

14.

APPENDIX FOLLOWING

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 1

Case Selection Table

X

ACMS ShowDoc

X

+

① 🔒 https://ca9-showdoc.azurewebsites.us/24-3420



Case Search Calendar Opinions Orders/Judgments

Print Logout Help

If you view the Full Docket, you will be charged for 2 Pages \$0.20

ACMS Case Summary
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Court of Appeals Docket #: 24-3420

Docketed: 05/30/2024

Nature of Suit: 2440 Other Civil Rights

Graven v. Snow, et al.

Appeal From: Phoenix, Arizona

Fee Status: IFP Pending in COA

Case Type Information:

- 1) Civil
- 2) United States
- 3)

Originating Court Information:

District: District of Arizona : 2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB

Trial Judge: Stephen M. McNamee, District Judge

Date Filed: 03/15/2024

Date Order/Judgment:

04/01/2024

Date Order/Judgment EOD:

04/01/2024

Date NOA Filed:

05/29/2024

Date Rec'd COA:

05/30/2024

Ref 1 Ref 2
05/30/2024 1 CASE OPENED. A copy of your notice of appeal / petition filed in 2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB has been received in the Clerk's office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The U.S. Court of Appeals docket number 24-3420 has been assigned to this case. All communications with the court must indicate this Court of Appeals docket number. Please carefully review the docket to ensure the name(s) and contact information are correct. It is your responsibility to alert the court if your contact information changes.

Resources Available

For more information about case processing and to assist you in preparing your brief, please review the Case Opening Information (for attorneys and pro se litigants) and review the Appellate Practice Guide. Counsel should consider contacting the court's Appellate Mentoring Program for help with the brief and argument. [Entered: 05/30/2024 04:42 PM]

R3 R4
05/30/2024 2 SCHEDULE NOTICE. Appeal Opening Brief (No Transcript Due) (Appellant) 7/9/2024. For appeal no. 24-3420, 2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB. All briefs shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 31 and 9th Cir. R. 31-2.1. Failure of the petitioner(s)/appellant(s) to comply with this briefing schedule will result in automatic dismissal of the appeal. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1. [Entered: 05/30/2024 04:49 PM]



Case Selection Table

X

ACMS ShowDoc

X +

https://ca9-showdoc.azurewebsites.us/24-3420



The Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The U.S. Court of Appeals docket number **24-3420** has been assigned to this case. All communications with the court must indicate this Court of Appeals docket number. Please carefully review the docket to ensure the name(s) and contact information are correct. It is your responsibility to alert the court if your contact information changes.

Resources Available

For more information about case processing and to assist you in preparing your brief, please review the [Case Opening Information](#) (for attorneys and pro se litigants) and review the [Appellate Practice Guide](#). Counsel should consider contacting the court's [Appellate Mentoring Program](#) for help with the brief and argument. [Entered: 05/30/2024 04:42 PM]

05/30/2024 2 **SCHEDULE NOTICE.** Appeal Opening Brief (No Transcript Due) (Appellant) 7/9/2024. **For appeal no. 24-3420, 2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB.** All briefs shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 31 and 9th Cir. R. 31-2.1. Failure of the petitioner(s)/appellant(s) to comply with this briefing schedule will result in automatic dismissal of the appeal. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1. [Entered: 05/30/2024 04:49 PM]

06/13/2024 3 **MOTION** to Proceed In Forma Pauperis filed by Appellant William A. Graven. [Entered: 06/14/2024 03:57 PM]

06/17/2024 4 **SUPPLEMENT** to Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (DE 3) filed by Appellant William A. Graven. [Entered: 06/17/2024 03:36 PM]

06/21/2024 5 **ORDER FILED.** Response to Order to Show Cause due (Appellant) 7/26/2024 [Entered: 06/21/2024 02:01 PM]

07/30/2024 6 **RESPONSE** to court order filed by Appellant William A. Graven. [Entered: 07/30/2024 02:36 PM]

07/30/2024 7 Miscellaneous Pro Se Filings Filed [Entered: 07/30/2024 02:38 PM]

08/28/2024 8 **ORDER FILED.** (Mary M. SCHROEDER, Milan D. SMITH, Jr., Andrew D. HURWITZ) Upon a review of the record and the responses to the court's June 21, 2024 order, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's supplemented motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry Nos. 3 and 4), see 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious). No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

DISMISSED. [Entered: 08/28/2024 10:32 AM]

PACER Service Center**Transaction Receipt**

U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit - 09/06/2024

PACER Login:	williamgraven	Client Code:	
Description:	ACMS Case Summary	Search Criteria:	24-3420
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.10

[Court Information](#)[Court Home](#)[PACER Service Center](#)[Change Client](#)[Billing History](#)[Contact Us](#)

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, for **Graven v Snow, et al** (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 2

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COPY
MAR 15 2024	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT	
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
PHOENIX, DIV. DEPUTY	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, DIV. DEPUTY

In Re: William A. Graven,
Plaintiff,
v.

G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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.

Ref 2

TRIAL BY JURY REQUESTED

) Case No.: **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**
) Case Filed: **March 15, 2024**
) Assigned to Honorable Judge: _____
) **COMPAINT FOR THE CIVIL LIABILITIES FROM THE BELOW CAUSES OF ACTION:**
) 1.) VIOLATIONS OF THE 14th AMENDMENT FOR DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION;
) 3.) VIOLATIONS OF 18 USC Sec 1001;
) 4.) VIOLATIONS OF 18 USC Sec 471;
) 5.) OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE 18 USC Sec 1503;
) 6.) FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT AND OTHER DECEPTIVE ACTS ON THE COURT;
) 7.) VIOLATIONS OF RICO/18 USC SEC 1961;
) 8.) CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT 18 USC Sec 1961;
) 9.) VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES;
) 10.) ABUSE OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.

OPENING COMMENTS BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

Defendant Murray Snow abused his position as a Federal Judge to dismiss my Civil Complaint against 11 individuals as defendants (CV-22-00062-PHX-GMS [Ex 1]), many of whom are fellow Republican Power Elites and longtime associates/friends of his, by gifting them State Sovereign Immunity (which those 11 defendants never claimed, nor ever tried to justify) (Defendants Murguia, Wallace, Lee, and Bumatay, as Circuit Judges, refused to act on Snow's gift of Sovereign Immunity [Ex's 2/3; and Ch's 2/3 in Ex 4]). Snow also used my 11 defendants' fraud (Ex 3), by which they claimed I merely alleged they "declined to indict" certain parties, which is antithetical to my allegations/evidence to 10 of 11 defendants' documented criminal acts (I detailed that fraud *ad nauseam*, but Snow used that fraud to dismiss the 10; and his fellow Defendants, Murguia, Wallace, Lee and Bumatay, not only refused to act on Snow's use of that fraud, *they even Affirmed by it* (Ex's 5/6; and Ch 4, Ex 2), thereby claiming I had no Standing. Snow further abused his position in dismissing my 11 defendants by claiming I had not given "any reason" why the Statutes of Limitation had been suspended or Res judicata voided (Ex 5), which are 2 more blatant frauds by Snow as my Complaint, Sec II, is 42 pages with 76 Ex's and over 300 references to those Ex's as to why those Statutes had been suspended/Res judicata voided (Sec II, Ex 1). Snow said nothing of my Sec II. Murguia, Wallace, Lee, and Bumatay also refused to act on Snow's fraudulent ruling by Statutes of Limitation and Res judicata (Ex 6). Murguia, Wallace, Lee and Bumatay refusing to act on Snow's frauds examples their complicity.

When I Appealed Snow's fraudulent dismissal of the 10+1 defendants, he asked his longtime fellow Phoenix based legal associate and later fellow Judge, Mary Murguia, to use her authority as Chief Judge for the Ninth Circuit, to save him from being reversed on Appeal, to thereby protect the 11 (many of whom are also longtime associates/friends of hers, e.g., my lead defendant of the 11 defendants is married to a Judge on their Court).

Murguia selected 3 Republican Judges, Wallace, Lee and Bumatay, as my Panel, to save Snow. They Affirmed by the fraud of "declined to indict," relabeled as "prosecutorial discretion." They documented their corruption when they all missed that the 10+1 defendants had filed 2 motions to dismiss, and Snow had issued 2 Orders of dismissal, by different legal reasoning, both Orders argued on Appeal. By Wallace, Lee and Bumatay Affirming but 1 Order: *They documented they had not read Snow's Orders/any Appeal documents...they ruled by Snow/Murguia's conspiracy.*

XIII. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

90.) Plaintiff incorporates and realleges from OPENING COMMENTS BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS, and through paragraphs 1 through 86 above, the allegations therein as being common to all Causes of Action.

91.) For the above stated reasons, and more that will be forthcoming, Plaintiff prays the Court will award damages against Defendants as sought by the Plaintiff, likely to be amended, and as the Court may also determine.

CAUSES OF ACTION, AND DAMAGES REQUESTED

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE AND 14TH AMENDMENT FOR DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION

92. Plaintiff repeats and realleges his allegations as summarized in OPENING COMMENTS BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS on page 1, and then in Paragraphs 1 through 91, inclusive, as though fully set forth below.

93. Defendants as listed above, and John and Jane Doe's as may be uncovered in discovery, have caused the Plaintiff material damages by virtue of their repeated errant acts 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, in Judicial proceedings, to the benefit of parties the Plaintiff had taken legal action against, errant acts which they committed as individuals outside of their official capacities, and so are personally liable for (not the US Government), by violating my 14th Amendment rights to Due Process, and Equal Protection, both Substantive and Procedural. Defendants, while having no legitimate reason to do so, repeatedly committed these acts, individually, and in concert with one another.

94. As a direct and proximate result of the acts herein alleged, Defendants are, and each of them is, personally (not the US Government), jointly and severally liable to the Plaintiff, for each of the wrongful acts herein alleged.

95. By virtue of the foregoing, and the acts herein alleged, the Plaintiff prays that this Court award the Plaintiff actual damages; punitive damages; damages to his person; compensatory damages, all of which have not yet been fully ascertained but are believed to be well in excess of \$628 million plus the highest rate of interest under Arizona Law, pre and post Judgment. Plaintiff will request leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to allege the full amount of damages incurred by Defendants when the same has been fully ascertained. As the acts which created this liability were done with an evil mind, Plaintiff asks for treble damages.

96. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in engaging in the wrongful conduct and have herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, have been guilty of oppression, fraud and malice, acted in conscious disregard of the rights of the Plaintiff, entitling the Plaintiff to an award of damages as described above,

herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, have been guilty of oppression, fraud and malice, and have acted in conscious disregard of the rights of the Plaintiff, entitling the Plaintiff to an award of damages as described above, sufficient to punish and make an example of Defendants and their fellow conspirators and Co-Defendants, and each of them. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that as to each Defendant which is a corporation, partnership, trust or other entity, including an association-in-fact enterprise, such actions were authorized or ratified by the leader-in-fact; one or more officers; directors; or managing agents of such Defendant.

XIV. CONCLUSION OF THE FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS MADE IN THIS COMPLAINT

138). The 11 defendants, as AGO employees, committed documented criminal acts (documented by internal AGO documents they withheld/hid for years), to “exonerate” the Snell Parties who had been investigated and approved to be indicted by the just previous Attorney General, thereby injuring me.

