and sole executor to the *Estate of Lillian J. Clark*)

Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*

## **RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

*Santander Bank, N.A. v. Clark, Lillian J. et al.*  
**Supreme Court of Connecticut**

**SC230264 – Motion for Reconsideration En  
Banc of Motion for a Writ of Mandamus to  
Compel the Constitutional and Inviolable Right  
to a Jury Trial**

Denied – June 4, 2024;

**SC230271 – Motion to Vacate Superior Court  
Judgment Due to Lack of Jurisdiction**

Dismissed – June 4, 2024;

**SC230272 – Motion to Vacate Superior Court  
Judgment Due to Lack of Standing**

Dismissed – June 4, 2024;

**SC230273 – Motion to Vacate Superior Court  
Judgment Due to Fraud Upon the Court**  
Dismissed – June 4, 2024;

**SC230274 – Motion to Vacate Superior Court  
Judgment Due to Lack of Due Process of Law**  
Dismissed – June 4, 2024;

**SC230194 – Motion for a Writ of Mandamus to  
Compel the Constitutional and Inviolable Right  
to a Jury Trial**  
Denied – May 7, 2024;

**SC230195 – Motion for Reconsideration En  
Banc of Petition for Certification**  
Denied – May 7, 2024;

**SC230179 – Petition for Certification**  
Denied – February 20, 2024; and

**SC220302 – Petition for Certification**  
Denied – April 4, 2023.

*Santander Bank, N.A. v. Clark, Lillian J. et al.*  
**Appellate Court of Connecticut**

**AC46473 – Motion for Reconsideration En Banc**  
Denied – September 13, 2023;

**AC46473 – Motion to Compel Transcript  
Delivery**

Denied – June 14, 2023; and

**AC45927 – Motion for Reconsideration En Banc**

Denied – February 15, 2023.

*Santander Bank, N.A. v. Clark, Lillian J. et al.*

**Superior Court of Connecticut**

**HHD-CV19-6120472-S**

Decision – May 19, 2023.

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A.*

**United States Bankruptcy Court**

**District of Connecticut**

**23-20642-JJT (Chapter 13)**

Pending Appeal

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A. et al.*

**United States Bankruptcy Court**

**District of Connecticut**

**23-02013-JJT (Adversary Complaint)**

Pending Appeal

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A.*

**United States District Court**

**District of Connecticut**

**3:24-CV-00026-VAB (Chapter 13)**

Pending Appeal

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A. et al.*  
**United States District Court**  
**District of Connecticut**  
**3:24-CV-00055-VAB (Adversary Complaint)**  
Pending Appeal

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A. et al.*  
**United States District Court**  
**District of Connecticut**  
**3:22-CV-00039-SVN**  
Pending Appeal

*Clark v. State of Connecticut et al.*  
**United States District Court**  
**District of Connecticut**  
**3:23-CV-01527-SVN**  
Pending

*Clark v. Santander Bank, N.A. et al.*  
**United States Court of Appeals for the**  
**Second Circuit**  
**22-2965; and**  
**23-7834**  
Pending Appeal

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	1
PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	2
STATEMENT .....	5
<i>Factual Background:</i> .....	9
<i>Legal Background:</i> .....	11
<i>Procedural Background:</i> .....	22
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION .....	32
CONCLUSION .....	35

## TABLE OF APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A:

Nine (9) denials and/or dismissals of appeals  
to the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, Filed  
April 4, 2023 to June 4, 2024 ..... 1

### APPENDIX B:

Three (3) denials of appeals to the *Appellate  
Court of Connecticut*, Filed February 15, 2023;  
June 14, 2023; and September 13, 2023 ..... 13

### APPENDIX C:

Sixteen (16) orders of the *Superior Court of  
Connecticut*, Filed April 25, 2023 to May 3,  
2023 ..... 17

### APPENDIX D:

Decision of the *Superior Court of Connecticut*,  
Filed May 19, 2023 ..... 33

### APPENDIX E:

*The Backstory Behind Judge Richard Posner's  
Retirement* ..... 51

### APPENDIX F:

Chapter 9: *Capture of the Civil Jury* from  
the book entitled, *Captured: The Corporate  
Infiltration of American Democracy*, by  
United States Senator Sheldon Whitehouse,  
Published 2017 ..... 57

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Scriptural Commandments

#### *The Ninth (9<sup>th</sup>) Commandment*

Exodus 20:16 ..... 2, 33

#### *The Tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) Commandment*

Exodus 20:17 ..... 2, 33

#### *The Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Great Commandment*

Matthew 22:39 ..... 2, 33

Common Law Maxim (Truth & Justice)..... 34

Common Law Maxim (Justice delayed/denied)..... 34

Common Law Maxim (Sacred & Inviolable)..... 34

*The Declaration of Independence – 1776* ..... 34

### Federal Constitution & Amendments

#### *The Constitution of the United States: Freedom to*

*Contract Clause, Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 .. 35*

*The Constitution of the United States: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause – 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment* ..... 3, 41

*The Constitution of the United States: The Due Process of Law Clause – 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment* ..... 3, 41

*The Constitution of the United States: The Due Process of Law and Equal Protection Clause – 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1* ..... 3, 41

#### State Constitutional Articles

*The Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause – Article IV* ... 4, 41

*The Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Due Process of Law Clause – Article XVII* ... 4, 41

*The Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Equal Protection Clause – Article XXI* ..... 4, 41

#### Cases

*Joyce v. United States*, 474 U.S. 215 (1973). ..... 6

*Moffett, Hodgkins, and Clarke Company v. Rochester*, 178 U.S. 373 (1900). ..... 7, 8, 15

