"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

No. 24-5703

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mark Bochra, individually and on Behalf of all others similarly situated,

Petitioner

V.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; Miguel Cardona, in his official Capacity as the Secretary for DOE and Suzanne Goldberg in her official Capacity as the secretary for OCR,

Respondents

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To the United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
(Case 22-2903 and 23-1388)
District Court 1:21-cv-03887 (Judge Sara Ellis)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Mark Bochra
5757 North Sheridan Road, Apt 13B
Chicago, IL 60660
Plaintiff, Pro Se
elohim.coptic@outlook.com

December 19, 2024

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Other Authorities

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 44.2, petitioner Mark Bochra respectfully petitions this honorable Court for an order (1) granting rehearing, (2) vacating the Court's November 25, 2024, order denying certiorari, and (3) re-disposing of this case by granting the petition for a writ of certiorari, vacating the judgment, and remanding to the Seventh Circuit for further consideration in light of *Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* No. 22–451 and *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors* No. 22–1008 which provides Mark with a standing in his lawsuit, just as the Supreme Court has done the same with many cases "vacate and remand for further proceedings" when they overruled the "chevron doctrine" why treat Mark the Coptic differently? See 23-133 *Foster v. U.S. Department of Agriculture et al*; 22-863 *Diaz-Rodriguez v. Garland*; 22-868 *Bastias v. Garland*; 22-1246 *Edison Electric Institute, et al. v. FERC et al*; 23-413 *Michael Lissack v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*; 23-538 *Moises Cruz Cruz v. Merrick Garland*; 23-558 *United Natural Foods, Inc. v. NLRB*; 23-876 *KC Transport, Inc. v. Secretary of Labor*; and 23-913 *Cesar Solis-Flores v. Merrick Garland.*

As Pope Paul VI said —"If you want peace, work for justice."

Mark who is a Christian Coptic submits that, this Court granted many petitions for writ of certiorari raising the same issues to which Mark the petitioner had raised with respect to standing to bring his lawsuit against a federal agency in both official and individual capacity. Many times the Solicitor General Ms. Elizabeth Prelogar told the Supreme Court to wait until they rule on *Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* No. 22–451 case.[1]

a) 22-1246 EDISON ELEC. INST., ET AL. V. FERC, ET AL.[2]
b) 23-133 FOSTER, ARLEN V. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, ET AL.[3]
c) 23-413 LISSACK, MICHAEL V. CIR.[4]

> The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for further consideration in light of *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S.* ___ (2024).

Other times the Supreme Court ruled in favor of petitioners when either the Solicitor General objected to reversal or when the Solicitor General waived her right to respond to the petition. So

[1] See order list https://www.supremecourt.gov/orders/courtorders/070224zor_2co3.pdf
[2] See https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/22-1246.html
[3] See https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/23-133.html
[4] See https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/23-413.html

not all petitions which were filed by different petitioners, the Supreme Court expected the Solicitor General to respond to them in order to grant or deny a petition. And there are other instances when the Solicitor General waived her right to respond and yet the Court asked for a response because it is interested in hearing what the Solicitor General has to say like the ban on body mutilation for children under the absurd term "gender affirmative care". The Christian Supreme Court Justices took pleasure questioning the Solicitor General and showing that she was not defending American Children but aligning herself with an agenda.[5]

In this petition, the Solicitor General waited till the last day before midnight to write that she waived her right to respond to Mark's petition.[6] Ms. Prelogar waiving her right to respond on behalf of the Department of Education went against what the counsel for the Department of Education told Mark i.e., Ms. Sarah Terman when she advised Mark that if the 7th Circuit returned the case to the District Court, she will explore settlement. At this point, the Defendants waived their rights to respond to many of Mark's raised arguments at the district court level.. The Solicitor General waiving her right to respond is an admission of guilt because there is nothing further to says. When the Jewish people accused Jesus Christ before the Roman Emperor Pontius Pilate shouting "we caught this man perverting our people, he caused uproar in the temple market, what will be his punishment?" Emperor Pilate responded "I see no reason to condemn this man, no reason" but the persistent Jewish rabbis shouted "we found him guilty, telling us not to pay taxes to the emperor, claiming himself a messiah, a king." Emperor Pilate asked Jesus Christ "Are you the King of the Jews?" Jesus replied "So you say!"[7]

The same manner here in which the Supreme Court asked the Solicitor General to respond to this petition by November 4, 2024 and on November 4, 2024 the Solicitor General Ms. Prelogar knowing the sins that took place by Ms. Sarah Terman, the Department of Education via Kenneth Marcus, the 7th Circuit Judges, and the District Court Judge when Mark was targeted over his Christian faith and the words of Jesus Christ[8], Ms. Prelogar came and said

---

[5] See full hearing by supreme court justices https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=31aqWViBOlg

[6] See https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/24/24-5703/331120/20241104201216651_Waiver%20Letter%20-24-5703.pdf

[7] See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0feZQkHbCkM&t=5900s

[8] See https://www.scribd.com/document/716159090/Brief-Related-to-The-Executive-Committee-and-a-Coptic-in-22-1815-121-Cv-06223 see https://www.scribd.com/document/797003154/7th-Judicial-Misconduct-Complaint-Nos-07-24-90122-07-24-94723-07-24-70724 and see https://www.scribd.com/document/717275139/Judicial-Misconduct-Reporting-Jim-Richmond-of-the-7th-Circuit See

"I have nothing to say, I am waiving my right to respond"[9] to which translates into "So you say". There is no argument to which Ms. Prelogar could rebuttal when the Supreme Court overruled the "chevron doctrine" providing Mark with a standing in his lawsuit; this was God's work and it is marvelous in one's eyes.