139.) One of the 11 defendants, Mark Brnovich, was politically indebted to the Snell Parties for his election as the then new Attorney General.

140.) Brnovich used his position and power, and staff at the Arizona AGO to “exonerate” the Snell Parties.

141.) Defendant Snow, a member of the Power Elite in Arizona, is a longtime associate of many of my 11 defendants, including, the wife of my lead defendant of the 11, is one his Judges (Judge Susan Brnovich).

142.) Defendant Snow also has longtime associations with many of the Snell Parties.

143) Defendant Murguia, like Snow, is also a longtime member of the Arizona Power Elite.

144.) Murguia, like Snow, also has longtime associations with many of the Snell Parties.


142.) Republican Snow walked down to Murguia’s office; asking for her help to ensure he was not reversed on Appeal, and so she called upon 3 stalwart Republican Circuit Judges to Affirm Snow, thereby saving him; my 11 defendants/their associates; and other parties within the Arizona Power Elite.

145.) And Defendants Snow, Murguia, Wallace, Lee, and Bumatay, injured me in the process.

146.) It is that simple.

147.) Unfortunately for the 5 Defendants, they inadvertently and indisputably documented the corruption of their actions, by their own Order.

148. Thanking the Court in advance for its time and efforts in adjudicating the matters herein.

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of March 2024, by:  , In Pro Se
Plaintiff Will Graven

No. 24-_____

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 3

23-7130
No. 24-

ORIGINAL

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

FILED

MAR 28 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN RE WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, PETITIONER

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: This matter is quite simple: My District Court Judge considered 2 motions to dismiss by my 11 defendants, who had split themselves into 2 groups, by my different allegations; the Judge issued 2 Orders of dismissal (Attached as A); I appealed; both Orders were argued on Appeal, by both sides (e.g., Attchd as B and C); my Panel ruled on the 1st Order/Group of 10 defendants (Attchd as D) by language that clearly applies to only that 1st Group (current/former State AGO employees), but they have not ruled on the 2nd Order for 1 defendant (a previously State retained civil defense attorney). *Did my Panel miss the 2nd Order? I have asked, 6 times (see Apndx E1-6). They won't respond.*

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

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court must approve my Petition for a Writ of Mandamus directing the Court of Appeals to:

- A.) appoint a new Panel to rule on the appealed and argued but yet outstanding 2nd Order of Dismissal for the 2nd Group of 1 Defendant; and
- B.) have that new Panel review the first Panel's suspect 1st Order Affirming the 1st Group of 10 Defendants: *If the first Panel did not know there were 2 Groups of Defendants by 2 Orders of Dismissal, that had been Appealed and Argued On-Appeal, by both Appellant and Appellees, they had not read any documentation to independently and honestly Affirm the 1st Order/Group by.*

Again, this matter is very simple: My District Court Judge considered 2 motions to dismiss for defendants who had split themselves into 2 Groups; he then issued 2 Orders of Dismissal; both Orders were appealed and argued On-Appeal, by both sides; my Panel ruled on the 1st Order (by language that applies to that 1st Order/Group of State AGO employees [By: prosecutorial discretion]), but have not ruled on the 2nd Order (Re: an outside civil defense attorney's potential liability for representing State parties in a civil lawsuit).


What could be more basic for any Panel, more obvious, than reading the District Court's Orders; and reading the Appeal documentation, and issuing Appeal Orders that match the District Court's Orders, and Orders argued?!

But now, the first Panel cannot rule on the 2nd Order as it would make clear: My Panel did not read any documentation to rule by (they simply took instructions from someone) (which is why they have ignored my repeatedly raising this matter).

And which, again, is why they will not rule without a Writ of Mandamus.

And without my Petition for Mandamus being granted, Courts of Appeals may think they can rule or not rule on appealed and argued Orders, as it suits them.

Respectfully submitted,



William "Will" A. Graven

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 4

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, *Petitioner*,

v.

THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, *Respondent*.

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI,
regarding the Appeals Court ruling on the 1st Order argued On-Appeal, by a forged Docket, and so false case law citations; and refusing to rule on the 2nd Order appealed/argued On-Appeal.

Synopsis: As matters now stand, this Supreme Court has approved/condoned our Courts forging their Dockets (be that the initial Defendant/Appellee Header and/or subsequent Entries); to manipulate how that Court rules.

As matters now stand, this Supreme Court has approved/condoned our Appeals Courts refusing to rule on lower Court Orders, that were properly appealed, and argued before it, for whatever reason the Court chooses.

Sadly, it appears these maneuvers are dirty tricks reserved for parties that represent themselves (attorneys would not be given, nor accept such abusive, errant treatment).


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

CONCLUSION

Petitioner respectfully Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari to review the Judgment of the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit.

For the foregoing reasons, I pray the Court will approve my Petition, which has frightening implications to our Justice systems: Federal, State, and Local.

Respectfully submitted,

Two handwritten signatures are placed side-by-side. The signature on the left is a stylized 'W' and the signature on the right is a stylized 'A'.

William "Will" A. Graven

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 5

General Docket
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Court of Appeals Docket #: 22-16909

Nature of Suit: 3440 Other Civil Rights

William Graven v. Mark Brnovich, et al

Appeal From: U.S. District Court for Arizona, Phoenix

Fee Status: Paid

Docketed: 12/14/2022

Termed: 12/15/2023

Case Type Information:

- 1) civil
- 2) private
- 3) null

Originating Court Information:

District: 0970-2 : 2:22-cv-00062-GMS

Trial Judge: G. Murray Snow, Chief District Judge

Date Filed: 01/12/2022

Date Order/Judgment:	Date Order/Judgment EOD:	Date NOA Filed:	Date Rec'd COA:
12/07/2022	12/07/2022	12/13/2022	12/13/2022

Prior Cases:

<u>11-15914</u> Judge Order	Date Filed: 04/14/2011	Date Disposed: 10/19/2011	Disposition: Affirmed -
<u>11-16763</u> Memorandum	Date Filed: 07/21/2011	Date Disposed: 04/30/2014	Disposition: Affirmed -
<u>12-16229</u> Defects - Judge Order	Date Filed: 05/23/2012	Date Disposed: 06/13/2012	Disposition: Jurisdictional
<u>12-17442</u> Memorandum	Date Filed: 10/31/2012	Date Disposed: 02/02/2015	Disposition: Affirmed -
<u>17-16889</u> Judge Order	Date Filed: 09/19/2017	Date Disposed: 05/21/2018	Disposition: Dismissed -
<u>20-15110</u> Memorandum	Date Filed: 01/27/2020	Date Disposed: 12/16/2020	Disposition: Affirmed -
<u>22-15456</u> Defects - Judge Order	Date Filed: 03/29/2022	Date Disposed: 04/20/2022	Disposition: Jurisdictional

Current Cases:

None

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, Named as Will
Plaintiff - Appellant,

William A. Graven
Direct: 928-890-8825
Email: will@willgraven.com
[NTC Pro Se]
Suite 300-251
2700 S. Woodlands Village Blvd.

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

v.

MARK BRNOVICH, Attorney General, Attorney
General

Defendant - Appellee,

Ref 1: title forged in!

Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8054

Email: mark.dangerfield@gknet.com

Fax: 602/530-8602

[COR LD NTC Retained]

Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.

Firm: 602-530-8000

2575 East Camelback Road

Suite 1100

Phoenix, AZ 85016

MICHAEL BAILEY, for acts as Asst AG and
Chief of Staff

Defendant - Appellee,

"for acts as" in place

DON CONRAD, for acts as Chief of the Criminal
Division

Defendant - Appellee,

PAUL AHLER, for acts as Chief Prosecutor and
later Criminal Division Chief

Defendant - Appellee,

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8185

Email: mark.fuller@gknet.com

[COR NTC Retained]

Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.

Firm: 602-530-8000

2575 East Camelback Road

Suite 1100

Phoenix, AZ 85016

Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8054

[COR LD NTC Retained]

(see above)

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8185

[COR NTC Retained]

(see above)

Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8054

[COR LD NTC Retained]

(see above)

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8185

[COR NTC Retained]

(see above)

Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney

Direct: 602-530-8054

[COR LD NTC Retained]

(see above)

	Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8185 [COR NTC Retained] (see above)
JOE WATERS, for acts Asst AG Defendant - Appellee,	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8054 [COR LD NTC Retained] (see above)
	Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8185 [COR NTC Retained] (see above)
LISA R. RODRIGUEZ, for acts as Criminal Division Administrator Defendant - Appellee,	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8054 [COR LD NTC Retained] (see above)
	Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8185 [COR NTC Retained] (see above)
MARK PERKOVICH, for acts as Chief of Special Investigations Defendant - Appellee,	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8054 [COR LD NTC Retained] (see above)
	Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8185 [COR NTC Retained] (see above)
ZORA MANJENCICH, for acts as Asst Criminal Division Chief and FSP Section Chief Counsel Defendant - Appellee,	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8054 [COR LD NTC Retained] (see above)
	Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8185 [COR NTC Retained] (see above)
JOHN LOPEZ, for Acts as Solicitor General Defendant - Appellee,	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney Direct: 602-530-8054 [COR LD NTC Retained]

(see above)

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney
Direct: 602-530-8185
[COR NTC Retained]
(see above)

MARK C. DANGERFIELD, for acts in his past
representation of the Defendants
Defendant - Appellee,

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney
Direct: 602-530-8185
[COR LD NTC Retained]
(see above)

JENNIFER PERKINS, for acts as Asst Solicitor
General
Defendant - Appellee,

Mark C. Dangerfield, Esquire, Attorney
Direct: 602-530-8054
[COR LD NTC Retained]
(see above)

UNKNOWN PARTIES, named as John Does I
through X and Jane Does I through X for all acts
committed as Arizona State officials but for the
resulting personal (not State) liabilities
Defendant - Appellee,

Mark Andrew Fuller, Attorney
Direct: 602-530-8185
[COR NTC Retained]
(see above)

Ref 5

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, Named as Will,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

Ref 3

MARK BRNOVICH, Attorney General, Attorney General; MICHAEL BAILEY, for acts as Asst AG and Chief of Staff; DON CONRAD, for acts as Chief of the Criminal Division; PAUL AHLER, for acts as Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal Division Chief; JOE WATERS, for acts Asst AG; LISA R. RODRIGUEZ, for acts as Criminal Division Administrator; MARK PERKOVICH, for acts as Chief of Special Investigations; ZORA MANJENCICH, for acts as Asst Criminal Division Chief and FSP Section Chief Counsel; JOHN LOPEZ, for Acts as Solicitor General; MARK C. DANGERFIELD, for acts in his past representation of the Defendants; JENNIFER PERKINS, for acts as Asst Solicitor General; UNKNOWN PARTIES, named as John Does I through X and Jane Does I through X for all acts committed as Arizona State officials but for the resulting personal (not State) liabilities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Ref 6

12/14/2022 : 1
61 pg, 1.13 MB DOCKETED CAUSE AND ENTERED APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL AND PRO SE APPELLANT. SEND MQ: No. The schedule is set as follows: Appellant William A. Graven opening brief due 02/13/2023. Appellees Paul Ahler, Michael Bailey, Mark Brnovich, Attorney General, Don Conrad, Mark C. Dangerfield, John Lopez, Zora Manjencich, Jennifer Perkins, Mark Perkovich, Lisa R. Rodriguez, Unknown Parties and Joe Waters answering brief due 03/13/2023. Appellant's optional reply brief is due 21 days after service of the answering brief. [12610091] (JMR)
[Entered: 12/14/2022 10:03 AM]