<i>United States v. Throckmorton</i> , 98 U.S. 61 (1878). .....	18
<i>Rhode Island v. Massachusetts</i> , 37 U.S. 657 (1838). .....	6
<i>JPMorgan Chase Bank v. Robert J. Virgulak, et al.</i> , 341 Conn. 750 (2022). ....	7, 9, 17
<i>Harlach v. Metropolitan Property</i> , 221 Conn. 185 (1992). ....	7, 8, 16
<i>State of Connecticut v. Hahn</i> , 207 Conn. 555 (1988). .....	7, 8, 15
<i>Electrical Contractors, Inc. v. Dept. of Education</i> , 303 Conn. 402, 411, 35 A.3d 188 (2012). ....	14
<i>Talenti v. Morgan and Bro. Manhattan Storage</i> , 113 Conn. App. 845, 853-854, 968 A.2d 933 (2009). ....	14
<i>Esposito v. Specyalski</i> , 268 Conn. 336, 348, 844 A.2d 211 (2004). ....	14

## **Federal Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1) .....	1, 4
28 U.S.C. § 1331 .....	1, 4

28 U.S.C. § 1654 .....	1, 4
------------------------	------

## State Statutes

### *Connecticut Practice Book*

Sec. 10-33. Waiver and Subject Matter Jurisdiction .....	13
--	----

### *The Connecticut Attorney's Oath*

<i>General Statutes § 1-25 and annotations</i> .....	18
--	----

## Rules & Codes

### RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Preamble: A Lawyer's Responsibilities .....	19
---	----

### RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE

3.1. Meritorious Claims and Contentions .....	19
---	----

### RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE

3.3(A)(1). Candor Toward the Tribunal .....	20
---	----

### TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS OTHER THAN CLIENTS

Rule 4.1. Truthfulness in Statements to Others ...	20
--	----

RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE 5.1(A). Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers .....	21
CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT – PREAMBLE .	21

**Other Authorities**

**APPENDIX E:**

<i>The Backstory Behind Judge Richard Posner's Retirement</i> .....	51
---	----

**APPENDIX F:**

Chapter 9: <i>Capture of the Civil Jury</i> from the book entitled, <i>Captured: The Corporate Infiltration of American Democracy</i> , by United States Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, Published 2017 .....	57
--	----

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Gordon Clark petitions for a *Writ of Certiorari* to review the judgment of the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*.

## OPINIONS BELOW

The five (5) decisions on June 4, 2024 of the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, which are: 230264; 230271; 230272; 230273; 230274; and are included in *Appendix A*. *Pro Se Petitioner* is unaware of any published reporting elsewhere.

## JURISDICTION

The *Supreme Court of Connecticut* entered its final decisions on June 4, 2024 (*Appendix A*). The deadline to file a *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* with this Court was September 3, 2024. The original *Petition* was timely filed on August 30, 2024. This Court returned said original *Petition* on September 5, 2024 for corrections within 60 days. The deadline to file a corrected *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* with this Court is November 4, 2024. This corrected *Petition* is timely filed on October 17, 2024. Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1), 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 1654, and Rule 12.4.

**SCRIPTURAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, AND  
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

***Scriptural***

*The Ninth (9<sup>th</sup>) Commandment:*

***"Thou shalt not bear false witness against  
thy neighbor."***

Exodus 20:16

*The Tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) Commandment:*

***"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house ...,  
nor any thing that is thy neighbor's."***

Exodus 20:17

*The Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Great Commandment:*

***"... Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."***

Matthew 22:39

**Constitutional - Federal**

**In The Constitution of the United States: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause Right – 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment,** it states, in its entirety, the following:

*“In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.”*

**In The Constitution of the United States: The Due Process of Law Clause – 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment,** it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; ... ”*

**In The Constitution of the United States: The Due Process of Law and Equal Protection Clause – 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1,** it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”*

### ***Constitutional - State***

In the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Right of Trial by Jury Clause – Article IV*, it states, in part, the following:

*“Section 19 of article first of the constitution is amended to read as follows: The right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate ...”*

In the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Due Process of Law Clause – Article XVII*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, ...”*

In the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut: The Equal Protection Clause – Article XXI*, it states, in part, the following:

*“... No person shall be denied the equal protection of the law ...”*

### ***Statutory - Federal***

28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1) – *Petition for Writ of Certiorari*

28 U.S.C. § 1331 – *Federal Question*

28 U.S.C. § 1654 – *Pro Se Appearance*

## STATEMENT

*Ab initio*, the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut ***lacked subject matter jurisdiction*** in this case, based on the following facts and law, which are:

*Plaintiff-Respondent Santander Bank, N.A.* knowingly or unknowingly ***admitted against interest***, and ***without any claims of fraud nor mutual mistake*** by the Defendant-Petitioner in its Complaint, that they have an ***invalid, unenforceable, and unreformable alleged mortgage***; and therefore, an ***invalid, unenforceable, and unreformable alleged mortgage*** that the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut ***never had subject matter jurisdiction*** to consider.

Consequently, the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut had ***no*** jurisdictional authority to reform said ***invalid, unenforceable, and unreformable alleged mortgage***. That is, ***without completely disregarding and violating the law***, including, but not limited to our federal and state Constitutional rights to a jury trial, to due process of law, to equal protection under the law, the rule of law, their

*Attorney's Oath, their Rules of Professional and Judicial Conduct, and basic contract law, all of which was done **under the color of law and with impunity.***

Additionally, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* **lacks standing** due to a **failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.**

More *specifically, clearly, and simply* this case would be akin to an **unsecured alleged creditor** filing a foreclosure claim with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* on a property with a **blank piece of paper or without a valid, enforceable, or reformable mortgage.**

Therefore, due to the Plaintiff-Respondent's said **invalid, unenforceable, and unreformable alleged** mortgage, and the resultant Plaintiff-Respondent's **lack of proper and lawful standing due to a failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted**, the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Superior Court of Connecticut* "**ab initio**" **lacked any and all subject matter jurisdiction in this matter**; and consequently, all said Courts' previous judgments are "**forever a nullity**" and/or are "**void ab initio.**"

**Please see:** *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts*, 37 U.S. 657 (1838); and *Joyce v. United States*, 474 U.S. 215 (1973).

