


24-5562

ORIGINAL

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE: WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, PETITIONER



ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT; AND THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX DIVISION, for Graven v Snow, et al (my 3rd recent Mandamus).

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted [as anyone could have]*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [first Denied on 5/30/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Judges, and our Clerks of Court, would take your Denying my Petition (Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24) as your approving/condoning a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket (e.g., a Judge could make false case law citations by that forgery); or a Clerk of Court's sandbagging a pleading, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/a decision/a ruling; and your approval/condoning that an Appeals Panel can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Judge's interest to rule; as anything now goes for a Judge/a Panel/a Clerk.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption; and here we are: the Ninth Circuit; a District Court; and your own Clerk of Court; are acting errantly by using their new found powers, having recognized/ adopted your approval/condoning forgery/manipulating a Court's purpose.

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court. This Petition asks you to reverse that.

William "Will" A. Graven, In Pro Se
2700 S. Woodlands Village Blvd.; Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Phone: 928-890-8825; Email: will@willgraven.com

i.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

QUESTION 1: Have our Judges now been approved by this Supreme Court to forge their Dockets, and rule by their forgeries, at will? (I.e., when it is in a Judge's best interest to commit such errant acts.)

QUESTION 2: Have our Clerks of Court now been approved by this Supreme Court to manipulate Court processes, such as sandbagging properly filed pleading, at will (please see Note 1)? (See my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus filed yesterday, Tuesday, 9/17/24, against your Clerk of Court.)

QUESTION 3: Have our Judges and/or Appeal Panels now been approved by this Supreme Court to refuse to rule on a matter, at will? (I.e., when it is in the Judge's/Appeal Panel's interest to refuse to rule on a matter; and/or in the Clerk's interest to manipulate Court processes for a Judge/himself.)

QUESTION 4: Does this respected United States Supreme Court not see its approval for our Judges to forge their Dockets, and rule by those forgeries; and does this Court not see its approval for a Judge and/or an Appeal Panel to refuse to rule on matters; and does this Court not see its approval for a Clerk of Court of Court manipulating Court processes, by a Judge's and/or Appeal Panel's instruction, and/or on his own; as recipes for Judicial anarchy and corruption (be it by Judges and/or Clerks)?

Note 1: I note this Court's Clerk of Court has now used similar errant tactics as the ones you approved for the Ninth Circuit (and that the Arizona District Court has now also followed suit by using similarly creative, errant tactics [which this Petition it seeking to overcome); more than twice refusing (by sandbagging, and directly) to Docket my Supplemental Brief; my Application to Remove him from my Case; and my Motion to Vacate the Court's Denying my Petition for a Mandamus, in Case No.: 24-7130, *Graven Brnovich, et al* (again, see my Writ of Mandamus filed yesterday, on Monday, 9/17/24, against your Clerk of Court).

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner in this Court is William “Will” A. Graven (Plaintiff in Arizona District Court, Phoenix Division, and Appellant at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals).

Primary Respondent is the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Secondary Respondent is the US District Court for the District of Arizona.

STATEMENT OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner's Appeal at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals for the present matter is Appeal No.: CV24-3420, *Graven v Snow, et al*, is the primary case to this Petition (*see* the Appeals Court's Docket as Appendix 1).

Petitioner's Complaint to the just above Appeal is in Arizona District Court, Phoenix Division, Case No.: CV24-00549-SMM-ASB, *Graven v Snow, et al*, and is the secondary case to this Petition (Appendix 2).

Petitioner's Petition for a Mandamus to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Appendix 3), in a matter closely related (*see* Note 2 for "closely related") to the present matter, at the Supreme Court, Case No.: 24-7130, *Graven v Brnovich, et al* (which *see* that Denied Petition raised to a Petition for Certiorari, filed on Monday, 9/16/24 [Apndx 4]).

The Docket for Petitioner's Appeal at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Appendix 5) in this matter closely related to the present matter that the Supreme Court just Denied for *Graven v Brnovich, et al*, is Appeal No.: 22-16909.

Petitioner's Complaint in Arizona District Court, Phoenix Division, in this matter closely related to present matter through the just above Appeal in *Graven v Brnovich, et al*, is Case No. CV22-00062-PHX-GMS (which *see* the Complaint as Appendix 6; and which *see* the Docket for as Appendix 7).