12/14/2022 : 2
10 pg, 237.71 KB Filed clerk order (Deputy Clerk: CKP): Order to show cause docket fee due [12610803] (CKP) [Entered: 12/14/2022 03:21 PM]

12/14/2022 : 3
4 pg, 144.2 KB Filed (ECF) Appellant William A. Graven Urgent Motion to expedite case. Date of service: 12/14/2022. [12610836] [22-16909] (Graven, William)
[Entered: 12/14/2022 03:30 PM]

12/16/2022 : 4
Received notification from District Court re: payment of docket fee. Amount Paid: USD 505.00. Date paid: 12/14/2022. [12612495] (RT) [Entered: 12/16/2022 11:56 AM]

12/27/2022 : 5
4 pg, 11.62 KB Filed (ECF) Appellees Paul Ahler, Michael Bailey, Mr. Mark Brnovich, Don Conrad, John Lopez, Zora Manjencich, Jennifer Perkins, Mark Perkovich, Lisa R. Rodriguez and Joe Waters response to motion ([3] Motion (ECF Filing), [3] Motion (ECF Filing)). Date of service: 12/27/2022. [12618270] [22-16909] (Dangerfield, Mark) [Entered: 12/27/2022 12:51 PM]

01/03/2023 : 6
5 pg, 165.68 KB Filed (ECF) Appellant William A. Graven reply to response (). Date of service: 01/03/2023. [12621027] [22-16909] (Graven, William) [Entered: 01/03/2023 08:25 AM]

01/03/2023 : 7
3 pg, 124.19 KB Filed (ECF) Appellant William A. Graven Supplemental Motion to expedite case. Date of service: 01/03/2023. [12621036] [22-16909] (Graven, William)
[Entered: 01/03/2023 08:31 AM]

01/03/2023 : 8
3 pg, 124.9 KB Filed (ECF) Appellant William A. Graven Correspondence: Errata to Supplemental Motion to expedite case. Date of service: 01/03/2023. [12621880] [22-16909]--[COURT UPDATE: Updated docket text to reflect correct ECF filing type. 01/03/2023 by SLM] (Graven, William) [Entered: 01/03/2023 03:36 PM]

01/13/2023 : 9
8 pg, 24.79 KB Filed (ECF) Appellees Paul Ahler, Michael Bailey, Mr. Mark Brnovich, Don Conrad, John Lopez, Zora Manjencich, Jennifer Perkins, Mark Perkovich, Lisa R. Rodriguez and Joe Waters response to motion ([7] Motion (ECF Filing), [7] Motion (ECF Filing) motion to expedite case). Date of service: 01/13/2023. [12630539] [22-16909] (Dangerfield, Mark) [Entered: 01/13/2023 02:56 PM]

01/17/2023 : 10
7 pg, 178.33 KB Filed (ECF) Appellant William A. Graven reply to response (). Date of service: 01/17/2023. [12632133] [22-16909] (Graven, William) [Entered: 01/17/2023 04:40 PM]

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 6

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

JAN 12 2022
 CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
 BY DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, DIV.

CV22-00062-PHX-SMB

In Re: William A. Graven,
 Plaintiff,

v. *Ref 1*
 Mark Brnovich, for acts as Attorney General;
 Michael Bailey for acts as Asst AG and Chief
 of Staff; Don Conrad for acts as Chief of the
 Criminal Division; Paul Ahler for acts as
 Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal Division
 Chief; Joe Waters for acts Asst AG; Lisa
 Rodriguez for acts as Criminal Division
 Administrator; Mark Perkovich for acts as
 Chief of Special Investigations; Zora
 Manjencich for acts as Asst Criminal
 Division Chief and FSP Section Chief
 Counsel; John Lopez for acts as Solicitor
 General; Jennifer Perkins for acts as Asst
 Solicitor General; John Doe's 1 through X;
 and Jane Doe's 1 through X; all for acts
 committed as Arizona State officials but for
 the resulting personal (not State) liabilities;
 and attorney Mark Dangerfield for acts in his
 past representation of the Defendants,

Ref 2
 Defendants.

) Case No.: _____
) Case Filed: January 11, 2022
) Assigned to Honorable Judge: _____
) COMPAINT FOR CIVIL LIABILITIES FROM THE
) BELOW CAUSES OF ACTION:
) 1.) VIOLATIONS OF THE 14TH
) AMENDMENT OF THE US CONSTITUTION FOR
) DUE PROCESS
) 2.) VIOLATIONS OF THE 14TH
) AMENDMENT FOR EQUAL PROTECTION
) 3.) VIOLATIONS OF 42 USC SEC 1983
) 4.) VIOLATIONS OF RACKETEER INFLUENCED
) AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS (RICO) 18 USC
) SEC 1961
) 5.) CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT RACKETEERING
) ACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 USC SEC 1961
) 6.) OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE 18 USC Sec 1503
) 7.) FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT
) 8.) FRAUD AND OTHER DECEPTIVE ACTS ON
) THE COURT
) TRIAL BY JURY REQUESTED *Ref 7*

OPENING COMMENTS BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS: Defendants have used the power/credibility of the Attorney General's Office and their cleverness to lead me on a wild geese chase as I sought Justice for injuries by their criminal acts when they "exonerated" the Snell Parties (Snell's and Defendants' criminal acts are documented by AGO records). Defendants concealed records; refused records requests; denied records existed; fired active investigators; threatened witnesses; forged records to stop restitution I was receiving; Manufactured Evidence; dismissed completed criminal cases against already convicted criminals (who were to testify against the Snell Parties); committed repeated Frauds and other deceptive acts on the Court(s); and hid their corrupt and criminal acts behind/abused the 11th Amendment for State Sovereignty...*all to exonerate the Snell Parties for their criminal acts and to cover Defendants' own tracks, left from the acts they committed exonerating the Snell Parties.*

Most shocking is that Defendant Lopez as Sol Gen, using Manufactured Evidence, swore to the Arizona Supreme Court that Defendant Ahler was Screened (Sec's IIC-2/3). Lopez then lied again when he swore that Ahler was not "involved." These claims are lies, as Ex's 13, 14, 15, 17, 25-31 and 35 document Defendants' criminal acts... acts which included Ahler, as they exonerated the Snell Parties. With the foundation of these first two lies, Lopez was then able to swear to an even larger lie (Ex 51): the AGO simply made the "decision to decline" charging the Snell Parties. Defendants, building on this fraudulent foundation, covered their tracks, and used such as defenses.

Please see Factual Allegations for Voiding Res judicata and Statutes of Limitation as Sec II. *Ref 6*

Between Defendant Lopez's 3 Major Frauds on the Arizona Supreme Court and the miscellaneous frauds he

E.) Defendants stopped seizing and liquidating the assets of criminal defendants, and paying those proceeds to me as Restitution, as *per* the Asset Seizure Warrant described above (Ex 1) (see Sec IIC-1j);

F.) After bullets C and E here, I could no longer afford an attorney (Defendants knew my finances, or rather lack of, so cutting off my receiving Restitution was an obvious effort to suffocate my ability to retain counsel and continue my efforts (I have lived as a vagabond since, while pursuing Justice), as they were concerned I might eventually uncover what they had done (and they were right...as I have uncovered what they did) (see Sec IIC-1j);

G.) Defendants actually Manufactured Evidence, and then used it in the Arizona Supreme Court, to then use that fraudulently won “victory” in succeeding defenses against me/my Complaints (see Sec IIC);

H.) Defendants closed the Snell Case (Ex 15), although Dubree had pled guilty and signed a Plea Agreement and Esposito and had been charged for Conspiring to Commit Fraud Schemes with the Snell Parties (see this record/forgery of the Ending/Closing the Snell Case in IIC-1f);

I.) Defendants closed by forgery the Victorville Case (Ex 18) and the Rubble Case (Ex 19) (both ready for the Grand Jury). (The Snell Case and the Victorville Case [an \$8.5m fraud], my two largest sources of restitution.);

J.) Defendants dismissed cases of other admitted/convicted felons (to prevent those felons testifying against the Snell Parties [e.g., Ex 20 pg 2, at the felt-marker dots] [see detail for Defendants’ closing cases to further exonerate the Snell Parties and further injure me in Supporting Acts Sec II-I Par 409 bullets 6-9 and 19-23]);

K.) Defendant Brnovich will prevent my Serving my first Complaint on his officers, by concealing not only their home addresses, but their identities as a whole; and not allowing them being Served at the AGO (Ex’ 21-24), which left me with only the State to pursue and the 11th Amendment to block my efforts; and etc, etc, which *see*.

51. *This is an old story of public corruption: the well connected were owed a favor, and they called it in.*

IIA. THIS COMPLAINT BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS FOR VOIDING RES JUDICATA AND STATUTES OF LIMITATION BY DEFENDANTS’ FRAUDS ON THE COURT(S); AND DEFENSES OF ONE FRAUDULENTLY DEFENDED CASE BEING USED AS THE NEXT FRAUDULENT DEFENSE
52. Introduction: Defendants committed countless “General Acts Voiding *Res judicata* and Statutes of Limitation”

(“General Acts” [Sec IIB]), and Defendants committed countless “Case Specific Acts Voiding *Res Judicata* and Statutes of Limitation” (“Case Specific Acts” [Sec IID]); which *see* a discussion of and examples of each below.

53. *Ten of eleven Defendants have never been Served* (only Defendant Brnovich has been Served), in large part, as Brnovich both does not allow a licensed process server (or any one else) serving AGO officers at the AGO offices (Ex’s 21-24), and he (Brnovich) *hides not only their home addresses, but their identities in total.*

54. *None of the Defendants have ever had to answer* for their documented corrupt and criminal acts.

55. My past Complaints have been Dismissed by Defendants’ one abused use of the 11th Amendment for State Immunity, or another...none of my Complaints have been judged on their merits (see Sec’s IID-G).

56. My most recent Complaint (CV-21-01391-PHX-MTM) was dismissed for the 11th Amendment, without reviewing my factual allegations, including my claims as to who was liable. Then, rather than consider Defendant’s (singularly Brnovich) Motion to Dismiss based on accepting my factual allegations as true, that Court accepted/quoted Defendants’ claims as to the supposed facts of *Res judicata*, saying nothing about my allegations.