Once again, *ab initio*, the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut ***lacked subject matter jurisdiction, which cannot be waived***, based on four (4) SCOTUS and Supreme Court of Connecticut ***cited and binding*** precedents, which are:

*Moffett, Hodgkins, and Clarke Company v. Rochester*, 178 U.S. 373 (1900).

*State of Connecticut v. Hahn*, 207 Conn. 555 (1988).

*Harlach v. Metropolitan Property*, 221 Conn. 185 (1992).

*JPMorgan Chase Bank v. Robert J. Virgulak, et al.*, 341 Conn. 750 (2022).

Additionally, the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut denied *Pro Se* Petitioner Gordon Clark's (Mr. Clark's) ***inviolable right to a jury trial***.

Moreover, the Supreme Court of Connecticut, the Appellate Court of Connecticut, and the Superior Court of Connecticut denied Mr. Clark's right to ***due process of law***.

Furthermore, the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Superior Court of Connecticut* denied Mr. Clark's right to ***equal protection under the law***.

And, *equally egregious*, the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Superior Court of Connecticut* failed to address, recognize, and/or ***"secure or maintain the uniformity"*** of previous precedents; thereby ***creating erroneous, and conflicting decisions*** and/or the ***unjust and unlawful overturning*** of four (4) previously ***cited and binding SCOTUS and Supreme Court of Connecticut*** precedents.

Consequently, Mr. Clark was forced, that is, given no other legal option than to petition this Court to review, consider, and correct said ***erroneous, conflicting, and unlawful rulings*** by the lower courts, which once again, failed to address, recognize, and/or ***"secure or maintain the uniformity"*** of their decisions with the following precedents:

*Moffett, Hodgkins, and Clarke Company v. Rochester*, 178 U.S. 373 (1900).

*State of Connecticut v. Hahn*, 207 Conn. 555 (1988).

*Harlach v. Metropolitan Property*, 221 Conn. 185 (1992).

*JPMorgan Chase Bank v. Robert J. Virgulak, et al.*, 341 Conn. 750 (2022).

***Factual Background:***

*Pro se* Defendant-Petitioner Gordon Clark (Mr. Clark) and Lillian J. Clark (Mrs. Clark) were married for 27 years (married on February 14, 1993), and together for *nearly* 30 years, before Mrs. Clark's *tragic and heart-wrenching* passing on October 18, 2020, after a *long, daily, and courageous* 11-year battle with Parkinson's disease, in her *beloved and humble* home of 65 years in Enfield, Connecticut at the age of 92 (nearly 93).

**May she ... rest in peace ... forever ...**

In November 2009, Mr. Clark's *beloved* wife, Lilli, was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease. During the last five (5) years of his wife's *precious* life, Mrs. Clark required *nearly* 24-hour care. Therefore, Mr. Clark chose to become his *beloved* wife's full-time caregiver, in an effort to keep her out of a permanent nursing home, and in her *beloved and humble* home of 65 years, that her *beloved* father (Papa) helped her build in the *hope* of prolonging her life as long as possible, and keeping her from *dying alone*, that is, without Mr. Clark by her side, in a nursing home due to COVID-19 restrictions, *all only by His Loving Grace and Mercy!*

Mr. Clark was born in Connecticut, raised in West Hartford, Connecticut, and is a *United States Navy veteran*, who once managed over \$200 million (over \$500 million today) in commercial real estate for *Barclays Bank*. Moreover, Mr. Clark earned an economics degree *with honors* from *Trinity College* in Hartford, where he was *asked* to be the teaching assistant for the *Finance* class, as well as *asked* to be the teaching assistant for the *Money & Banking* class. And where Mr. Clark also completed his *Senior Thesis*, which was approximately 200 pages in length on *Property Rights*. Furthermore, Mr. Clark earned an MBA from the most competitive business school in the country *at the time*. Additionally, Mr. Clark was a carpenter in his youth.

Mr. Clark has resided in Enfield, Connecticut for the past 32 years; and he is 59 years old.

Approximately eleven (11) months before Mrs. Clark's passing, on November 22, 2019, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* filed an ***unjust, legally baseless, erroneous, fraudulent, and malicious*** foreclosure lawsuit against the *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner in this matter, including against Lillian J. Clark (Mrs. Clark), a 92-year-old woman battling daily against Parkinson's disease. Moreover, prior to receiving an ***erroneous and threatening foreclosure letter***, dated May 1, 2019, and addressed to a Lillian Byron, ***not Lillian Clark***, ***illegally demanding*** \$37,575.86 in a lump sum payment in less than 20 days or be foreclosed upon from Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*, Mr. and Mrs. Clark had ***never missed a payment***

*and were current on our property taxes at the time.*

Tragically, Mrs. Clark passed away on October 18, 2020, after an eleven (11) year *courageous* battle against Parkinson's disease. ***Shockingly and incomprehensibly***, that is, *in the United States of America* (not in Russia), and in the great *State of Connecticut*, and over approximately 3.5 years (from November 22, 2019 to May 19, 2023), and four (4) ***different Superior Court of Connecticut judges*** (Dubay, Taylor, Budzik, and Baio), the *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner's ***federal and state constitutionally protected rights to a jury trial, to due process of law, and to equal protection under the law were repeatedly denied***; including, but not limited to ***the denial of a jury trial, the denial of discovery, the denial of all exhibits, the denial of any witnesses, the denial to physically examine Santander Bank's exhibits, the denial to fully cross-examine Santander Bank's witnesses, the denial to freely testify, the denial of a fair and impartial trial of the facts and law, and a denial of a full transcript of the proceedings.***

#### ***Legal Background:***

On April 29, 2022, *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner Gordon Clark (Mr. Clark) filed his *Answer, Affirmative/Special Defenses, Counterclaim, and Jury Demand* with the Superior Court of

*Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 196.00).

On April 10, 2023, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* through its attorney, Jeffrey M. Knickerbocker (Mr. Knickerbocker), filed a *fraudulent Certificate of Closed Pleadings* with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* *falsely* certifying that the pleadings were closed and *dishonestly* claiming that this is a *non-jury matter* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 252.00).