Also *see* a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the Clerk of the Supreme Court in a matter closely related to present matters, the result of the Clerk's errant acts in *Graven v Brnovich, et al*, filed yesterday, Tuesday, 9/17/24 (Appendix 8) (*see* Note 3).

Note 2: Present matters are "closely related" to the *Graven v Brnovich, et al* case, as it was this Court Denying my Petition for a Mandamus in that case which gave approval to our Courts to forge their Dockets to rule as they wish; and which gave approval to our Appeals Courts to refuse to rule on a lower Court Order brought before it, for whatever reason they wish, without explanation...that gave rise to similar acts by the Arizona District Court, and full-approval to the Ninth Circuit; that caused the present Petition.

Note 3: It is a cascading series of events/errant acts by Court personnel that was brought on by this Court's Denying my Mandamus in *Brnovich, et al*, that has mandated I must file the present Petition for a Mandamus; the Certiorari filed Monday; and the Mandamus filed yesterday. ***Senior Court personnel now believe this Court has given them unrestricted licenses to do as they wish, at their own choosing, for their own benefit.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... | i |
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING..... | ii |
| STATEMENT OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS..... | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | iv |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... | vi |
| PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS..... | 1 |
| OPINIONS BELOW..... | 3 |
| JURISDICTION..... | 6 |
| RELEVANT CONSITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... | 6 |
| AS TO TIMELINESS..... | 6 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE FOR THIS PETITION..... | 7 |
| IN REVIEW..... | 10 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION..... | 11 |
| I. PETITIONER’S RIGHT TO THE ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IS CLEAR..... | 11 |
| II. A PETITION FOR MANDAMUS IS WARRANTED GIVEN THAT BOTH THE COURT OF APPEALS AND THE DISTIRCT COURT CLEARLY DOCUMENTED THEIR ERRANT ACS BY THEIR OWN DOCKETS/ORDERS..... | 11 |
| III. NO OTHER ADEQUATE MEANS EXISTS FOR AN ABUSED LITIGANT TO OBTAIN RELIEF: THIS SUPREME COURT HAS GIVEN ITS APPROVAL TO THE ERRANT ACTS SEEN HERE..... | 12 |

| | |
|--|----|
| IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT CLARIFYING ITS VIEWS ON OUR COURTS FORGING THEIR DOCKETS; RULING BY THOSE FORGERIES; REFUSING TO RULE ON A MATTER; AND SUPPORTIVE ERRANT ACTS BY THE CLERK OF A COURT; IS NEEDED TO PREVENT JUDICIAL ANARCHY AND CORRUPTION..... | 12 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 13 |
| APPENDIX..... | 14 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

All Judicial Acts governing our US Courts;

The Rules of Appellate Procedure;

28 U.S.C. § 165;

The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a);

Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2010) (quoting *Cheney v. United States Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004));

Gen. Atomic Co. v. Felter, 436 U.S. 493, 497 (1978) (per curiam) (quoting *In re Sanford Fork & Tool Co.*, 160 U.S. 247, 255 (1895)).

PETITION FOR MANDAMUS

1.) First action/Order being Petitioned for; at the Appeals Court: Petitioner respectfully Petitions for a Writ of Mandamus to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals directing that Court to remove the following forgeries from/make the following corrections to their Dockets for my Appeal No.: 24-3420:

- a.) Restore the District Court's forgery of deleting my qualifiers for Defendants as per my Complaint, and etc; and my Notice of Appeal, and etc (after the 5th Defendant's name [which see in OPINIONS BELOW]);
- b.) Remove the District Court's forgery of "...and as a federal judge" (remove it from wherever the Appeals Court has it buried; noting, it appeared on their Orders, but it is not on their Docket [as noted in "a." above, the Docket is incomplete]);
- c.) Remove the District Court's forgery of "District Judge" from Defendant/Appellee G Murray Snow's name (remove it from wherever they have it buried; noting, it appeared on the Appeals Court's Orders, but it is not on their Docket [as noted in "a" above, the Docket is incomplete]);
- d.) Make certain my Complaint (not just my Exhibits) is accessible (which *see* 2.e.);
- e.) List Appellant and Appellees on the Court's Docket, as named in my Complaint, and etc; and my Notice of Appeal, and etc; as per standard Court procedures.

