

**No. 24-467**

---

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

---

IN RE ESTATE OF CHARLES HADSELL,

Deceased,

CHRISTOPHER HADSELL,

*Petitioner,*

-v-

CATHERINE ISHAM,

*Respondent.*

◆  
**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the  
Supreme Court of California**  
◆

---

**PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

---

◆  
Service on California Attorney General Required by  
Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.29(c)  
◆

Christopher Hadsell  
*Petitioner In Propria Persona*  
9000 Crow Canyon Rd., S-399,  
Danville, CA 94506  
● (925) 482-6502 ● CJHadsellLaw@gmail.com

---

## **I. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I. TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>II. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>III. JUDGMENT BELOW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>IV. PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A. IT IS NOW BEYOND ANY REASONABLE         DOUBT THAT THE CALIFORNIA JUDICIARY IS         UTILIZING PRETEXT TO DENY ACCESS TO         ITS COURTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>V. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>3</b>

## **APPENDICES**

### **Court Opinions:**

#### **Appendix A**

<b>1DCA: 12/4/24 JDMT .....</b>	<b>1a</b>
---------------------------------	-----------

## II. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Statutes

U.S. Const. amend. I .....	2
----------------------------	---

### III. JUDGMENT BELOW

The Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District's ("1DCA") judgment is reproduced as follows:

Judgment (12/4/24) ..... 1a.

### IV. PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

#### A. IT IS NOW BEYOND ANY REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE CALIFORNIA JUDICIARY IS UTILIZING PRETEXT TO DENY ACCESS TO ITS COURTS

Subsequent to the 10/25/24 Docketing of Hadsell's Writ of Certiorari, regarding another matter in the case below (Superior Court of California, Contra Costa County ("Trial Court"), case no.: P22-00643), Petitioner, Christopher Hadsell ("Hadsell"), filed an appeal to two appealable interlocutory orders on 11/4/24, "11/4/24 Appeal".

The 11/4/24 Appeal proceedings are at the notice-of-appeal stage; therefore, no merits arguments or briefing are yet before 1DCA.

Notwithstanding, prematurely, and solely because of the undisputed legal nullity that Hadsell is listed on

the California Vexatious Litigant List<sup>1</sup>, on 11/19/24, 1DCA required Hadsell to file an Application to File New Litigation.

Pursuant to 1DCA's directive, on 11/20/24, Hadsell filed an Application to File New Litigation.

1DCA responded with a decision entered 12/4/24, "12/4/24 JDMT", p. 1a.

The 12/4/24 JDMT states:

Application for permission to appeal is denied.  
Appellant has failed to demonstrate a reasonable possibility his appeal has merit.

This is a bizarre ruling because *there are no merits arguments or briefs* before the court.

Here, because there are no merits arguments or briefs before the court, what this bizarre ruling demonstrates, beyond any reasonable doubt, is that the California Judiciary simply uses boilerplate pretext regarding the merits of a so-called vexatious litigant's pleading to deny access to its courts.

Ineluctably, such action violates the [U.S. Const. amend. I](#)'s right to redress of grievances—a central issue in Hadsell's Writ of Certiorari docketed 10/25/24.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 12/4/24 JDMT (p. 1a) begins with the sentence, "Hadsell was designated a vexatious litigant by the Contra Costa County Superior Court in May [sic] 2016 and is subject to a prefiling order."

## V. CONCLUSION

The Court should grant the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christopher Hadsell  
Christopher Hadsell, Petitioner

December 14, 2024

Appendix A

1DCA: 12/4/24 JDMT

Court of Appeal, First Appellate District  
Charles D. Johnson, Clerk/Executive Officer  
Electronically FILED on 12/4/2024 by S. Diener, Deputy Clerk

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

Estate of CHARLES RICHARD  
HADSELL, Deceased.

CHRISTOPHER HADSELL,  
Plaintiff and Appellant,  
v.  
CATHERINE ISHAM et al.,  
Defendants and Respondents.

A171758

(Contra Costa County  
Super. Ct. No. P22-00643)

Christopher Hadsell was designated a vexatious litigant by the Contra Costa County Superior Court in May 2016 and is subject to a prefiling order. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 391, 391.7.)

On November 4, 2024, appellant filed a notice of appeal seeking to appeal two orders issued by the Contra Costa County Superior Court on October 31, 2024.

On November 22, 2024, Hadsell submitted an application seeking permission to appeal. His application referred us to his "Notice of Motion and Motion to Vacate Prefiling Order and Vexatious-Litigant Order, and to Remove Him from the Judicial Council's List of Vexatious Litigants," which he separately filed with the court on November 20, 2024.

Application for permission to appeal is denied. Appellant has failed to demonstrate a reasonable possibility his appeal has merit. (Code Civ. Proc., § 391.7, subd. (b); *Kobayashi v. Superior Court* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 536, 541, 544; *In re Marriage of Rifkin & Carty* (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 1339, 1349 fn.8.) The appeal is dismissed, and the matter is deemed complete in this court.

2a

Further, Hadsell's November 20, 2024 motion described above – which is not properly before this court (see Code Civ. Proc., § 391.8, subd. (a) [requiring application to vacate prefilng order and to have named removed from list of vexatious litigants to be filed in the court that entered the order]) – is denied as moot.

Dated: 12/04/2024

Humes, A.P.J.

A.P.J.