The *inviolable* federal and state constitutional right of trial by jury *cannot* be lawfully taken by force, nor stolen by *fraud upon the court* perpetrated by Mr. Knickerbocker's said *fraudulent* filing of a *Certificate of Closed Pleadings* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 252.00), nor waived *without proper and lawful notice* and *expressed consent* by *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner Gordon Clark.

On April 26, 2023, Mr. Clark filed his *Claim for Jury* form and paid the associated \$440 court fee with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 264.00).

On April 28, 2023, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* through Mr. Knickerbocker, filed a *Motion to Strike Jury Demand* with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 272.00).

On May 2, 2023, Judge Claudia Baio of the *Superior Court of Connecticut* ***erroneously, unjustly, and unconstitutionally*** granted Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*'s *Motion to Strike Jury Demand* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 272.86).

*Pro se* Defendant-Petitioner Gordon Clark was ***repeatedly denied*** his federal and state constitutionally protected rights to *due process of law*, to *equal protection under the law*, and to his ***inviolable right to a jury trial***, all under the color of law; and, without establishing proper and lawful subject matter and *in personam jurisdiction*, nor standing through ***fraud upon the court***.

The *Connecticut Practice Book* states, in part, the following:

**Sec. 10-33. Waiver and Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

Any claim of lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter cannot be waived; and whenever it is found after suggestion of the parties or otherwise that the court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter, the judicial authority shall dismiss the action.

“Jurisdiction of the subject-matter is the power [of the court] to hear and determine cases of the general class to which the proceedings in question belong.”

(Internal quotation marks omitted.)” *Esposito v. Specyalski*, 268 Conn. 336, 348, 844 A.2d 211 (2004).

**Personal Jurisdiction:** “Jurisdiction over the person is the legal power and authority of a court to render a personal judgment against a party to an action or proceeding.” *Talenti v. Morgan and Bro. Manhattan Storage*, 113 Conn. App. 845, 853-854, 968 A.2d 933 (2009).

**Standing:** “is the legal right to set judicial machinery in motion. One cannot rightfully invoke the jurisdiction of the court unless he [or she] has, in an individual or representative capacity, some real interest in the cause of action, or a legal or equitable right, title or interest in the subject matter of the controversy.” *Electrical Contractors, Inc. v. Dept. of Education*, 303 Conn. 402, 411, 35 A.3d 188 (2012).

More specifically, and once again, the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Superior Court of Connecticut*, ***all failed*** to properly and lawfully adhere to and follow the following *Supreme Court of the United States* precedents, nor adhere to and follow their own following *Supreme Court of Connecticut* precedents:

The *Supreme Court of the United States* ruled, in part, the following:

***“The party alleging the mistake must show exactly in what it consists and the correction that should be made. The evidence must be***

*such as to leave no reasonable doubt upon the mind of the court as to either of these points. The mistake must be mutual, and common to both parties to the instrument. It must appear that both have done what neither intended. A mistake on one side may be a ground for rescinding, but not for reforming, a contract. Where the minds of the parties have not met there is no contract, and hence none to be rectified."*  
*Moffett, Hodgkins, and Clarke Company v. Rochester*, 178 U.S. 373 (1900).

The Supreme Court of Connecticut ruled, in part, the following:

*"Applying these definitions in the present circumstances, we must decide whether a mortgage deed that contains no description of the mortgaged property can reasonably be held to be "fully drawn with respect to every essential feature thereof." We conclude that it cannot. Whether we turn to the requirements of our recordation statutes; General Statutes §§ 47-5, 47-10 and 47-36c; or to those of the statute of frauds; General Statutes § 52-550; it is evident that a mortgage is unenforceable without identification of the mortgaged property."*  
*State of Connecticut v. Hahn*, 207 Conn. 555 (1988).

The Supreme Court of Connecticut ruled, in part, the following:

***"Reformation is appropriate in cases of mutual mistake—that is where, in reducing to writing an agreement made or transaction entered into as intended by the parties thereto, through mistake, common to both parties, the written instrument fails to express the real agreement or transaction. 5 Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence (2d Ed.) § 2096; 53 C.J. p. 941; Amer. Law Institute Restatement, Contracts, Vol. 2, §§ 504, 505 .... [R]eformation is also available in equity when the instrument does not express the true intent of the parties owing to mistake of one party coupled with fraud, actual or constructive, or inequitable conduct on the part of the other. 5 Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence (2d Ed.) § 2097; 53 C.J. p. 949...." (Citations omitted.) Home Owners' Loan v. Stevens, 120 Conn. 6, 9-10, 179 A. 330 (1935). Here, there was neither claim nor proof of a mutual mistake, fraud or inequitable conduct on the part of either party. Since none of these elements was present, application of the equitable principle of reformation was not proper."***  
*Harlach v. Metropolitan Property*, 221 Conn. 185 (1992).

The Supreme Court of Connecticut ruled, in part, the following:

*“To be sure, identifying the obligation secured by a mortgage deed is not a technical or scrivener’s error. Reforming the mortgage deed in the manner sought by the plaintiff without establishing that the change effects the original intention of the parties changes the defendant’s \*769 obligations and creates a new contract between her and the plaintiff. This court has cautioned that “[a]n obstacle to reformation [that] we find insurmountable arises from the fundamental principle that there can be no reformation unless there is an antecedent agreement upon which the minds of the parties have met. The relief afforded in reforming an instrument is to make it conform to the previous agreement of the parties.” Hoffman v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York, 125 Conn. 440, 443, 6 A.2d 357 (1939). Consequently, “a definite agreement on which the minds of the parties have met must have [preexisted] the instrument in question.” Id. It is axiomatic that a “court cannot supply an agreement [that] was never made, for it is [a court’s] province to enforce contracts, not to make or alter them.” JPMorgan Chase Bank v. Robert J. Virgulak, et al., 341 Conn. 750 (2022).*