2.) Second action/Order being Petitioned for; in District Court: Petitioner respectfully Petitions for a Writ of Mandamus to the Arizona District Court (whether it be via the Appeals Court or not) directing the District Court in my Case No. 24-00549-SMM-ASB to:

- a.) Restore my qualifiers for my Defendants, as per my Complaint, and all pleadings I filed in their District Court, all of which have my qualifiers, following the 5th Defendant's name;
- b.) Remove that Court's forgery on their Docket of "...and as a federal judge," from all Defendants;
- c.) Remove the Court's forgery on their Docket of "Jury Demand"... "None," and replace with what it says on my Complaint: **"TRIAL BY JURY REQUESTED;"**
- d.) Remove the Court's forgery on their Docket of "Jurisdiction," whereby it says "US Government Defendant," and replace it with "Federal Question."
- e.) Docket my Complaint (not just my Exhibits);

2.

3.) Third action/Order being Petitioned for; by the Supreme Court: I pray that this respected Supreme Court will make a major pronouncement that no Court in the United States is allowed to forge any part of its Docket (including, refusing to Docket pleadings); and that a Court must rule on all matters that are properly presented before it (*see* Note 4); and that Clerk's of Court are to cease manipulating Court processes, for a requesting Judge, and/or for his own interest.

Note 4: With no abuse of the word "properly" allowed.

OPINIONS BELOW, as inspired by this Supreme Court

First Time at the Ninth Circuit, they test a new “standard” of Justice on a Pro Se

The Ninth Circuit, in Appeal No.: 22-16909, *Graven v Brnovich et al* (an Appeal from Arizona District Court, No.: 22-00062-PHX-GMS [Apnd 6, Ref’s 1, 2-5]), allowed “Someone” to forge the Appellee Header, and multiple Docket Entries; and that “Someone” deleted my lead Defendant/Appellee’s qualifier of “for acts as” (Apndx 5, Ref 2), which my Appeal Panel Affirmed by (making false case law citations by those forgeries/that deletion [Apndx 9, Ref’s 1-4]). I asked about these forgeries/deletion by 8 pleadings: Why; where; etc? (Apndx 10:1-8). The Appeals Court did not Respond.

And the Appeals Court simply refused to rule on the 2nd Order of Dismissal I had appealed (apparently, as there was no way to forge the record to Affirm that Order), for which I filed for a Mandamus with this Supreme Court (Apndx 3). I asked by different 6 pleadings: Why didn’t you rule; etc? (Apndx 11:1-6).

See an overview here of both errant acts (a forged ruling; and refusing to rule) by the Ninth Circuit in “Statement of the Case for this Petition” (or see detail for such in my Petition *et al* for a Writ of Mandamus for *Graven v Brnovich, et al*, No.: 24-7130 [Apndx 3], and my Supplemental Brief to that Petition [Apndx 12]).

The Supreme Court approves/condones an Appeal Court forging its Docket

As this ugly corruption of American Justice was gaining size/momentum as it left the Ninth, this Supreme Court Denied my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to Order the Ninth Circuit to explain its forgeries/deletions/refusal (for No.: 24-7130, *Graven v Brnovich, et al*). Did the Supreme Court approve these errant acts? Condone them?

Then, not only did the Ninth Circuit take this Court’s Denial of my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus as full-blown approval to forge its own Docket, but to allow District Courts below to also forget their Dockets, and so the District of Arizona did.

In District Court, they ran with the Ninth’s lead, and this Court’s approval

Then, the District Court, in my later Complaint against 5 errant, private individuals (masquerading as Federal Judges), in *Graven v Snow, et al* (Apndx 2), almost “on cue,” used what it must have interpreted as approval by this Court for our Courts to forge their Docket (based on the forgeries the Ninth used in Appeal 22-16909), and to rule by those forgeries, that Court forged their Docket to Dismiss this new case by:

- “Someone” at the District Court deleted/forged my qualifiers for my Defendants (Apndx 2, Ref 1; Apndx 13, pg 2, Ref 8);

“...being sued as individuals, for acts committed outside of their Judicial capacity, Judicial authority, and Judicial Immunity, as Federal Judges, for having committed the alleged acts with an evil mind (*mens rea*), and with malice, Defendants.”