- Neil Gorsuch Cheers Supreme Court Placing 'Tombstone' on 40-Year Precedent.[10]

Respondents failed to challenge Petitioner's lawsuit in ECF No. 9 and his response in ECF No. 54 wherein, he mentioned Kenneth Marcus, how he used the IHRA definition to personally grant Zoa's appeal and the communication history between Mark Bochra and Kenneth Marcus. In fact, Respondents waived their rights to challenge many of Mark's legal arguments which challenges the IHRA definition under the APA on four bases: (1) arbitrary & capricious, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); (2) "contrary to a constitutional right, power, [or] privilege," id. § 706(2)(B); (3) exceeding statutory authority, id. § 706(2)(C); and (4) promulgated "without observance of procedure required by law," id. § 706(2)(D). See *CFPB v. All Am. Check Cashing, Inc.*, 33 F.4th 218, 241 (5th Cir. 2022) (Jones, J., concurring).

Respondents waived their rights on appeal to challenge petitioner's arguments under the (law of the case, waiver, and judicial estoppels).[11] See *Bradley v. Vill. of Univ. Park, Ill.* No. 22-1903 (7th Circuit), the 7th Circuit explained "we explain how respondents previously waived the issue of Bradley's property interest in his job and why we hold them to that waiver. . . respondents intentionally and permanently abandoned the right to contest Bradley's property interest."

> Respondents never challenged Petitioner's assertions surrounding Kenneth Marcus and his use of the IHRA definition as a force of law (the definition was used by Kenneth Marcus and is on the department's website); (a) Respondents failed to challenge who are members of the Semitic tribe including the Copts, see ECF No. 54 pages 18-20; (b) Respondents never challenged how the IHRA definition harmed Mark Bochra as a

---

https://www.scribd.com/document/789856149/Petition-7th-Circuit-Judicial-Council-in-Nos-07-22-90041-through-90048

[9] See https://www.scribd.com/document/716159090/Brief-Related-to-The-Executive-Committee-and-a-Coptic-in-22-1815-121-Cv-06223 see https://www.scribd.com/document/797003154/7th-Judicial-Misconduct-Complaint-Nos-07-24-90122-07-24-94723-07-24-70724 and see https://www.scribd.com/document/717275139/Judicial-Misconduct-Reporting-Jim-Richmond-of-the-7th-Circuit See https://www.scribd.com/document/789856149/Petition-7th-Circuit-Judicial-Council-in-Nos-07-22-90041-through-90048

[10] See https://www.newsweek.com/neil-gorsuch-supreme-court-tombstone-40-year-precedent-1918885

[11] These doctrines of-ten overlap. See, e.g., *Carmody v. Board of Trustees of Univ. of Illinois*, 893 F.3d 397, 407–08 (7th Cir. 2018); *United States v. Husband*, 312 F.3d 247, 250–51 (7th Cir. 2002) (remand does not include issues "waived or decided"). See *Eddie Bradley v. Village of University Park et al* No. 22-1903 (7th Circuit).

> petitioner, ECF No. 54 pages 22-24; (c) Respondents never challenged that congress did not authorize respondents to adopt the IHRA definition ECF No. 54 pages 66-67 and a president cannot amend a regulation through an executive order ECF No. 54 pages 71-76; (d) Respondents never challenged Petitioner's argument that the IHRA definition lacks statutory authority and is arbitrary and capricious ECF No. 54 pages 82-84; (e) Respondents never challenged Petitioner's argument that the IHRA definition was in violation of notice and comment requirement, is a major rule in violation of congressional review act, and falls under the ongoing coercion doctrine, ECF No. 54 pages 86-88 & 95-96; (f) Respondents never challenged that a budget must be created to use the IHRA definition, see Kenneth Marcus' own words ECF No. 54 pages 47, 72-73, 87-88.

The district court never evaluated any of Petitioner's presented arguments concerning "arbitrary and capricious" agency action, in fact it never even mentioned the words "arbitrary and capricious" under the APA once in its decision, rather the court pretended it never read them while the Respondents abandoned their rights to challenge many of Petitioner's raised arguments. And yet the same District Court Judge Sara Ellis ruled in favor of the Plaintiff Santa Maria by holding the Defendants to the waiver rule when they failed to challenge certain claims raised by Santa Maria in *Santa Maria v. Loyola University of Chicago Stritch School of Medicine* (1:24-cv-01698) ECF 48.[12]

> By Stritch's own admission, it waived any argument that her complaint failed to plausibly allege these theories of relief. See Draper v. Martin, 664 F.3d 1110, 1114 (7th Cir. 2011) (finding waived an argument not made because "it is not this court's responsibility to research and construct the parties' arguments."). Therefore, Santa Maria's retaliation claims may proceed (Counts II and IV).