In *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878)., it states the following, in part:

“There is no question of the general doctrine that *fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments.*”

“*Fraud vitiates every thing*, and a judgment equally with a contract; that is, *a judgment obtained directly by fraud ...*”

Furthermore, opposing counsel (at least five (5) attorneys) for Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*, especially, Mr. Knickerbocker, *blatantly, fraudulently, and with impunity* denied Mr. Clark his rights to a *trial by jury*, to *due process of law*, and to *equal protection under the law*. Said opposing counsel along with multiple members of the *State of Connecticut* judiciary *blatantly and with impunity* violated their attorney's oath, and multiple *Rules of Professional Conduct*, as well as the *Code of Judicial Conduct* as listed below:

The *Connecticut Attorney's Oath* reads as follows:

“You solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that you will do *nothing dishonest*, and will not knowingly allow *anything dishonest* to be done in court, and that you will inform the court of *any dishonesty* of which you have knowledge; that you will not knowingly maintain or assist in maintaining any cause of action

*that is false or unlawful; that you will not obstruct any cause of action for personal gain or malice; but that you will exercise the office of attorney, in any court in which you may practice, according to the best of your learning and judgment, faithfully, to both your client and the court; so help you God or upon penalty of perjury."*

*General Statutes § 1-25 and annotations.*

## RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

### Preamble: A Lawyer's Responsibilities

*"A lawyer, as a member of the legal profession, is a representative of clients, an officer of the legal system and a public citizen having special responsibility for the quality of justice.*

*As negotiator, a lawyer seeks a result advantageous to the client but consistent with requirements of honest dealing with others."*

## RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE

### 3.1. Meritorious Claims and Contentions

*"A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law."*

RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE  
3.3(A)(1). Candor Toward the Tribunal

*“(a) A lawyer shall not knowingly: (1) Make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer.”*

TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS OTHER THAN  
CLIENTS

Rule 4.1. Truthfulness in Statements to Others

*“In the course of representing a client a lawyer shall not knowingly:*

- (1) Make a false statement of material fact or law to a third person; or*
- (2) Fail to disclose a material fact when disclosure is necessary to avoid assisting a criminal or fraudulent act by a client, unless disclosure is prohibited by Rule 1.6.”*

“COMMENTARY: Misrepresentation.

*A lawyer is required to be truthful when dealing with others on a client's behalf, but generally has no affirmative duty to inform an opposing party of relevant facts. A misrepresentation can occur if the lawyer incorporates or affirms a statement of another person that the lawyer knows is*

***false. Misrepresentations can also occur by partially true but misleading statements or omissions that are the equivalent of affirmative false statements.***

**RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RULE 5.1(A).**

**Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers**

***"A partner in a law firm, and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct."***

**CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT - PREAMBLE**

***(1) An independent, fair and impartial judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice.*** The United States legal system is based on the principle that an independent, impartial, and competent judiciary, composed of men and women of integrity, will interpret and apply the law that governs our society. Thus, ***the judiciary plays a central role in preserving the principles of justice and the rule of law.*** Inherent in all the Rules contained in this Code are the precepts that judges, individually and collectively, ***must respect***

*and honor the judicial office as a public trust and strive to maintain and enhance confidence in the legal system.*

***Procedural Background:***

After nearly four (4) years and four (4) ***different*** judges in the *Superior Court of Connecticut*, and the ***repeated denial*** of Mr. Clark's ***federal and state constitutionally protected due process of law rights***, including, but not limited to, the ***denial of a jury trial, the denial of discovery, the denial of any exhibits, the denial of any witnesses, along with the denial of a full transcript of the Remote Court Trial***, along with the denial of his appeals to the *Appellate Court of Connecticut* and to the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*. Mr. Clark was forced, that is, given no other legal option than to file this *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* with the *Supreme Court of the United States* in his ***ongoing and good faith effort*** to obtain justice, based on truth, for his *beloved, precious, and most beautiful* wife, Lillian J. Clark (Lilli-Bella).

More specifically, on November 22, 2019, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* filed an ***unjust, legally baseless, erroneous, fraudulent, and malicious*** Complaint with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* seeking to foreclose on a property owned *in its entirety* by Lillian J. Clark (Mrs. Clark) ***without a valid, enforceable, nor reformable mortgage.***

Consequently, based on said *fraudulent* Complaint and said *invalid, unenforceable, and unreformable* alleged mortgage the *Superior Court of Connecticut* nor said Plaintiff-Respondent *properly and lawfully* established *subject matter jurisdiction* nor *standing* to proceed in this matter.

On October 18, 2020, Mrs. Clark tragically passed away after an 11-year *courageous* battle against Parkinson's disease at the age of 92 (nearly 93).

Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* was noticed of Mrs. Clark's passing, and was also noticed *five (5) separate times* to make a claim against Mrs. Clark's estate or the executor of said estate before the *strict legal deadline*, which said Plaintiff-Respondent failed to do.

Additionally, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* was noticed to amend said Complaint's caption replacing Mrs. Clark's name with the name of her estate, which said Plaintiff-Respondent also failed to do.

Consequently, on October 18, 2020, the *Superior Court of Connecticut* lost *in personam jurisdiction* over Mrs. Clark, due to said passing, which was *never* properly and lawfully reestablished by said Court nor by the Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*

Nonetheless, on May 19, 2023, Judge Claudia Baio of the *Superior Court of Connecticut* entered an ***invalid, unjust, and unlawful judgment*** against Defendant Lillian J. Clark ***without having proper and lawful subject matter jurisdiction*** in this matter, nor *in personam jurisdiction* over Mrs. Clark (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries 292.00, 292.10, and 293.00).