- *Someone*” at the Court added/forged “*and as a federal judge*” to each Defendant, which I had specifically excluded from each Defendant (Apndx 13, Ref’s 1-5);”
- *Someone*” at the Court also forged “Jury Demand:” with “None” Apndx 13, pg2, Ref 6, but I had clearly stated **TRIAL BY JURY REQUESTED**, all caps, in bold, just below the Defendant Header (Apndx 2, pg 1, Ref 2);
- *Someone*” at the Court refused to Docket my Complaint (Apndx 13, pg 1, Ref 7) (obviously to hide what my Defendants had done);
- *Someone*” at the Court ignored that my SUMMONS were in my individual Defendants’ personal names (Apndx 14);
- Had the Court inquired, they would have learned that I had hired a company to skip-trace my Defendants’ residential addresses, to serve them at home;
- By their forgeries, *Someone*” at the Court claimed “US Government Defendant,” rather than “Federal Question,” against private individuals Apndx 13, pg 1, Ref 9) (see my specifically exclude the US Government in Apndx 2, pg 15, Ref’s 5/6).

Federal Judges, using Federal Courts, cannot commit the acts these 5 individuals did. These 5 errant, private individuals, masquerading as Federal Judges, acted outside of their Judicial capacity; Judicial authority; and Judicial Immunity; so they were not acting as Federal Judges, and they were not sued as Federal Judges; acts that were committed with an evil mind (*mens rea*), and with malice.

I filed a Motion asking for corrections to these “errors” (Apndx 15, Ref’s 1-4).

Curiously, the Court did make one correction...they corrected their forged “Jury Demand:” with “None,” to: By Plaintiff (Apndx 16, Ref 1), but made none of their other forgeries (so, they had read my pleading, Apndx 15).

I immediately asked why my Complaint had not been Docketed (Ex’s only [Apndx 17]).

My Complaint was Dismissed by these forgeries/deletions (Apndx 18, pgs 2/3, Ref’s 1/2). In Dismissing my Complaint, Judge McNamee explained the only times Judges can be sued outside of their capacity/authority...and in doing so, he described my situation with these 5 errant acting Defendants (which see in Statement). Judge McNamee Dismissed by the very forgeries, he Denied my Motion to correct (Ref 3).

I filed a Notice of Appeal (Apndx 19), simply stating:

“This Complaint was dismissed on 4-1-24, by false information, and by/for errant reasons.”

Then, back at the Ninth, a 2nd time, they used “the new standard” approved here

When I Appealed Judge McNamee’s Dismissal of my Complaint (*Graven v Snow, et al*, Appeal No 24-3420), on my Appeal Docket (Apndx 1), they eliminated the body of the Docket, thereby not listing “Prior Cases” (Ref 1); not listing Defendants/Appellees, or myself as the Appellant (Apndx 1, Ref 2); nor did the Ninth Circuit include the qualifiers from my Complaint (Apndx 1, Ref 3 [*see* in Apndx 2, Ref 1; or as per my Notice of Appeal Apndx 19, Ref 1]); nor a Summary of the Docket (Apndx 1, Ref 4).

These are new/additional examples of the Ninth Circuit’s now approved license to forge as they wish, as the did the Docket in 22-16909, Apndx 5, Ref’s 1-5), and approve lower Court using forgery to their Docket; as this Supreme Court approved/gave license for by Denying my Petition for a Mandamus in No. 23-7130.

I filed a Motion to Take Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Apndx 20), as I am homeless, amongst other, that example my financial limitations, giving examples of why Motion should be granted, saying (Ref’s 1/2):

“Judge McNamee’s dismissal if full of blatant, errant, misapplications of reality such as these.

I also note that the District Court Docket was forged as to several (alleged) facts and matters.

Apparently, the District Court deleting my qualifiers; adding “...and as a federal judge,” and other forgeries as outlined here (Apndx13, Ref’s 1-5), was not sufficient for the Ninth Circuit for their Order to Show Cause whether or not my Appeal was frivolous...so in their Order, they used the District Court’s forgeries; forged their own Docket as outlined here, and added “District Judge” to G. Murray Snow (Apndx 21, Ref 1) (and blocked me from receiving e-notices and e-filing, which I had long had).

In my Response to their Order, I outlined the acts the five had committed in forging my Appeal 22-16909, and for which I had sued them (Apndx 22, throughout)

In the Court’s Order (Apndx 23) Denying my Motion for Pauperis, they again added “District Judge” after Defendant Snow’s name; and they used the earlier described deletions of my qualifiers; and Dismissed my Appeal...all by multiple forgeries.

Our Courts are taking their lead from the Supreme Court: It is ok to forge their Dockets to support the ruling a Judge wishes to rule...anarchy and corruption to follow.