2013-1134, known as the Emery Rubble Case (she was also 2nd most active agent on all my cases);

16.) Defendants demoted the other/second Assistant Chief of Special Investigations, Dr. Charles Loftus (and the third agent who worked on my cases), and Dr. Loftus was told it would be best if he moved on;

17.) Defendants demoted SA Mike Edwards, the fourth agent who worked on my cases, and he was transferred out of the Special Investigations Section;

18.) Defendants told and threatened the fired, demoted and transferred Agents, with being sued and put on the Brady List if they were to talk about my cases publicly (e.g., **Ex. 16** Par 153);

19.) Defendants dismissed two case of mine against Michael Martin (**Ex 20**, see the series of black dots on pg 2, at 1/12/17): CR2015-002486-001; CR2014-001649-001; Martin, as the former President of several of my companies, was the “ringleader” of the “crime family” that had formed within my companies, involving several employees, as is now obvious;

20.) Defendants dismissed a case of mine against Michael Groh: CR2014-001649-005 (**Ex 20**, see the series of black dots on pg 2, at 1/12/17); Groh had pled guilty and signed his Plea Agreement, which included his testifying in all other cases, several months earlier; Groh was my former Chief Financial Officer, and knew how the “Martin Crime Family” had moved my funds; assets; and businesses from my companies;

21.) Defendants dismissed a case of mine against Pamela Johnson CR2014-001649-003 (**Ex 20**, see the series of black dots on pg 2, at 1/12/17); she had agreed to “roll-over;” Johnson was my Controller (under Groh);

22.) Defendants dismissed a case of mine against Scott Hesse: CR2015-006239-001 (**Ex 20**, see the black dot on pg 2, at 12/14/16); his Plea Agreement had been signed, which included his testifying in the Snell Case, and all other cases, and paying restitution to me; Hesse was a Senior Vice-President of several of my companies;

23.) Defendants dismissed a case of mine against Marc Stricker: Criminal Report P0022015000920; his Plea Agreement was complete and ready for signature (this would have included Stricker testifying in the Snell Case, and all other cases, and paying restitution) (Woods' Aff **Ex 7** at Par's 58; 143; 144; 150; 153; 167; 168d; 169; 198); Stricker was a Senior Vice-President of several of my companies;

24.) Over 100 interviews had been conducted in the above investigations; dozens of search warrants had been executed; and over 10 terabytes of evidence collected; over a 4 year period, by several Special Agents;

25.) There were additional investigations underway, that were also closed;

26.) Defendants Manufactured evidence... (per Sec II);

27.) Defendants recently refused to investigate the documented criminal acts of ...themselves (I recently reported their acts to the AGO);

28.) There is much more to tell, but I believe it is clear: Defendants were getting rid of anyone and anything, that could add to the Snell & Wilmer Case being completed.

409. *This is certainly an example of the cover-up having become worse than the acts the cover-up was intended to cover.*

III. SUMMARY OF FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS: RES JUDICATA AND STATUTES OF LIMITATION

410. Defendants' countless Frauds and deceptions on the Courts, and other acts causing false Judgments, as I alleged, detailed, and gave real proof of, and their documented criminal acts (“documented” by their own records), have caused a domino effect of voiding Defendants' past defenses to my efforts for Justice/my Complaints.

411. Defendants began their fraudulent efforts by first forging AGO records; then concealing records; then filing a fraud-filled Response with the Arizona Supreme Court...to add that "victory" to their foundation of frauds for defenses then, and the future (these acts were a part of exonerating the Snell Parties and covering their own tracks).

412. Because fraud/other deceptive acts are exceptions to *Res judicata*, it is voided here. And then, actually, my Complaints and Defendants' defenses to date are nonexistent/did not occur (e.g., *Riehle v Margolies*).

413. Fraud and other deceptive acts on the Court has no Statutes of Limitation (e.g., *Valerio v Cascade Corp*).

414. Because Fraud and other deceptive acts on the Courts have no Statute of Limitation, and each of Defendants' succeeding defenses was built on previous frauds, none of Defendants' defenses can be seen as yet on the record.

415. *Defendants using earlier frauds as later defenses is not allowable...not since Booth v Lord Warrington (1694-1695) has an English Court; an American Colonial Court; or a US Court, accepted a defendant pleading a defense based on his/her/their own fraud.*

from pg 9

416. Defendants have no claim to *Res judicata* or Statutes of Limitation.

III. FURTHER TO THIS COMPLAINT, BY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

417. Plaintiff further alleges the following:

418. Rule 4.1 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure is for Service. This Rule forcefully mandates the Court's goal of defendants readily accepting Service, to, in part, eliminate the games played to evade Service. In fact, Rule 4.1 requires that Courts impose all costs for Service on a defendant who is unwilling to Waiv[ing] Service. The Court has included a legal obligation for costs for potential defendants in Rule 4.1: "...has a duty to avoid unnecessary expense in serving the summons." The Federal Rule for Service is essentially the same.

419. The Arizona Agency Handbook (the State's Employee Manual, authored by Defendant Brnovich) reflects the Court's mandate and goals in Rule 4.1, stating that officers or employees should (normally) Waive Service, even quoting Rule 4.1 to emphasize that: "In fact, there is a "duty to avoid unnecessary costs" of Service:

"13.2.3 Waiver of Service. The State and state entities (such as agencies, boards, commissions or departments) as well as individual state officers or employees may (and normally should) waive personal service of process if the plaintiff makes a proper request under Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 4.1(c). In fact, there is "a duty to avoid unnecessary costs of serving the summons." Ariz. R. Civ. P. 4.1(c)(2)." (Underline by Plaintiff.)

420. Further to Service in the Agency Handbook, Brnovich have authored that "only by one of three methods" of Service is acceptable by him for one of his officers or employees to be Served:

"13.2.2.3 Personal Service of Summons and Complaint on an Individual. Personal service on individual state officers or employees can be accomplished only by one of three methods: (1) by delivering the necessary documents to the named individual; (2) by leaving the documents at the individual's home with a person who both lives there and is of suitable age and discretion; or (3) by delivering the documents to an agent whom the individual has authorized to receive them. Ariz. R. Civ. P. 4.1(d)." (Underline and bold numbers by Plaintiff.)

1 through 470 above, the allegations therein as being common to all Causes of Action.
472. For the above stated reasons, and more that will be forthcoming, Plaintiff prays the Court will award damages against Defendants as sought by the Plaintiff.

CAUSES OF ACTION, AND DAMAGES REQUESTED

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF THE 14TH AMENDMENTS FOR DUE PROCESS

473. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations set forth from OPENING COMMENTS BY FACTUAL

ALLEGATIONS on pages 1/2 and paragraphs 1 through 472, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

474. Defendants as listed above, and John and Jane Doe's as may be uncovered in discovery, have caused the Plaintiff material damages by virtue of their repeated errant acts as State officials and/or employees of the State, and in representation of various parties whom Plaintiff has taken legal action against, errant acts which they committed as individuals outside of their official capacities, and so are personally liable for (not the State), by *PLA* *PLA*
violating my 14th Amendment rights to Due Process, both Substantive and Procedural. Defendants, while having no legitimate reason to do so, repeatedly committed these acts, individually, and in concert with one another.

475. As a direct and proximate result of the acts herein alleged, Defendants have, and each of them, are personally (not the State), jointly and severally liable to the Plaintiff, for each of the wrongful acts herein alleged. *Ref 5*

476. By virtue of the foregoing, and the acts herein alleged, the Plaintiff prays that this Court award the Plaintiff actual damages; punitive damages; damages to his person; compensatory damages, all of which have not yet been fully ascertained but are believed to be well in excess of \$628 million (this is the amount the AGO was seeking to recuperate on my behalf under the just previous Attorney General, AG Tom Horne, an amount based upon my personal financial statement showing a net worth of this amount just before Defendants committed various acts as described in this Complaint), plus the highest rate of interest under Arizona Law, pre and post Judgment. Plaintiff will request leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to allege the full amount of damages incurred by Defendants when the same has been fully ascertained. As the acts which created this liability were done with an evil mind, Plaintiff asks for treble damages.

477. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in engaging in the wrongful conduct and have herein alleged, Defendants, and each of them, have been guilty of oppression, fraud and malice, acted in conscious disregard of the rights of the Plaintiff, entitling the Plaintiff to an award of damages as described above, sufficient to punish and make an example of Defendants and their fellow conspirators and Co-Defendants, of them. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that as to each Defendant which and each is a

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 7

U.S. District Court
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA (Phoenix Division)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:22-cv-00062-GMS

Graven v. Brnovich et al
Assigned to: Chief Judge G Murray Snow
Demand: \$9,999,000
Related Cases: 2:16-cv-01249-GMS
2:19-cv-04586-SPL
2:21-cv-01391-MTM

Date Filed: 01/12/2022
Date Terminated: 12/07/2022
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights:
Other
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Case in other court: Ninth Circuit, 22-15456 -
Mandate 05/12/22
- Ninth Circuit, 22-16909

Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Plaintiff

William A Graven
Named as Will

represented by **William A Graven**
2700 S. Woodlands Village Blvd.
Ste. 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-890-8825
Email: will@willgraven.com
PRO SE

Never before seen
title!

V.

Defendant

Mark Brnovich
for acts as Attorney General

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
Gallagher & Kennedy PA
2575 E Camelback Rd., Ste. 810
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225
602-530-8054
Fax: 602-530-8500
Email:
mark.dangerfield@gknet.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Ref 2: no title after (which see a title
forged at the Ninth)

Ref 3: qualifier: "for
acts as"

Mark Andrew Fuller
Gallagher & Kennedy PA
2575 E Camelback Rd., Ste. 810
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225
602-530-8000

Email: maf@gknet.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Michael Bailey
for acts as Asst AG and Chief of Staff

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Don Conrad
for acts as Chief of the Criminal Division

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Paul Ahler
for acts as Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal Division Chief

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Joe Waters
for acts Asst AG

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Lisa Rodriguez
for acts as Criminal Division
Administrator

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Mark Perkovich
for acts as Chief of Special
Investigations

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Zora Manjencich
for acts as Asst Criminal Division
Chief and FSP Section Chief
Counsel

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

John Lopez
for Acts as Solicitor General

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Unknown Parties

named as John Does I through X
and Jane Does I through X for all
acts committed as Arizona State
officials but for the resulting
personal (not State) liabilities

✓ Ref 4

Defendant

Mark Dangerfield
for acts in his past
representation of the Defendants

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Jennifer Perkins
for acts as Asst Solicitor General

represented by **Mark C Dangerfield**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mark Andrew Fuller
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

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, for **Graven v Snow, et al** (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 8

No. _____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE: WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, PETITIONER

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS
TO THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: At the suggestion of an Asst. Clerk in my Case No. 23-7130 (for a Mandamus to the Ninth), I submitted a Rule 15.8 Supplemental Brief, which the Clerk's Office received on May 16. I offered to have my Conference delayed from May 30, due to the late arrival of my Brief. I waited for my Brief to be Docketed; distributed; and considered, at Conference. None of that happened. So, the Court, without all the information it should have had, Denied my Petition. The Clerk of Court had "sandbagged" my Brief; including, he did not return either of my Briefs, to possibly be corrected (one version sent in error on May 8, but which was pulled from circulation by an Asst. Clerk; and one to be Docketed); nor did he notice me, that he had allegedly "disqualified" my Brief, supposedly on May 13... until July 26... 2 months after my Conference! Mr. Harris sat on my Brief for as long as he could, first to get passed Conference, then as he hoped I would go away. He didn't explain himself until I tried to re-file my Brief, on July 16, to support my Petition for Rehearing. I filed an Application to have the Clerk of Court Removed from my Case, and I filed a Motion to Vacate the Court having Denied my Mandamus, but "someone" early Denied my Rehearing, before acting on either, further concealing the Clerk's errant acts.

It appears the Clerk also delayed Docketing my Application to Remove him, and my Motion to Vacate, to then quickly post (ahead of any standard schedule for such) that my Rehearing was Denied, to then return both my sandbagged Application and Motion (allegedly, because my Rehearing was Denied), for his own benefit/protection.