Simply stated, based on the aforementioned above facts and law, for the *Superior Court of Connecticut* to have ***lawfully*** proceeded against Defendant Lillian J. Clark, said Court must ***first*** have established proper and lawful ***subject matter jurisdiction, and in personam jurisdiction***, both of which, said Court lacked. More specifically, said Court ***never*** properly and lawfully established *subject matter jurisdiction* in this matter, and ***lost in personam jurisdiction*** over Mrs. Clark on October 18, 2020 (the day of Mrs. Clark's passing), which said *in personam jurisdiction* was ***never*** properly and lawfully reestablished.

Moreover, on April 29, 2022, the *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner, Gordon Clark (Mr. Clark), filed his *Answer, Affirmative/Special Defenses, Counterclaim, and Jury Demand* with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 196.00).

On April 26, 2023, the *pro se* Defendant-Petitioner, Mr. Clark, filed his *Claim for Jury* form and paid the associated \$440 court fee with the *Superior Court of*

*Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 264.00).

On April 28, 2023, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* through its attorney, Jeffrey M. Knickerbocker (Mr. Knickerbocker) filed a *Motion to Strike Jury Demand* with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 272.00).

On May 2, 2023, Judge Claudia Baio of the *Superior Court of Connecticut* ***erroneously, unjustly, and unconstitutionally*** granted Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.*'s *Motion to Strike Jury Demand* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 272.86).

Mr. Clark was ***denied*** his federal and state constitutionally protected rights to *due process of law*, to *equal protection under the law*, and to his ***inviolate right to a jury trial***.

As a *pro se* litigant it is Mr. Clark's understanding that the remedy to this *judicial error* is a *Writ of Mandamus*. Therefore, Mr. Clark filed with the *Supreme Court of Connecticut* a **MOTION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO COMPEL THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND INVIOLETE RIGHT TO A JURY TRAIL**, which was denied.

**Please see:** Forrester, Nathan A. (1991) "Mandamus as a Remedy for the Denial of Jury Trial," *University of Chicago Law Review*: Vol. 58: Iss. 2, Article 13.

Additionally, on Tuesday, May 9, 2023, Defendant-Petition Gordon Clark, in an effort to *preserve the court record for appeal*, filed with the Appellate Court of Connecticut an Amended Appeal (Case No. AC-46473) of the following sixteen (16) Court Orders (Appendix C):

1. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on April 25, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR JUDGMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THREE (3) OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUT** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries – 205.00, and 205.86).
2. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on April 25, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL PLAINTIFF SANTANDER BANK, N.A. TO PRODUCE DEFENDANTS' FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 221.00, 221.86, and 221.87).
3. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on April 25, 2023, sustaining **PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO THE REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 222.00, and 222.86).

4. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on April 25, 2023, granting **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER OF COMPLIANCE** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 247.00, and 247.86).
5. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 1, 2023, overruling *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF SANTANDER BANK, N.A.'S FRAUDULENT FILING OF CERTIFICATE OF CLOSED PLEADINGS; AND DEFENDANTS' RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO FILE MOTIONS TO AMEND PLEADINGS UPON COMPLETION OF DISCOVERY, AND RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 253.00, and 253.86).
6. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 1, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF SANTANDER BANK, N.A.'S FILING OF FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATE OF CLOSED PLEADINGS** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 255.00, and 255.86).
7. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST ATTORNEYS**

**JEFFREY M. KNICKERBOCKER, AND  
ADAM L. BENDETT, AND BENDETT &  
MCHUGH, P.C. FOR ITS ONGOING  
ABUSE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS  
AGAINST PRO SE DEFENDANTS,  
WHICH INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT  
LIMITED TO THE FILING OF A  
FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATE OF  
CLOSED PLEADINGS (HHD-CV19-  
6120472-S: Docket Entries – 256.00, and  
256.86).**

8. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF A JURY TRIAL** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries – 257.00, and 257.86).
9. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, denying *pro se* **EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT RECONSIDERATION-REARGUMENT OF MOTIONS 205.00, 221.00, AND 247.00** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries – 263.00, and 263.86).
10. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, granting **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE JURY CLAIM** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 272.00, and 272.86).

11. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, sustaining **PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS 255.00, 256.00, 257.00 AND 263.00** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 275.00, and 275.86).
12. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 2, 2023, granting **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER TO FIND NO APPELLATE STAY** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 281.00, and 281.86).
13. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 3, 2023, granting **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR THE COURT TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries - 276.00, and 276.86).
14. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 3, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO SUBPOENA JOANNA WHEELER OF SANTANDER BANK, N.A.** (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries – 283.00, and 283.86).
15. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 3, 2023, overruling *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO ATTORNEY JEFFREY M.**

**KNICKERBOCKER'S FRAUDULENT  
LIST OF EXHIBITS FILING, AND  
FAILURE TO SUBMIT A WITNESS LIST  
TO THE PRO SE DEFENDANTS; AND  
THIS COURT'S FAILURE TO ENTER A  
TRIAL MANAGEMENT ORDER  
BEFORE TRIAL TO THE PRO SE  
DEFENDANTS (HHD-CV19-6120472-S:  
Docket Entries - 284.00, and 284.86).**

16. *Superior Court of Hartford* Court Order entered on May 3, 2023, denying *pro se* **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST ATTORNEYS JEFFREY M. KNICKERBOCKER, AND ADAM L. BENDETT, AND BENDETT & MCHUGH, P.C. FOR ITS ONGOING ABUSE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PRO SE DEFENDANTS, WHICH INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO THE FILING OF A FRAUDULENT LIST OF EXHIBITS FILING, AND FAILURE TO SUBMIT A WITNESS LIST TO THE PRO SE DEFENDANTS (HHD-CV19-6120472-S: Docket Entries – 285.00, and 285.86).**

In brief summary, on April 10, 2023, Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* through its attorney, Jeffrey M. Knickerbocker of *Brock & Scott, PLLC*, and formerly of *Bendett & McHugh, P.C.* ***knowingly and intentionally filed a fraudulent Certificate of Closed Pleadings*** with the *Superior*

*Court of Connecticut falsely* certifying that the pleadings were closed and *dishonestly* claiming that this is a *non-jury matter* (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 252.00).