6.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28U.S.C. § 1651.

RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), provides: “The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.”

AS TO TIMELINESS FOR THIS PETITION

The Order by the Ninth Circuit claiming my Appeal is “frivolous” was issued on August 28, 2024.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE FOR THIS PETITION

By a quick look at 4 Court Dockets, we can see how the Ninth Circuit, and the Arizona District Court, have taken your approving forging Court Dockets and approving Appeals Court's ignoring appealed Orders, as seen in your Denying my Petition for a Mandamus in No. 23-7130, *Graven v Brnovich, et al*, **and see how they have already applying these new found/approved powers to commit errant acts in another case:**

Arizona District Court Case No.: CV22-00062-PHX-GMS

1.) First, *see* 11 Defendants, and my many qualifiers, making clear how they are being sued, in Case No.: 22-00062-PHX-GMS (Apndx 6); sued in part under 42 USC § 1983 (Ref 2); "*for acts as*" (Ref's 6-15); 10 are sued in their positions as State employees, having acted under the color of State law (*see* Apndx 6 throughout; and *see* the Court's Docket as Apndx 5, Ref's 5/6). All 11 are listed as private individuals (the 11th is private civil defense attorney); with no titles. Please also note that their Summons were in just their personal names (again, no titles); please note that they were Served at their residences (not at State offices); note that they were sued for "personal (not State) liabilities" (Apndx 6 Ref 3; pg 56 Ref's 4/5 [*see* the importance of excluding the State's Treasury in *Dugan v Rank*, US]); *see* Defendants' attorneys in their Notice of Appearance only claim to be representing 11 individuals, not the State; not the Attorney General's Office; nor the Attorney General; *see* Defendants use my Defendant header (with no titles; "*for acts as*" and for their own liabilities); *see* Defendants never claim to be the State; the Attorney General's Office; the Attorney General [nor did that Judge call them such] I; or having Sovereign Immunity (e.g., in our 12.1[c] Meet/Confer proceedings; or their Motions to Dismiss) (so they clearly aren't the State/Attorney General's Office/Attorney General); and *see* Defendants use the same Header in their pleadings at the Ninth Circuit (no titles; with "*for acts as*;" and with "for personal liabilities") (Appeal 22-16909, which *see* just below). This Complaint was Dismissed, by clearly errant acts.

Ninth Circuit Appeal No. 22-16909, *Graven v Brnovich, et al*

2.) But now look at the Ninth's Docket of my Appeal for the above Dismissed case: My individual Defendant Mark Brnovich was forged to "Mark Brnovich, **Attorney General, Attorney General,**" and "*for acts as*" was deleted (Apndx 5, pg 2, Ref's 1/2). None of the 10 other Appellees were given titles or had "*for acts as*" deleted (pgs 2-5, Ref's 3-12 [but *see* my qualifiers, pg 4/5, Ref 5/6]). More forgeries by "*Someone*" at the Ninth occurred in at least 15 different Docket entries (I filed 8 different pleadings asking about these forgeries, *but my Appeal Panel did not respond* [*see* my Petition for a Mandamus, 23-7130, Apndx I] 10 here]). My Panel Affirmed the 1st of 2 Orders On-Appeal by false case law citations based on these forgeries (Apndx 9, Ref's 1-4); and they refused to rule on the 2nd Order On-Appeal (I filed 6 pleadings asking why not, *but my Appeal Panel did not respond* [again, *see* my Petition, 23-7130 Apndx E] [11 here])).

I also wrote to the Ninth Circuit's Chief Executive, and Clerk of Court, regarding these forgeries; and my Panel's refusal to rule on the 2nd Order, but did not receive a response. Not even the Defendants/Appellees used these forgeries (Apndx 24, with 3 pleadings).

Arizona District Court Case No.: CV24-00549-SMM-ASB

3.) And now, let's look at my Complaint Defendant Header against 5 individuals masquerading as Federal Judges in a subsequent and related Case, *Graven v Snow, et al*, CV24-00549-SMM-ASB (Apndx 2, Ref's 1-6), and compare that to that Court's Docket header...**now, "Someone" at the District Court has forged their Docket header, by deleting the below underlined portions of my Complaint Header, and added "...as a federal judge"** (again, Apndx 5, Ref's 1-6; and Apndx 6, pgs 1/2, Ref's 1-6):

"...being sued as individuals, for acts committed outside of their Judicial capacity, Judicial authority, and Judicial Immunity, as Federal Judges, for having committed the alleged acts with an evil mind (*mens rea*), and with malice, Defendants."