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

CONCLUSION

The Clerk's Office sandbagged my Petition for a Mandamus, by manipulating standard processes, for my Supplemental Brief (to prevent it from being considered by the Justices, and/or made public); for my Application to Remove the Clerk; and my Motion to Vacate.

They did this because my Brief exposes my Appeal Panel of 3 GOP Judges at the Ninth Circuit acting corruptly to Affirm a GOP District Court Chief Judge; who had errantly acted to protect several of his fellow Arizona GOP Power Elites...and the Clerk of the Supreme Court either himself, and/or with someone else, decided to evade this reality.

This is a reality that would have forced the Justices to grant my Petition.

The Clerk of Court acted to protect the powers at be, at the cost of my right to Justice.

The Clerk of Court did this, in part, by not notifying me there were any alleged faults in my Brief, as they did not want to alert me to the fact that they were subverting my Petition, and they did not want me to expect that I would have had the opportunity to correct my Brief, to resubmit it, as I was allowed/encouraged to do with the 8 other pleadings the Clerk's Office told me needed correcting (i.e., the Clerk's Office "spoon-fed" me).

That is why Clerk of Court Harris did not return either my May 8 Brief version/copies or my May 15 version/copies, as is the standard process for the Clerk's Office, as returning them would have been a huge red flag that a fraud on the Court was in process.

Why didn't Mr. Harris react as quickly on May 8 and May 15... as he did on every other pleading, including my July 16 attempt to again file my Brief? ***He was sandbagging me.***

In spite of numerous calls between myself and Asst. Clerk Jimenez (see numerous phone log Appendix/Exhibits throughout, discussing my June 3 Petition for Reconsideration; my June 20 Petition for Rehearing; and my July 1 Petition for Rehearing; and other matters...over a 2 ½ month period, from May 8 through July 26...the Clerk's Office did not say a word about my Brief having been disqualified on May 13, and would only say: "There is a copy in the file." **This is sandbagging.**

My Brief; my Application to Remove; and my Motion to Vacate; need to be Docketed for my just filed Petition for Certiorari to be fairly, and justly, considered.

Respectfully,



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

Date: September 16, 2024

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, 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 [which see my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 9

FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DEC 15 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, Named as Will,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

Ref 1

MARK BRNOVICH, Attorney General,
Attorney General; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 22-16909

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-00062-GMS

MEMORANDUM

*"for acts as
deleted*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
G. Murray Snow, District Judge, Presiding

Ref 2
Submitted December 12, 2023**

Before: WALLACE, LEE, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

William A. Graven appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b) for lack of standing. *Shulman v. Kaplan*, 58 F.4th 404, 407 (9th

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Cir. 2023). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Graven's action because Graven failed to allege facts sufficient to demonstrate Article III standing. *See Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (setting forth requirements for constitutional standing); *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) ("[A] private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or nonprosecution of another.").

We reject as without merit Graven's contention that the district court was biased against him.

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 10

Appendix 10:1-8: See my 8 pleadings filed in the Appeals Court, Case No 22-16909, asking about the forgeries, including the deletion of “*for acts as,*” and other matters related to the forgeries, to their Docket and various Entries:

- 1.) My Motion for Clarification, Dkt No 23;
- 2.) My request to the Appeals Court to have the Clerk correct the Docket, Dkt No 47;
- 3.) My Emergency Motion to have the Appeals Court recognize the corruption seen in the Docket forgeries, Dkt No 48;
- 4.) My Reply to Appellees’ non-response Re Dkt No 48, Dkt No 49;
- 5.) My Motion for Default Judgment due to fraud on the Court (i.e., the forgeries addressed earlier), Dkt No 52;
- 6.) My Motion for a Hearing Re the described forgeries, Dkt No 53;
- 7.) My 2nd Motion for Default Judgment due the described forgeries, Dkt No 55; and
- 8.) My Correspondence with the Court re the above outstanding 7 pleadings re the described forgeries, Dkt No 84;

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 11

Appendix 11:1-6: See my 6 pleadings filed in the Appeals Court, Case No 22-16909, asking about their not having ruled on the 2nd Order On-Appeal:

- 1.) my Correspondence to the Court: Does this Court realize Re Defendant/Appellee Dangerfield Dismissal is yet outstanding? CoA Case No 22-16909, CoA Dkt No 85;
- 2.) my Motion for Summary Reversal of Defendant/Appellee Dangerfield's yet outstanding Order of Dismissal, CoA Case No 22-16909, Dkt No 86;
- 3.) my Correspondence to the Court: The longer the Court takes.. CoA Case No 16909, Dkt No 88;
- 4.) my Correspondence to the Court: When will the Court rule on Dangerfield's yet outstanding Dismissal, CoA Case No 16909, Dkt No 92;
- 5.) my Correspondence with Chief Judge Murguia regarding Defendant/Appellee Dangerfield's yet outstanding Dismissal, CoA No 16909, Dkt No 93;
- 6.) my Correspondence with Chief Judge Murguia regarding the Court's Mandate (which *see* below as Appendix S) for 1st Order/ Group Dismissal has been Received...What about Dismissal the 2nd Order/Group for Dangerfield? CoA Case No 16909, Dkt No 95.

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 12

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**

**PETITIONER'S RULE 15.8 SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF TO MY
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

Synopsis: “Someone” at the Appeals Court forged my lead, individually named Defendant to *Attorney General, Attorney General* (“AG, AG”). **Why?** This is a title not used in District Court, not by me, not by Defendant(s), nor the Judge. I filed 8 pleadings questioning this forgery (Apndx I), the Court ignored me for my Panel to Affirm 1 of 2 Orders of Dismissal for 2 different Groups of Defendants: First, as if I had sued my Defendant as the AGO, so they cited *Lujan*, ruling I had no standing to do so (*I guess their forging AG, AG, made him the AGO?*); Secondly, as if I had sued him as the Attorney General (*per AG, AG*), citing *Linda RS*, ruling I had no rights by his “nonprosecution” (See Q/A 3 for the fraudulent root of “nonprosecution”). Not as Defendant(s) nor Appellee(s) did he/they claim to be/defend being the AG/AGO/State, or, having Sovereign Immunity. **Why not?** (Not even after the Court gifted them the AGO/AG/Immunity by AG, AG! **Why not?** Nor did the Court Affirm by Immunity. **Why not?**) My Judge overlooked his 2 Orders of Dismissal, for 2 Groups of Defendants, only giving my Panel instructions how to Affirm the 1st Group, which is all they Affirmed (just the 1st Group), making clear: The Panel had not read the 2 Orders; nor even seen that the 2 Orders for 2 Groups of Defendants were argued On-Appeal, by both sides (i.e., the Panel could not have missed there were 2 Orders of Dismissal issued, and that the 2 Orders were argued On-Appeal, if they had read the 2 Orders/any Appeal documents).

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

CONCLUSION

I should have included a 3rd “Question(s) Presented” to my Petition:


Question-3: Can an Appeals Court Clerk of Court, or Circuit Judge, even the Chief Judge for a Circuit; or a District Court Clerk of Court, or District Court Judge, or even the Chief Judge for a District; edit (forge), the named Appellees, or named Defendants (and without explanation), to suit their (a Circuit Panel’s) needs to Affirm a lower Court; or to suit a District Court’s needs, to issue an Order of Dismissal?

That is what happened here...and in my District Court Judge’s instructing my Panel how to best Affirm him, in their guilt ridden haste to Affirm, they carelessly, and overtly, erred...overlooking that he (the District Court Judge) had issued 2 Orders of Dismissal, for 2 Groups of Defendants; that I hadAppealed his 2 Orders; that both Orders had been argued On-Appeal, by both sides; and so that error caused my Panel to only Affirm the 1st Order/Group of Defendants, proving the Panel had not read the 2 Orders of Dismissal; nor read (seen?) that the 2 Orders were argued On-Appeal.

I pray the Court will Order that a New Party (i.e., someone other than the Ninth Circuit) review these matters; and Order that a Hearing be held by that New Party; so that I can finally have my day in Court/an opportunity to be heard.

Thanking the Supreme Court in advance for adjudicating the matters herein.

Respectfully submitted,


William “Will” A. Graven, Petitioner

Date: May 15, 2024

No. 24-_____

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*


PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 13



**U.S. District Court
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA (Phoenix Division)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:24-cv-00549-ASB**

Graven v. Snow et al
Assigned to: Magistrate Judge Alison S Bachus
Demand: \$9,999,000
Related Cases: 2:11-cv-01228-SRB
2:16-cv-01249-GMS
2:19-cv-04586-SPJ
2:21-cv-01391-MTM
2:22-cv-00062-GMS
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Plaintiff

17

Defendant

G Murray Snow
being sued as an individual and as a federal

Defendant

Family in mind, being sued as an *inadmissible witness*.

represented by **William A Graven**
2700 S Woodland Village Blvd., Ste. 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-890-8825
PRO SE

Ref 9
Ref 6
Date Filed: 03/15/2024
Jury Demand: None
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant



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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the

William "Will" A. Graven

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Snow et al

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. | **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

G. Murray Snow

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Will Graven
2700 S. Woodlands Village, Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

William "Will" A. Graves

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Spouse et al

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. | **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Mary H. Marguia

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

*Will Graves
2700 S. Woodlands, Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001*

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the

William "Will" A. Grawey

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Show et al

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

CV24-00549-PHX-ASB

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

16. (Defendant's name and address)
John C. Wallace

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

whose name and address are:
WILL GRAY
2700 S. Woodlands Village; suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

William W. A. Garry

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Civil Action No.

CV24-00549-PHX-ASB

Snow et al

Defendant(s)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Kenneth K. Lee

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

William Garry
2700 S. Woodlands Village, Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

William "Will" A. Graves

Plaintiff(s)

v.

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

CV24-00549-PHX-ASB

Snow et al

Defendant(s)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

Patrick V. Bimontay

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Will Graves
2700 E. Woodland Village; Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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, for *Graven v Snow, et al* (my 3rd recent Mandamus)*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Synopsis: As I stated (*predicted?*) in my Petition for a Mandamus filed here on 3/28/24 (No.: 24-7130 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Courts would take your Denying my Petition (which you did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning the use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Court/Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/ruling; and your approval/condoning that Court's can simply refuse to rule when they do not wish, and/or it is not in a Court/Judge's best interest/anything goes.

I suggested this would lead to Judicial anarchy, and corruption, and here we are: The Ninth Circuit and District Court are acting errantly, having quickly recognized and adopted your approval/condoning forgery/refusal.

Our Courts are quickly becoming the tools/playgrounds of our Judges.

Appendix 15

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
MAR 25 2024	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT	
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY <i>[Signature]</i>	DEPUTY

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, DIV.

In Re: William A. Graven,
 Plaintiff,
 v.

G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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.

) Case No.: **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**
) Case Filed: **March 15, 2024**
) Assigned to Honorable Judge: **Alison S. Bachus**

)
) **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR THE COURT TO**
) **ORDER THE CLERK OF COURT TO**
) **CORRECT CERTAIN ENTRIES/INNOCENT**
) **ERRORS BY THE CLERK MADE ON THE**
) **DOCKET IN THE INITIAL SET-UP OF THIS**
) **CASE**
)
)

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Clerk has innocently (I pray) made several errors in the set-up of the Docket for this Case.

