

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, PETITIONER

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT; AND THE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX
DIVISION, in *Graven v Snow, et al.**

**PETITIONER'S RULE 44 PETITION FOR REHEARING
FOR MY DENIED PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
MANDAMUS IN GRAVEN V SNOW, ET AL, DUE TO
ERRANT ACTS BY CLERK OF COURT HARRIS**

Synopsis: I submitted a Rule 15.8 Supplemental Brief on 9/24, which Clerk Harris Docketed as a “Letter,” on/as October 1. Furthermore, the Clerk did not post the 2 Exhibits filed with my Brief, but rather added a 3rd page to my “Letter” which says: **“Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk’s Office.”** By Docketing my Brief as a “Letter,” he deleted the legal basis by which the Court is required to consider it with my Petition. And by hiding my Exhibits, he kept them from easy access by the Court, and others, thereby keeping them from consideration. The Exhibits he hid were materials he had completely sandbagged in my just previous case, 23-730, and 2 cases he recently rejected.

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

Clerk Court Harris has repeatedly acted errantly in my Cases

I. Introduction and Background

On September 24, I submitted a Rule 15.8 Supplemental Brief (**Ex 1**), with 2 particularly important Exhibits, which Clerk Harris Docketed as a “Letter” (**Ex 2**) on October 1.

The Exhibits were “particularly important” as they were the complete Exhibits to my Petition, which only included the first and last page of each Exhibit, which were 2 case-initiating pleadings that had been filed concurrently with my Petition, and so were referenced for their completeness, by my having anticipated they would be on the Docket for reference...but Clerk Harris rejected both of those case-initiating pleadings, and so as they were not on the Docket, I filed a Supplemental Brief, and included the entire pleading of each as Exhibits to the Brief (rather than just the first and past page of each).

Not coincidentally, Clerk Harris prevented my Supplemental Brief from being Docketed for my just previous Mandamus in *Brnovich, et al* [23-7130], by sandbagging it for 2 months past Conference, only to tell me when I tried to Re-file it for my Rehearing, he had disqualified it 2 ½ months earlier (without saying a word to me, or returning it to me). Not coincidentally, that Brief in *Brnovich*, detailed how the Ninth Circuit had forged the Docket in my Appeal there, and ruled by those forgeries...which is what Clerk Harris from hiding from the Court, and the Public.

So not coincidentally, when Clerk Harris deleted the legal basis for my Brief here, he also hid the Exhibits, only saying: **“Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk’s Office.”** (**Ex 3**, pg 3) He was again preventing the Court and others from seeing the corrupt acts by the Ninth in *Brnovich*. He was also concealing additional corrupt acts by the Ninth in this case, and by the District Court in Arizona (and by himself). I have just filed a Motion to Vacate based on Clerk Harris’ errant acts (**Ex 4**), and an Application to Remove Harris from my case (**Ex 5**).

II. Petition for Rehearing

I hereby file this Petition for Rehearing my Petition for Clerk Harris having deleted the legal basis for the Court’s considering my Supplemental Brief, by mislabeling it as a Letter, rather than a Brief; delaying its being Docketed; and for concealing the Exhibits to it; thereby preventing these materials from be considered by the Court with my Petition.

III. Conclusion

Thanking the Court in advance for adjudicating the matters in this Application.

Respectfully,



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

Date: November 18, 2024

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**