It is by these forgeries Judge McNamee dismissed my Complaint (although in his Order of Dismissal, he inadvertently made it clear, that by how I had filed my Complaint, I did have the right to sue these 5 individuals masquerading as Judges (Apndx 7, pg 2 Ref 1):

"Judges are absolutely immune from §1983 suits for damages for their judicial acts **except when** they are taken "in the clear absence of all jurisdiction." *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 356–57 (1978); *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986). An act is "judicial" when it is a function normally performed by a judge and the parties dealt with the judge in his or her judicial capacity. *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 362; *Crooks v. Maynard*, 913 F.2d 699, 700 (9th Cir. 1990)." **(But jurisdiction/immunity are voided by errant acts.)**

Yes, the acts I described (forgeries/refusing to rule), and documented, were "...taken "in the clear absence of all jurisdiction." and were not "...a function normally performed by a judge and the parties dealt with the judge in his or her judicial capacity."

It is only by "Someone" at the District Court forging the Docket, deleting the qualifiers in my Defendant Header; adding "*and as a federal judge*;" and not docketing my Complaint/main document (so it was/is hidden), which was obviously done, to **enable Judge McNamee to make the untruthful claims he did, to thereby Dismiss my Complaint.**

I filed a Motion asking for corrections to these "errors" (Apndx 15, Ref's 1-4).

The Court did make one correction...they corrected their forged "Jury Demand:" with "None," to: By Plaintiff (Apndx 16, Ref 1).

I immediately asked why my Complaint had not been Docketed (Ex's only [Apndx 17]).

Again, this Court also forged "Jury Demand: None;" and "US Government Defendant."

What happens to "EIGHT MILES UNDER GYM?"

MAN of a Monastery used against Lord Clerk of Court on Monday, September 10).
benefit themselves, by such means as is sanctioned by law (see my Petition for a
Lord Clerk, & of Court out of the same to benefit themselves... they are well positioned to
On, and as this new form of legal creation/contribution has been approved, let, & not leave
Bridgton, where they seek to enrich themselves.

παρα ότι λοιπόν είναι βλαβερή:

It is not just me, it is quite a few others, actually...that we are not happy, who are happy

And now, judicial anarchy and corruption are taking hold.

...and then this Supreme Court approved/condoned this carter

խաղիւս նալ ԿՅԵՅԻՐ... աղ շրժ սաւանձի խօլ նալ ԿՅԵՅԻՐ ԾՈՐՔԻ ԻՅ ԲԵ խօլԶԵՐ...

Minor Circuit Chief Judge Mary Murguia' appointed 3 COB Appellate Panel Judges to
Judges): when I Appointed Judge Zhou, 2 longtime workmate and office neighbor,
his fellow Arizona Power Elites (including my son Delendaan is married to one of his
District Court Chief Judge Zhou dismissed my Complaint against against several of

And may God be of your assistance for ever.

refusing to file on an Appointed Order, is "Involuntary" (Appdx 33, Pg 4.)

And let the Minor Circuit Rule my outrage for all of these foreigners and their

ကဏ္ဍ/ဓာတ်ကဏ္ဍ ဤ ဇယား ၂ နှစ်များ၊ ၁၉၆၅ နှစ်က ခုနှစ် (ဇူလိုင် ၁၃၊ ၁၉၆၅ ခုနှစ်)၊

3450' and the Ninth Circuit not only condemned the District Court's findings of

- and then, for my Appeal in 54-00248, I am back at the Ninth Circuit for Appeal No. 54-

6(c) to assist my attorneys in Case No.: CV34-00240-SMN-VSB.

ԼՈՒՃՆԵԼ (գայերեն և՛ ժողովրդա: զգրրն յ սեւ շխլա: ուր Ծոճեւնն և՛ Ըօսնիսնը:

- the District Court in Phoenix took long approval from No. 33-1130' and passed

When this Supreme Court Denied my Petition for a Mandamus in 53-1130" and again:

Σύμφωνα (I filed a briefings asking why not' but my Attorney General said not to do so): and
 challenging the charges, but my Attorney General said not to do so): and they refused to file on the
 those charges, making false case law citations by those charges (I filed a briefings
 that the minor charges my Attorney General (Attorney No. 33-1000): and they will by
 I filed an Attorney for 3 Orders of Dismissal from Complaint No. CV33-00005-BHX-GW2.