I would appreciate the Court Ordering the Clerk to fix those errors, which include:

Ref 3 1.) At "Jury Demand" on the Docket it says "None".

This is wrong, as seen, in bold letters, at the bottom of this Copy/Paste of my Defendant Header:

"G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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.

TRIAL BY JURY REQUESTED"

I did demand a "Trial by Jury," from the get-go.

Ref 4 2.) After "Jurisdiction" on the Docket it says "US Government Defendant"

This is also wrong...the US Government **is not** a named Defendant, there are only 5 named individuals listed as named Defendants, as can be seen just above in my Defendant Header.

This error baffles me...how could someone list the US Government as a defendant for "...acts with an evil mind (*mens rea*), and with malice." (From my Defendant Header.)

And how could someone list the US Government a defendant for the CAUSES OF ACTION I have alleged?

Such as:

"9.) VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES;
 10.) ABUSE OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITY."

3.) Next error, after each of the 5 individually named Defendants on the Docket, the Clerk added:

“...and as a federal judge.” *Ref 2*

This is also wrong...this is not from my Complaint/Defendant Header, nor any allegations in my Complaint.

Again, as seen in my Defendant Header above, it clearly says:

Ref 1 “...being sued as individuals, for acts committed outside of their Judicial capacity, Judicial authority, and Judicial Immunity as Federal Judges, ...” (Bold underline by Plaintiff.)

And again, the acts I am alleging, by my Complaint and by the CAUSES OF ACTION I am alleging, are not acts and CAUSES a Federal Judge (or the United State Government) could commit, as such acts are (as described in my Defendant Header):

“...for acts committed outside of their Judicial capacity, Judicial authority, and Judicial Immunity...”

I did not sue any Federal Judges...I sued individuals who committed errant acts, thereby losing any “job protection” they may have been eligible for (i.e., in committing the alleged acts, job protections are lost).

Stating the obvious: *It is not* the Clerk’s job to edit my Complaint/allegations/Defendants.

And the Clerk is restricted from providing legal assistance to any/all litigants.

II. MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ORDER THE CLERK TO CORRECT THE ABOVE DESCRIBED ERRORS

I hereby Motion the Court to Order the Clerk to make the following corrections to the Docket:

1.) Remove “None” for Jury Demand, and replace it with “Yes” (or however this Court wishes to state a “Jury Demand” in the affirmative, as per my Complaint, not the Clerk);

2.) Remove “US Government as Defendant” and replace it with “Federal Question” (or however this Court wishes to state the Federal Question issues I have alleged, against the named individuals, as per my Complaint, not the Clerk);


3.) Remove “...and as a federal judge” after each individually named Defendant (there is a total of 5 individually named Defendants), and return these individuals to how they are listed in my Defendant Header, as per my Complaint, not the Clerk.

III. CONCLUSION

Apparently I should not be surprised that “*Someone*” would attempt to forge the Docket (just look at why I am suing these individuals), in such a way as to preemptively create the basis for the Defendants to file a motion to dismiss for my allegedly not having followed the requirements of the Federal Tort Claims Act; that the Defendants have Judicial Immunity; and/or some other clever trap/fraud; etc (which I will now attempt to be on-guard for).

Thanking the Court in advance for considering my Motion.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of March 2024, by:


Plaintiff Will Graven

The original of this Motion was filed with the Clerk of District Court this 25th day of March 2024
Defendants to be Served as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 16

CM ECF Civil ▾ Criminal ▾ Query Reports ▾ Utilities ▾ Search Help Log Out

U.S. District Court
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA (Phoenix Division)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB

Ref/

Date Filed: 03/15/2024
Date Terminated: 04/01/2024

Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other

Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

Graven v. Snow et al
Assigned to: Senior Judge Stephen M McNamee
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Alison S Bachus
Demand: \$9,999,000
Related Cases: 2:11-cv-01228-SRB
2:16-cv-01249-GMS
2:19-cv-04586-SPL
2:21-cv-01391-MTM
2:22-cv-00062-GMS

Case in other court: Ninth Circuit, 24-03420
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Plaintiff

William A Graven

represented by William A Graven
2700 S Woodland Village Blvd., Ste. 300-251

Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-890-8825
Email: will@willgraven.com

PRO SE

v.

Defendant

G Murray Snow

being sued as an individual and as a federal judge

Defendant

Mary H Murguia

being sued as an individual and as a federal judge

CM ECF Civil ▾ Criminal ▾ Query Reports ▾ Utilities ▾ Search Help Log Out

Mary H Murguia
being sued as an individual and as a federal judge

Defendant

John C Wallace
being sued as an individual and as a federal judge

Defendant

Kenneth K Lee
being sued as an individual and as a federal judge

Defendant

Patrick J Bumatay
being sued as an individual and as a federal judge*No complaint docketed*

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
03/15/2024	1	COMPLAINT filed by William A Graven. (Attachments: # 1 exhibits part 1, # 2 exhibits part 2, # 3 exhibits part 3, # 4 exhibits part 4, # 5 exhibits part 5, # 6 exhibits part 6, # 7 exhibits part 7 of 7, # 8 Civil Cover Sheet)(BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)
03/15/2024	2	SUMMONS Submitted by William A Graven. (BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)
03/15/2024	3	This case has been assigned to the Honorable Alison S. Bachus. All future pleadings or documents should bear the correct case number: CV24-00549-PHX-ASB. Magistrate Election form attached. (Attachments: # 1 instructions)(BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)
03/15/2024	4	NOTICE TO SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT re informational documents attached: (1) Notice to Self-Represented Litigant, (2) Federal Court Self-Service Clinic Flyer, (3) Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, and (4) Notice and Request re Electronic Noticing. (BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)
03/15/2024	5	MINUTE ORDER: If Plaintiff fails to submit the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis within 30 days, this action will be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice. (BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)
03/25/2024	6	REQUEST BY NON-PRISONER PRO SE PARTY FOR ELECTRONIC NOTICING filed by William A Graven. Pro se parties must promptly notify the Clerks Office, in writing, if there is a change in designated e-mail address or mailing address. (BAS) (Entered: 03/25/2024)
03/25/2024	8	Agreement to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction. Party agrees to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction. This is a TEXT ENTRY ONLY. There is no PDF document associated with this entry. (MAP) (Entered: 03/26/2024)
03/25/2024	9	MOTION for the Court to Order the Clerk to Correct Entries and Errors by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

CM/ECF Civil ▾ Criminal ▾

Query Reports ▾ Utilities ▾

Search Help Log Out

(Attachments: # 1 instructions)(BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)

03/15/2024 4 NOTICE TO SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT re informational documents attached: (1) Notice to Self-Represented Litigant, (2) Federal Court Self-Service Clinic Flyer, (3) Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, and (4) Notice and Request re Electronic Noticing. (BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)

03/15/2024 5 MINUTE ORDER: If Plaintiff fails to submit the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis within 30 days, this action will be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice. (BAS) (Entered: 03/15/2024)

03/25/2024 6 REQUEST BY NON-PRISONER PRO SE PARTY FOR ELECTRONIC NOTICING filed by William A Graven. Pro se parties must promptly notify the Clerks Office, in writing, if there is a change in designated e-mail address or mailing address. (BAS) (Entered: 03/25/2024)

03/25/2024 8 Agreement to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction. Party agrees to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction. This is a TEXT ENTRY ONLY. There is no PDF document associated with this entry. (MAP) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

03/25/2024 9 MOTION for the Court to Order the Clerk to Correct Entries and Errors by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

03/25/2024 10 MOTION for the US Marshals to Perform Service by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

03/25/2024 11 MOTION to Allow Electronic Filing by a Party Appearing Without an Attorney by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

03/25/2024 12 NOTICE re: Correspondence with the Court by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 03/26/2024)

04/01/2024 13 ORDER that Plaintiff's Complaint and this action are dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). FURTHER ORDERED denying as moot 9 Plaintiff's Motion for the Court to Order the Clerk to Correct Entries and Errors; 10 Motion for the US Marshals to Perform Service; and 11 Motion to Allow Electronic Filing. Signed by Senior Judge Stephen M McNamee on 4/1/24. (MAP) (Entered: 04/01/2024)

05/29/2024 14 NOTICE OF APPEAL to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals re: 13 Order by William A Graven. (DXD) (Entered: 05/30/2024)

PACER Service Center

Transaction Receipt

09/06/2024 11:43:03

PACER Login:	williamgraven	Client Code:	
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	2:24-cv-00549-SMM
Billable Pages:	3	Cost:	0.30

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, 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 [which see my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 17

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, DIV.

In Re: William A. Graven,
Plaintiff,

v.

G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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.

) Case No.: **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**

) Case Filed: **March 15, 2024**

) Assigned to Honorable Judge: **Alison S. Bachus**

) **PLAINTIFF'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE
COURT: WHILE MY EXHIBITS/SUMMONS/
COVER SHEET HAVE ALL BEEN POSTED,
MY COMPLAINT HAS NOT...WHY NOT?**

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND


In reviewing my Docket, and downloading my Complaint, Exhibits, SUMMONS, and Cover Sheet, I found: my Exhibits/SUMMONS/Cover Sheet have all been posted, but my Complaint has not.

May I ask the Court to check with the Clerk of Court on this question? (I have a Conformed copy of my Complaint, should the Clerk have misplaced the 2 Copies I filed with the Clerk).


II. CONCLUSION

Once again, I am reminded of the "nature" of the parties I am up against.

Thanking the Court in advance for considering this Correspondence.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of March 2024, by:  In Pro Se
Plaintiff Will Graven

The original of this Correspondence was filed with the Clerk of District Court this 25th day of March, 2024
Defendants to be Served as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
MAR 25 2024	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY 	DEPUTY

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 18

1
2
3
4
5
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
7
8

9 William A Graven,

No. CV-24-00549-PHX-ASB

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 v.

12 G Murray Snow, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14
15 The Court has reviewed the docket in this matter.¹ Plaintiff William Graven filed
16 this action on March 15, 2024 against District of Arizona Chief Judge G. Murray Snow,
17 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia, and Ninth Circuit Court of
18 Appeals Circuit Judges John C. Wallace, Kenneth K. Lee, and Patrick J. Bumatay “for

19 ¹ This Order is issued pursuant to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part:

20 When a United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been
21 assigned pursuant to Local Rule 3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be
22 appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1)
due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent
to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge,

23 IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge will prepare a Report and
24 Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED designating the following District Court
26 Judges to review and, if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on
my behalf:

27 Phoenix/Prescott: Senior United States District Judge Stephen M. McNamee.

...

28 Because this action is frivolous and the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, this Court
finds a Report and Recommendation is unnecessary.

1 errant acts committed outside of their Judicial capacity, Judicial authority, and Judicial
 2 Immunity, as Federal Judges, for having committed the alleged acts with an evil mind
 3 (*mens rea*), and with malice[.]” (Doc. 1 at 15 ¶ 93.) Plaintiff challenges Chief Judge
 4 Snow’s dismissal of a prior civil action, CV-22-0062-PHX-GMS, and the Ninth Circuit’s
 5 affirmation of that dismissal. Plaintiff alleges the Judges’ actions impinge upon Plaintiff’s
 6 due process and equal protection rights and also violate Title 18 of the United States Code,
 7 the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and constitute an abuse of judicial immunity.
 8 Upon review of the Complaint (Doc. 1), the Court will dismiss it and this action with
 9 prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 10 12(b)(1).