On May 19, 2023, Judge Claudia Baio of the *Superior Court of Connecticut* entered an *invalid, unjust, and unlawful judgment* against Defendant Lillian J. Clark *without having proper and lawful subject matter jurisdiction* in this matter, nor in *personam jurisdiction* over Mrs. Clark (HHD-CV19-6120472-S – Docket Entry 292.00, 292.10, and 293.00).

Simply summarized, and once again, based on the aforementioned above facts and law, the Plaintiff-Respondent *Santander Bank, N.A.* through its attorney, Jeffrey M. Knickerbocker of *Brock & Scott, PLLC*, and formerly of *Bendett & McHugh, P.C.* *knowingly and intentionally filed a fraudulent Certificate of Closed Pleadings* with the *Superior Court of Connecticut* *falsely* certifying that the pleadings were closed and *dishonestly* claiming that this is a *non-jury matter*; and *tragically and unjustly* the *Superior Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Supreme Court of Connecticut* *assented to this fraud*, and to the denial of Mr. Clark's federal and state constitutionally protected rights to *due process of law*, to *equal protection under the law*, and to his *inviolable right to a jury trial*.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

First and foremost, beyond the previously cited *lack of subject matter, and in personam jurisdiction* along with a *lack of standing*, as well as federal and state Constitutional *violations of due process of law*, which includes, but is not limited to the denial of Mr. Clark's *inviolable and unalienable right to a jury trial*, in addition to a *blatant failure with impunity* to adhere to multiple precedents from the *Supreme Court of the United States*, and the *Supreme Court of Connecticut*. *No ruling and/or judgment should stand that was also based on lies and fraud*; therefore, the *unjust and unlawful* rulings and/or judgments against Mr. and Mrs. Clark should be *overturned in its entirety*; or *with all due respect*, remanded back to the *Supreme Court of Connecticut* for further review of their *multiple constitutional and judicial errors*; or remanded back to the *Superior Court of Connecticut* for a *fair and impartial jury trial*.

Anything short of said rulings and/or judgments against Mr. and Mrs. Clark being *overturned in its entirety*; or remanded back to the *Supreme Court of Connecticut* for further review; or remanded back to the *Superior Court of Connecticut* for a jury trial is abhorrent and a *miscarriage of justice* to any fair minded and decent individual of character who values the *rule of law*; and who also cares about keeping our *beloved, yet imperfect democracy* from falling into the abyss of autocracy.

In addition, there are foundational ***Commandments, Common Law Maxims, and Unalienable Rights***, that serve as the basis of our judicial system, which include, but are not limited to the *freedom to contract*; and therefore, anyone in government, including members of the judiciary are ***Constitutionally barred from passing*** any law and/or making any judgment that ***impairs or alters*** a contract. Said ***Commandments, Common Law Maxims, and Unalienable Rights*** also include, but are not limited to the following:

*The Ninth (9<sup>th</sup>) Commandment is:*

***“Thou shalt not bear false witness  
against thy neighbor.”***

Exodus 20:16

*The Tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) Commandment is:*

***“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house ...,  
nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.”***

Exodus 20:17

*The Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Great Commandment is:*

***“... Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”***

Matthew 22:39

There is a *Common Law Maxim*, which states the following:

***"Truth is the essence of justice.  
Without truth justice cannot exist."***

There is also a *Common Law Maxim*, which states the following:

***"Justice delayed is justice denied."***

There is another *Common Law Maxim*, which states the following:

***"There is nothing more sacred, more inviolate,  
than the house of every citizen."***

*The Declaration of Independence* – 1776, which states, in part, the following:

***"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that  
all men are created equal, that they are  
endowed by their Creator with certain  
unalienable Rights, that among these are  
Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."***

The *Constitution of the United States: Freedom to Contract Clause*, Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, which states, in part, the following:

*"No State shall ... pass any ... Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts ..."*

### CONCLUSION

*Tragically, and sadly*, Mr. Clark, as a native Connecticuter, born and raised in Connecticut, and a lifelong Connecticut and American citizen, who loves and has honorably served his home state and country, and has lived *nearly* his entire life in Connecticut is ***pained to experience firsthand the absolute injustice*** that is administered in our *beloved, yet imperfect* state judiciary to *pro se* litigants who cannot afford to hire an honest, competent, and experienced litigator.

Is it any wonder that *nearly half* of our fellow Americans want to give up on democracy for autocracy, in the *false belief* that they can also have immunity, and/or ***live above the law***, and/or insulated from any ***fair and just accountability***, even though ***accountability is an act of love, not of hate, just ask any good and decent parent.***

Because if we have *no rule of law*, and *no fair, impartial, and just accountability* from our state and federal judicial system, then we are already living in

an autocracy, kleptocracy, and/or theocracy, whether we are willing to admit it or not.

The aforementioned above facts and law are clear evidence that the *Superior Court of Connecticut*, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut*, and the *Supreme Court of Connecticut* over approximately 3.5 years ***failed to provide*** the Defendant-Petitioner and his *beloved and deceased* wife, Lillian, with their ***federal and state constitutionally protected rights to a jury trial, to proper and lawful due process of law, and to equal protection under the law.*** More specifically, said state Courts have ***repeatedly failed*** to provide the Defendant-Petitioner with his right to proper and lawful ***due process of law***, including, but not limited to *discovery, exhibits, witnesses, and a jury trial*, as well as the denial of a full transcript (written, audio, and/or video) of the *Remote Court Trial* proceedings, which would prove ***beyond any reasonable doubt*** that Mr. Clark was ***repeatedly denied*** his *due process of law rights* in this matter.

However, on June 14, 2023, the *Appellate Court of Connecticut* denied Mr. Clark's **MOTION TO COMPEL TRANSCRIPT DELIVERY** (*Appendix B* – page 14).