IN BEATUM

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION

The Court may “issue all writs necessary or appropriate in the aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.” 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a).

A Petition for a Writ of Mandamus is warranted where “(1) no other adequate means exist to attain the relief [the party] desires, (2) the party’s right to issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable, and (3) the writ is appropriate under the circumstances.”

Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2010) (quoting *Cheney v. United States Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004)) (internal quotation marks and alterations omitted).

Exceptional circumstances exist here, as the Appeals Court and the District Court have documented their errant acts by their own Dockets; and their own Orders.

I. PETITIONERS’ RIGHT TO ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IS CLEAR

Petitioner is entitled to a Writ directing the Ninth Circuit and the Arizona District Court to take remedial act as outlined in my PETITION FOR MANDAMUS,

II. A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS IS WARRANTED, GIVEN THAT THESE 2 COURTS CLEARLY DOCUMENTED THEIR ERRANT ACTS BY THEIR OWN DOCKETS, AND THEIR OWN ORDERS.

Because the Court of Appeals is acting in a suspicious manner, evading its obvious duties, a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus from this Court is the appropriate vehicle to rectify the **error**. See, e.g., *Ex parte Republic of Peru*, 318 U.S. 578, 583 (1943); *Fossatt*, 62 U.S. at 446.

This Court’s intervention is particularly necessary because the Appeals Court and the District Court are acting by your Denial of my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, which they have interpreted as being approval for, and the condoning of, forging their Dockets, and not ruling, in their best interest, not that of Justice, or me.

III. NO OTHER ADEQUATE MEANS EXISTS FOR AN ABUSED LITIGANT TO OBTAIN RELIEF

There is no way for me to fight the errant acts, and almost unlimited power of an Appeals Court, or even a District Court, except by an Order from this respected United States Supreme Court.

There is no way for any In Pro Se to fight this death knell for Justice, except by an Order from this respected United States Supreme Court.

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT CLARIFYING ITS VIEWS ON OUR COURTS FORGING THEIR DOCKETS, AND RULING BY THOSE FORGERIES; AND REFUSING TO RULE ON A MATTER, IS NEEDED TO PREVENT JUDICIAL ANARCHY AND CORRUPTION

As I have stated many times; and as anyone with an ounce of common sense would know; and as should be clear by now: Approving/condoning the forgery of our Courts' Dockets; and allowing them to rule or not rule, as may be in the best of a Judge/Panel, would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are already acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal as given by your Denying my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus (No.: 23-7130), *Graven v Brnovich, et al.*

And as your own Clerk of Court has clearly demonstrated, it is not just Judges/Panels that will act errantly by your approval/condoning the acts you have given your approval to (*see* my Petition for a Mandamus against your Clerk, filed 9/17/24).

For this Supreme Court to not now stop this madness, will lead to the end of American Justice as we have known it, and the world has long respected us for.

CONCLUSION

By the Supreme Court Denying my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, in which I asked the Court to order the Ninth Circuit to explain why they forged my Docket, and why they then used those forgeries to Affirm the 1st of 2 Orders I had appealed; and why the Ninth Circuit had refused to rule on the 2nd Order I had appealed, and that was argued On-Appeal, by both sides...by the Supreme Court Denying my Petition you approved/condoned our Courts forging Dockets to rule however they wish; and you approved/condoned a Judge/Panel simply refusing to rule when it/a Judge does not want to.

The Judicial anarchy you set in motion by Denying my Mandamus, is taking root.

You must reverse this terrible wave of anarchy/corruption, first by letting the Ninth Circuit know, and the District Court in Phoenix know, and thereby all of our Courts know: Forgery of a case Docket to manipulate rulings/opinions; and refusing to rule on appealed and argued On-Appeal Orders, to also manipulate Justice...*is not American Jurisprudence.*

For the foregoing reasons, the Court must approve my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus directing the Court of Appeals; and Arizona District Court; to perform as outlined in my PETITION FOR MANDAMUS.

This Supreme Court must eliminate the Judicial anarchy (and certainly corruption) you have set in-motion.

Respectfully submitted,

William "Will" A. Graven, In Pro Se; Petitioner/Appellant/Plaintiff

Date: _____