11 In a December 7, 2022 Order in CV-22-0062-PHX-GMS, the Court noted Plaintiff
 12 had filed five lawsuits contending “his legal rights were infringed when the office of the
 13 Arizona Attorney General (‘AGO’) declined to indict Snell & Wilmer back in 2015 for
 14 what [Plaintiff] believes to be complicity in the failure of a former business in which he
 15 had an interest—ABS Enterprises (‘ABS’).” *Graven v. Brnovich*, No. 2:22-cv-0062-PHX-
 16 GMS, 2022 WL 17818554, at *1 (D. Ariz. Dec. 7, 2022), *aff’d*, No. 22-16909, 2023 WL
 17 8676220 (9th Cir. Dec. 15, 2023). The Court dismissed the 2022 action and declared
 18 Plaintiff a vexatious litigant.² *Id.* The instant lawsuit now purports that the alleged
 19 conspiracy has extended to the Judge who dismissed his 2022 action and the appellate
 20 judges who affirmed its dismissal.

21 The instant Complaint is similarly vexatious. It expands upon Plaintiff’s previously
 22 dismissed allegations and alleges a criminal conspiracy involving the Judges involved in
 23 adjudicating Plaintiff’s cases and seeks damages “well in excess of \$628 million” (Doc. 1
 24 at 18). These allegations are frivolous.

Ref 1 Judges are absolutely immune from §1983 suits for damages for their judicial acts

26 ² The Vexatious Litigant Order requires Plaintiff to file a Motion for Leave to File if he
 27 wishes to file any new Complaint that relates to any of the Defendants in CV-22-0062-
 28 GMS, or any person or entity currently or previously employed by or affiliated with
 Defendants and that allege damage from a Defendant’s acts or omissions relating to Snell
 & Wilmer (or its individual attorneys), or relating to Plaintiff’s prior involvement with
 ABS.

1 except when they are taken “in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.” *Stump v. Sparkman*,
 2 435 U.S. 349, 356–57 (1978); *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986). An
 3 act is “judicial” when it is a function normally performed by a judge and the parties dealt
 4 with the judge in his or her judicial capacity. *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 362; *Crooks v. Maynard*,
 5 913 F.2d 699, 700 (9th Cir. 1990). This immunity attaches even if the judge is accused of
 6 acting maliciously and corruptly, *Peirson v. Ray*, 386 U.S. 547, 553–54 (1967), or of
 7 making grave errors of law or procedure. *Schucker v. Rockwood*, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th
 8 Cir. 1988); *see also Ammons v. Baldwin*, 705 F.2d 1445, 1446–48 (11th Cir. 1983) (judge
 9 entitled to immunity from a claim that he verbally abused and humiliated plaintiff); *Tanner*
 10 *v. Heise*, 879 F.2d 572, 577–78 (9th Cir. 1989). Plaintiff alleges no facts to support that
 11 any Judge took any action in the “clear absence of all jurisdiction.” Instead, Plaintiff
 12 disagrees with the Judges’ prior rulings and concludes that an adverse ruling is tantamount
 13 to participating in a criminal conspiracy. The Complaint must be dismissed as frivolous.
 14

1 A frivolous complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v.*
 2 *Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). An action may be dismissed as frivolous “where the
 3 defense is complete and obvious from the face of the pleadings.” *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745
 4 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir. 1984), *abrogated on other grounds by Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325.
 5 Such claims include those in which “it is clear that the defendants are immune from suit.”
 6 *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. “A complaint may be dismissed as ‘factually frivolous’ only if
 7 the facts alleged are ‘clearly baseless’ which encompasses allegations that are fanciful,
 8 fantastic and delusional.” *Frost v. Office of Attorney Gen.*, No. 17-cv-04983-JSW, 2018
 9 WL 6704137, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2018) (citing *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25,
 10 33 (1992)). “A federal claim which is so insubstantial as to be patently without merit
 11 cannot serve as the basis for federal jurisdiction.” *Tr. v. Am. Honda Fin. Corp.*, No. 2:16-
 12 cv-1237-ODW-SS, 2016 WL 756461, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2016)
 13 (sua sponte dismissing the complaint after concluding that “the complaint is frivolous,
 14 provides insubstantial support for federal subject matter jurisdiction, and cannot be
 15 amended to state a claim for which relief can be granted”) (citing *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415

1 U.S. 528, 537–38 (1974) (noting that “federal courts are without power to entertain claims
2 otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be
3 absolutely devoid of merit, wholly insubstantial, obviously frivolous, plainly unsubstantial,
4 or no longer open to discussion”); *see also Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir.
5 1999) (noting that “a district court may, at any time, sua sponte, dismiss a complaint for
6 lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil
7 Procedure when the allegations of a complaint are totally implausible, attenuated,
8 unsubstantial, frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion”).


9 The Court finds that Defendants are entitled to absolute judicial immunity and that
10 Plaintiff’s claims against them are frivolous. For these reasons, the Court will exercise its
11 authority to sua sponte dismiss the Complaint and this action for lack of subject
12 matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). *See Neitzke*, 490 U.S.
13 at 327 n.6 (courts lack subject matter jurisdiction to consider “patently insubstantial”
14 complaints).

15 Accordingly,

16 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Complaint and this action are dismissed for lack
17 of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1).

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying as moot Plaintiff’s Motion for the Court
19 to Order the Clerk to Correct Entries and Errors (Doc. 9); Motion for the US Marshals to
20 Perform Service (Doc. 10); and Motion to Allow Electronic Filing (Doc. 11).

21 Dated this 1st day of April, 2024.

22 
23 Honorable Stephen M. McNamee
24 Senior United States District Judge

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 19

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, DIV.

In Re: William A. Graven,
Plaintiff,
v.
G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C.
Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J.
Bumatay; 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.
Case No.: **CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**
Case Filed: March 15, 2024
Assigned to Honorable Judge: Alison S. Bachus
PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

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

II. NOTICE OF APPEAL

I hereby Notice the respected Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that I am Appealing the dismissal of this Complaint, for the Court to review, and reverse.

II. CONCLUSION

Thanking the Court of Appeals in advance for accepting this Notice/Appeal.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of May 2024, by:  , In Pro Se
Plaintiff Will Graven

The original of this Notice of Appeal was filed with the Clerk of District Court this 30th day of May, 2024
Defendants to be Served as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 20

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In Re: William A. Graven,
 Plaintiff/Appellant,
 v.
 G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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/Appellees.

) **Appeal No.: 24-3420**
) **Appeal Filed: 5-29-24**
) **Case No.: CV24-00549-PHX-ASB**
) **Case Filed: March 15, 2024**
) **Assigned to Honorable Judge: Alison S. Bachus**
) **APPELLANT'S MOTION TO TAKE LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Re f3 The District Court, in dismissing my Complaint, used a number of errant, and even forged, reasons to dismiss.

For instance, in Judge McNamee dismissing my Complaint here, he claimed:

² The Vexatious Litigant Order requires Plaintiff to file a Motion for Leave to File if he wishes to file any new Complaint that relates to any of the Defendants in CV-22-0062-GMS, or any person or entity currently or previously employed by or affiliated with Defendants and that allege damage from a Defendant's acts or omissions relating to Snell & Wilmer (or its individual attorneys), or relating to Plaintiff's prior involvement with ABS." (Bold underline by Appellant.)

This a gross exaggeration/misapplication of what Judge Snow ruled when he granted then Defendants' efforts to have me declared a vexatious litigant (Judge McNamee knows this far better than I). Here is how Judge Snow actually ruled (Case No CV-22-00062-PHX-GMS, Dkt No 91, pg 6, lns 18-20):

"The Court therefore will impose the narrow relief required to balance the Movants' right not to be subject to further harassment, with the need to not overly infringe Plaintiff's resort to the Court. The Court orders that prior to filing any suit in federal court that alleges the action or omissions of a Defendant relating to Snell & Wilmer (or its individual attorneys) Plaintiff must obtain the approval of this Court by written order filed in the court docket to do so." (Bold underline by Appellant.)

Defendants here, were neither "Movants" nor "a Defendant" in CV-22-00062-PHX-GMS.

Re f1 I note the word "narrow" and "with the need to not overly infringe."

Judge McNamee's dismissal is 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.

Re f2 My Appealing Judge McNamee's Order is reasonable and fair, and should not be prohibited by my finances.

I note that the US Supreme Court recently granted me In Forma Pauperis, in a related matter (Ex 1).

II. MOTION TO TAKE LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

I hereby Motion this respected Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to allow me to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, as the United States Supreme Court recently did, in a related matter.

II. CONCLUSION

Thanking the Court of Appeals in advance for considering this Motion.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of June 2024, by: William Graven(e-signature), In Pro Se.
Petitioner, Will Graven

The original of this Motion was filed with the Clerk of Appeals Court this 13th day of June, 2024
Defendants/Appellees to be Served as required by the Appellate Rules of Civil Procedure.

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 21

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUN 21 2024

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

Ref 1

G. MURRAY SNOW, District Judge, being
sued as an individual and as a federal judge,
et al.;

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-3420

D.C. No.
2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB
District of Arizona,
Phoenix

ORDER

It appears that this appeal may be frivolous. If the appeal is frivolous, the court will deny permission to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Within 35 days, appellant must:

- (1) file a statement explaining why the appeal is not frivolous, OR
- (2) file a motion to voluntarily dismiss the appeal, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 42(b).

If appellant files a statement explaining why the appeal is not frivolous, or any other response other than a motion to dismiss, the court will determine whether the appeal is frivolous. If it is frivolous, the appeal will be dismissed. If it is not frivolous, the appeal will proceed.

If appellant does not respond to this order, the court may dismiss this appeal without further notice.

Briefing is stayed.

The clerk will serve on appellant: (1) a form motion to voluntarily dismiss the appeal, and (2) a form statement that the appeal should go forward.

FOR THE COURT:

MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 22

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In Re: William A. Graven,
Plaintiff/Appellant,
v.
G. Murray Snow; Mary H. Murguia; John C. Wallace; Kenneth K. Lee; and Patrick J. Bumatay; 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/Appellees.

) **Appeal No.: 24-3420**
) **Appeal Filed: 5-29-24**
) **Case No.: CV24-00549-SMM-ASB**
) **Case Filed: March 15, 2024**
) **Assigned to Honorable Judge: Alison S. Bachus**
) **NOTICE OF ERRATA FOR MY:**
)
) **APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S**
) **ORDER TO RESPOND TO WHETHER OR NOT**
) **MY APPEAL MAY BE FRIVOLOUS**

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Court need not look beyond 3 Court Dockets to see that my allegations of Judicial misdeeds by 5 individuals acting errantly outside of their Judicial capacity and authority as Federal Judges is well founded.