Additionally, Mr. Clark is well aware through *first-hand knowledge and experience* of the disdain that *nearly all* of the legal industry has for *pro se* litigants. However, Mr. Clark is *pro se*, not out of choice, but out of necessity, and despite Mr. Clark's

ongoing efforts to find an *honest, competent, affordable, and trustworthy litigator*, he has yet to find one; nevertheless, Mr. Clark continues to act ***respectfully and in good faith*** throughout this entire *arduous, costly, lengthy, and time-consuming legal process*.

**Please see: Appendix E - The Backstory Behind Judge Richard Posner's Retirement**

<https://abovethelaw.com/2017/09/the-backstory-behind-judge-richard-posners-retirement/?rf=1>

Moreover, Mr. Clark would be remiss if he did not *once again* mention that approximately three (3) years ago one of the experienced and well-known Connecticut foreclosure attorneys that Mr. Clark interviewed stated that, ***"The facts do not matter, because the courts favor the banks."*** Mr. Clark was not shocked to hear this due to having managed over \$200 million (\$500 million today) in commercial real estate for *Barclays Bank*, along with the knowledge of money, banking, and finance that his economics degree from *Trinity College in Hartford*, and MBA have provided.

Nonetheless, Mr. Clark was ***astonished*** that a well-established, prominent, and experienced Connecticut foreclosure attorney would ***boldly, unapologetically, unashamedly, with impunity, and against interest*** make such an admission over the phone to a complete stranger; and yet no matter how many times Mr. Clark references said phone conversation with an *Officer of the Court* (said attorney) in his court filings, as well as in open court.

Not a single member from the judiciary, nor from state or federal law enforcement, nor any member of the bar or bench has ever asked Mr. Clark a single question about this *admission against interest* concerning the ***lack of impartiality*** of the *State of Connecticut's* judiciary, nor is Mr. Clark aware of anyone investigating the matter at this time.

Consequently, Mr. Clark presumes that said members of the judiciary are either already aware of this ongoing and growing ***lack of impartiality*** within the *State of Connecticut's* judiciary or they do not want to know. Because they, like most, *likely and understandably* find it difficult to recognize and/or confront this ***most critical and serious problem*** within our own legal system, and within our own country. Even though said ***lack of impartiality*** within our judiciary is not only ***undermining the trust and credibility*** of our judicial system and the *rule of law* nationwide, but it is also threatening the survival of our ***fragile democracy***, that is, if we do not collectively work together to *truly reform* said judiciary with ***real and accountable reforms***.

Since, the reality is that we cannot fix a problem within our *beloved, yet broken* judicial system if the people administrating the judicial system refuse to recognize and/or confront and/or take responsibility and/or ***accept accountability*** for the ***long overdue need*** for judicial reform to protect and defend all of our fellow *American citizens (that is, to love our neighbors as ourselves)* from injustice and harm; and *especially*, pro se litigants, that is, ***the poor***,

*powerless, and uneducated*, who for the most part and for *all intents and purposes* are *defenseless* in our present *civil* judicial/justice system, and have *no real rights* at all, as *United States Senator* Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut recently, *wisely*, and clearly stated and acknowledged.

***“Rights need remedies. Rights without remedy is not worth the paper it’s printed on.  
And the remedies to be effective need to be enforceable without years delay and millions of dollars in litigation costs.”***

United States Senator Richard Blumenthal

January 10, 2024

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mAXqALrNC8o>

**Please also see:**

**APPENDIX F:**

Chapter 9: *Capture of the Civil Jury* from  
the book entitled, *Captured: The Corporate  
Infiltration of American Democracy*, by  
United States Senator Sheldon Whitehouse,  
Published 2017 ..... 57

Lastly, in honor and memory of one of Mr. Clark’s heroes, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who in his *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, which Mr. Clark reads on or around *Martin Luther King Day* every year since first being *blessed* to have read said

*Letter at Trinity College in Hartford, which had a profound life changing effect on Mr. Clark's life. Reverend King's said Letter stated many profound truths; however, the six (6) truths that deeply resonate with Mr. Clark, which Mr. Clark also hopes and prays will resonate with this Court are the following:*

1. *"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."*
2. *"Justice too long delayed is justice denied."*
3. *"An unjust law is no law at all."*
4. *"We will have to repent ... for the appalling silence of the good people."*
5. *"In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sidelines and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities."*
6. *"My feets is tired, but my soul is rested."*

**Please see:** *Letter From Birmingham Jail*  
<https://letterfromjail.com/>

WHEREFORE, this *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* should be granted by this Court to ***not only reaffirm*** that *The Constitution of the United States*, including, but not limited to the ***7<sup>th</sup> Amendment (The Right of Trial by Jury)***, the ***5<sup>th</sup> Amendment (The Right to Due Process of Law)***, and the ***14<sup>th</sup> Amendment (The Right to Equal Protection)*** are ***still in effect*** in our beloved, yet imperfect Nation; but also, that the *Constitution of the State of Connecticut*, including, but not limited to ***Article IV (The Right of Trial by Jury)***, ***Article XVII (The Right to Due Process of Law)***, and ***Article XXI (The Right to Equal Protection)*** are ***still in effect*** in our beloved, yet imperfect State of Connecticut. As well as to ***protect and defend*** the rights of every American ***to a jury trial, to due process of law, and to equal protection under the law***, all of which are bedrocks of our judicial system, and foundational to the *rule of law*, that our beloved, yet imperfect and ***fragile democracy*** needs to survive and thrive for us today, and for our ***precious*** posterity for generations to come.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and understanding of this *urgent and critically important* legal matter; and blessings *always* to you and yours. Please continue to stay healthy and be safe.

And may *The Creator of Heaven and Earth* have *Mercy* on our beloved, yet broken and divided Nation, and may *He* have *Mercy* on *all* our souls.

Respectfully filed on October 17, 2024, by *pro se*  
Petitioner Gordon Clark.

/s/ Gordon Clark

Gordon Clark  
70 Elm Street  
Enfield, CT 06082  
(860) 833-3195  
gordon@christianeconomics.net

*Pro Se Petitioner*