Please *see* the Defendant header to my 11 Defendants, and *all* Docket entries, in 22-00062-PHX-GMS:

1.) Please *see* each Defendant, sued in part under 42 USC Sec 1983, listed as private individuals, with no titles, and "*for acts as*" in their positions as State employees, having acted under the color of State law. Please also note that their SUMMONS were just in their personal names (again, no titles); please note that they were Served at their residences (not place of employment); that they were sued for "personal (not State) liabilities" (*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 their own liabilities); *see* Defendants never claim [nor did Defendant Snow] to be the State; nor the Attorney General's Office, nor the Attorney General, nor having Sovereign Immunity (e.g., in our 12.1[c] Meet and Confer proceedings, or their Motions to Dismiss) (so they clearly aren't the State/the Attorney General's Office/the Attorney General); and *see* Defendants as Appellees use the same header in their pleadings at your Ninth Circuit (no titles; "*for acts as*;" and personal liabilities) (Appeal No: 22-16909, which *see* just below).

2.) But now look at this Court's header for the Docket of my Appeal (again, 22-16909): my individual Defendant Mark Brnovich was forged to "Mark Brnovich, "Attorney General, Attorney General,"" and "*for acts as*" was deleted...none of the other 10 Appellees had "*for acts as*" deleted nor were they given unwarranted titles. Forgeries based on "Attorney General, Attorney General" at your Court occurred in at least 15 different Docket entries (*I filed 8 different pleadings asking about these forgeries, but my Appeal Panel did not respond*). My Panel Affirmed 1 of 2 Orders On-Appeal by false case law citations based on these forgeries (which *see* below).

Note 1: It is these 15 plus forgeries; fraud based rulings; and more, that are the basis of my present Complaint.

Note 2: *What is an "Attorney General, Attorney General"?*

3.) And now, look at my Defendant header for the present case, and compare that to the Docket header... "Someone at the District Court has forged the Court's header by adding "and as a federal judge." It is by this false claim (and others) that Judge McNamee dismissed my Complaint (*see* your Order for the same forgeries).

II. CONCLUSION

Unless forging the Docket has become a part of American Jurisprudence, my Complaint is not frivolous, but the result of Defendant Mary Murguia arranging for “*Someone*” at your Court to forge the Docket; and her handpicking 3 GOP Judges to be my Appeal Panel to support Defendant G Murray Snow, also GOP, for his dismissing my Complaint to protect my Defendants, his fellow GOP Power Elites, including my lead Defendant, who is married to one of Defendants’ Murguia and Snow’s fellow Judges and office neighbors.

Note 3: While Mary Murguia, in her professional position, is Chief Judge of this Circuit, please note that she has long been based in Phoenix, as a fellow work and office neighbor of Defendant Snow, whom she handpicked 3 GOP Panel Judges to support (all 3 GOP? Isn’t that a bit obvious in this Circuit?), and to support him in dismissing my Complaint against long-term associates of both hers and Defendant Snow.

When “*Someone*” at your Court forged my lead, individually named Defendant to “*Attorney General, Attorney General*” (“AG, AG”), a title not used in District Court, not by me, not by Defendant(s), nor even Judge Snow, my Panel Affirmed the 1st of 2 Orders of Dismissal On-Appeal by (CoA Dkt No.: 65):

- First, as if I had sued the AGO, citing *Lujan v Defenders of Wildlife*, ruling I had no standing to do so (*I guess “Someone” forging “Attorney General, Attorney General,” made him the AGO?*); and

- Secondly, as if I had sued my individual Defendant as the Attorney General (*per “Attorney General, Attorney General”*), citing *Linda RS v Richard D*, ruling I had no rights by the Attorney General’s nonprosecution (I never alleged anything like “nonprosecution.”).


I also note my Appeal Panel, Defendants Wallace; Lee; and Bumatay; refused to rule on my 2nd On-Appeal Order of Dismissal (I filed 6 different pleadings asking why they did not rule on this appealed and argued On-Appeal, by both sides, Order...but they did not respond). Isn’t this further evidence my Appeal is not frivolous? Clearly, these 3 Appeal Judges acted errantly, outside of their capacities/authority as Federal Judges.

My 5 Defendants conspired to forge my Appeal Docket, to use false case law citations to Affirm the 1st Order On-Appeal by; and to refuse to rule on the 2nd Order; and have the Docket forged in my present case, to have this case dismissed; and more (apparently, there was no forgery to support Affirming the 2nd Order by?).

Note 4: See my Defendants also misuse their power/influence by having the District Clerk of Court not Docket my main pleading/Complaint (only my Exhibits were docketed), to hide their (my Defendants) errant acts.

Note 5: Please also consider the content of my Motion to Take Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, and my Complaint (*if* you can obtain a copy), with regards to this matter.

Thanking this respected Court of Appeals in advance for considering this Response.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of July 2024, by:  In Pro Se.
Will Graven, Appellant

- The original of this Response was filed via the US Mail to the Clerk of Appeals Court this 26th day of July, 2024
- Defendants/Appellees to be Served as required by the Appellate Rules of Civil Procedure.

Will Graven
2700 S. Woodlands Village Blvd.
Suite 300-251
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Email: will@willgraven.com
Phone: 928-890-8825

RECEIVED
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 30 2024

FILED
DOCKETED

DATE

INITIAL

July 27, 2024

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court of Appeals
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
James R. Browning Courthouse
95 Seventh Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Appeal No: 24-3420, and my Response to the Appeals Court's Order Re "frivolous"

Clerk of Court of Appeals Dwyer:

Good morning.

Yesterday, I mailed you the wrong version of my RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO RESPOND TO WHETHER OR NOT MY APPEAL MAY BE FRIVOLOUS.

I am hoping this copy arrives sooner (I am sending this correct version via the fastest service our USPS has, as you will have seen [the incorrect version was not sent by their fastest service]), so you will not have filed the first/incorrect version, to then need to also file this version.

Please file the enclosed version at your earliest convenience.


I apologize for any trouble I have caused you.

Should you have any questions, comments, or complaints, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Thanking you in advance.

And thank you for your continuing service to Justice.

Respectfully,



Will Graven, Appellant/Plaintiff

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 23

FILED

AUG 28 2024

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

G. MURRAY SNOW, District Judge, being
sued as an individual and as a federal judge;
et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-3420

D.C. No.

2:24-cv-00549-SMM-ASB

District of Arizona,
Phoenix

ORDER

Ref 3

Before: SCHROEDER, M. SMITH, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Upon a review of the record and the responses to the court's June 21, 2024
order, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's
supplemented motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry Nos. 3 and 4),
see 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is
frivolous or malicious).

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

DISMISSED.

Ref 2: Manuscripts are missing

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, 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 [which *see* my Petition for Rehearing Denied on 8/19/24]), if this Court did not Grant my then Petition, our Clerks/Judges would take your Denying my Petition (which you first did on 6/3/24) as this Court approving/condoning a Clerk's/a Judge's use of forgery to a Court's Docket, by which, amongst other, a Judge could make false case law citations by, to manipulate a Court's decision making process/decision/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 Clerk's/a Judge's best interest to rule, as anything goes for a Clerk/a Judge/a Panel.

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

Our Courts are thereby quickly becoming the personal tools/playgrounds of our Judges and Clerks of Court.

Appendix 24

1 Mark C. Dangerfield (Bar No. 010832)
2 Mark A. Fuller (Bar No. 012149)
2 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
2 2575 East Camelback Road
3 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
4 Telephone: (602) 530-8000
4 Facsimile: (602) 530-8500
5 mark.dangerfield@gknet.com
5 mark.fuller@gknet.com
6 Attorneys for Defendants

7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

9 William A. Graven,

No. 2:22-cv-00062-PHX-GMS

10 Plaintiff,
11 v. *Rcf1*

12 Mark Brnovich for acts as Attorney General;
13 Michael Bailey for acts as Assistant Attorney
13 General and Chief of Staff; Don Conrad for acts
14 as Chief of the Criminal Division; Paul Ahler for
14 acts as Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal
15 Division Chief; Joe Waters for acts as Assistant
15 Attorney General; Lisa Rodriguez for acts as
16 Criminal Division Administrator; Mark
16 Perkovich for acts as Chief of Special
17 Investigations; Zora Manjencich for acts as
17 Assistant Criminal Division Chief and FSP
18 Section Chief Counsel; John Lopez for acts as
18 Solicitor General; Jennifer Perkins for acts as
19 Assistant Solicitor General; John Does I through
19 X; and Jane Does I through X; all for acts
20 committed as Arizona State officials but for the
20 resulting personal (not State) liabilities; and
21 attorney Mark Dangerfield for acts in his past
21 representation of the Defendants,

**MOTION TO DISMISS STATE
DEFENDANTS**

The 10.

22 Defendants.
23
24
25
26

1 Mark C. Dangerfield (Bar No. 010832)
2 Mark A. Fuller (Bar No. 012149)
2 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
2 2575 East Camelback Road
3 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
4 Telephone: (602) 530-8000
4 Facsimile: (602) 530-8500
5 mark.dangerfield@gknet.com
5 mark.fuller@gknet.com
6 *Attorneys for Defendants*

7
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
8 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

9 William A. Graven,

No. 2:22-cv-00062-PHX-GMS

10 Plaintiff,

11 v. *Ref 2*

12 Mark Brnovich for acts as Attorney General;
13 Michael Bailey for acts as Assistant Attorney
13 General and Chief of Staff; Don Conrad for acts
14 as Chief of the Criminal Division; Paul Ahler for
14 acts as Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal
15 Division Chief; Joe Waters for acts as Assistant
15 Attorney General; Lisa Rodriguez for acts as
16 Criminal Division Administrator; Mark
16 Perkovich for acts as Chief of Special
17 Investigations; Zora Manjencich for acts as
17 Assistant Criminal Division Chief and FSP
18 Section Chief Counsel; John Lopez for acts as
18 Solicitor General; Jennifer Perkins for acts as
19 Assistant Solicitor General; John Does I through
19 X; and Jane Does I through X; all for acts
20 committed as Arizona State officials but for the
20 resulting personal (not State) liabilities; and
21 attorney Mark Dangerfield for acts in his past
21 representation of the Defendants,

**MOTION TO DISMISS
DEFENDANT MARK
DANGERFIELD**

The 1.

22 Defendants.

23

24

25

26

No. 22-16909

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

William A. Graven,
Appellant,

v.

Ref 2
Mark Brnovich, for acts as Attorney General; Michael Bailey for acts as Assistant Attorney General and Chief of Staff; Don Conrad for acts as Chief of the Criminal Division; Paul Ahler for acts as Chief Prosecutor and later Criminal Division Chief; Joe Waters for acts as Assistant Attorney General; Lisa Rodriguez for acts as Criminal Division Administrator; Mark Perkovich for acts as Chief of Special Investigations; Zora Manjencich for acts as Assistant Criminal Division Chief and FSP Section Chief Counsel; John Lopez for acts as Solicitor General; Jennifer Perkins for acts as Assistant Solicitor General; Unknown Parties, named as John Does I through X; and Jane Does I through X; all for acts committed as Arizona State officials but for the resulting personal (not State) liabilities; and attorney Mark Dangerfield for acts in his past representation of the Defendants,
Respondents.

Ref 1

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona
No. 2:22-cv-00062-GMS

APPELLEES' RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
AN ACCELERATED RULING

GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
Mark C. Dangerfield (Bar No. 010832)
Mark A. Fuller (Bar No. 012149)
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
(602) 530-8000
mark.dangerfield@gknet.com
mark.fuller@gknet.com
Counsel for Respondents