So why treat Mark differently?

As Justice Neil Gorsuch told students in civic stories at the National Constitution Center "we the people are sovereign here; not a king, not a communist dictator, not a fascist dictator, we the people are sovereign."[13] Justice Neil Gorsuch added "history has shown that humans cannot govern their own." As Justice Clarence Thomas said in Prager University's 2024 commencement address "courage is righteous esteemed the first of human qualities, because it is the quality which guarantees all others" adding "it takes courage to stand up to bullies but how many of us will choose to say nothing out of fear, it takes courage to do something despite the risk."[14] As Justice Amy Barrett told students at Notre Dame "You must first enable the government to

---

[12] See https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.455906/gov.uscourts.ilnd.455906.48.0.pdf
[13] See https://www.youtube.com/live/eBRJcJp0kGc?t=1390s
[14] See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSX5nAjWL90

control the governed and in the next place oblige it to control itself. Judges I am sorry to admit but know my family would agree are not angels."[15] Each Justice told the public something but do they stand by what they say when they attained power? And most of the Christian Justices spoke of "God" in secret recording or in public yet when Mark's came before them telling them this definition says "Jews didn't kill Jesus Christ", they all wanted to run away from it and yet another Federal Court in Texas declared IHRA is Viewpoint Discrimination in *Student for Justice et al v Greg Abbott et al* 1:24-CV-523-RP.[16]

Case 1:24-cv-00523-RP Document 62 Filed 10/28/24 Page 1 of 24

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

STUDENTS FOR JUSTICE IN PALESTINE, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GREG ABBOTT, *in his official capacity only as the Governor of the State of Texas*, et al.,

Defendants.

1:24-CV-523-RP

ORDER

In conclusion, the Court finds that Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on their claim, even under *Tinker*, that the GA-44-compliant university policies impose impermissible viewpoint discrimination that chills speech in violation of the First Amendment.

SIGNED on October 28, 2024.

ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The IHRA definition is unconstitutional under the Administrative Procedure Act ("the APA") on four bases: (1) arbitrary & capricious, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); (2) "contrary to a

[15] See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n0LA-z-SW5w&t=542s
[16] See ruling https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.txwd.1172787806/gov.uscourts.txwd.1172787806.62.0.pdf

constitutional right, power, [or] privilege," id. § 706(2)(B); (3) exceeding statutory authority, id. § 706(2)(C); and (4) promulgated "without observance of procedure required by law," id. § 706(2)(D).

> "An elective despotism was not the government we fought for; but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced . . . , as that no one could transcend their legal limits, without being effectually checked and restrained by the others." The Federalist No. 48 (J. Madison)(quoting Thomas Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (1781)). In particular, as George Mason put it in Philadelphia in 1787, "[t]he purse & the sword ought never to get into the same hands." The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, at 139–40 (M.Farrand ed. 1937). These foundational precepts of the American system of government animate the Petitioners' claims in this action. They also compel our decision today.

The IHRA definition violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment; the same is true with Equal Protection Clause under the 5th amendment; Jews vs. Gentiles is the definition of IHRA.

IHRA failed to pass in congress "Schumer's bid to add Anti-Semitism Awareness Act to NDAA defense bill fails."[17] The Supreme Court overruled the "Chevron Doctrine" which gives Mark standing in this lawsuit, but this lawsuit is a liability for many judicial officers who targeted Mark over this very same case and that reality can't be changed, many craved to destroy Mark and his civil right case. But Mark should be treated the same way the Supreme Court vacated many lower courts decisions and send the case for further proceedings. See a collection of cases based on *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. ___ (2024).*[18]

As grounds for this petition for rehearing, petitioner states the following:

1. Congress never passed the IHRA definition bill and signed it into law to become the law of the land in America, many members in the Israeli lobby tried to lobby the Senate just as they did in the house but the bill was never passed and signed into law. As William Daroff the CEO of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations screamed in a recent article dated December 12, 2024 "Pass IHRA now".[19] IHRA never was passed as the law of the land and Mark has a standing to challenge it being placed on the Department of Education website because the Supreme Court overruled the Chevron Doctrine; the Solicitor General Ms

[17] See Schumer's bid to add Antisemitism Awareness Act to NDAA defense bill fails
[18] https://www.supremecourt.gov/orders/courtorders/070224zor_2co3.pdf
[19] See Pass the Antisemitism Awareness Act

Prelogar under the Biden's administration would have said the same, her silence is evident and this Court could ask her to respond or not and could rule by granting the petition without her response as they've done with other petitions; when the evidence are clear, there is no need for a response.

2. The Supreme Court recent rulings in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* No. 22–451 and *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors* No. 22–1008 provided a pro se attorney and a rancher with a hope against the Biden Administration under the APA over lack of Farm Credit appointments. The Justice Department representing the Biden administration sought to dismiss the lawsuit, but the Supreme Court recent overruling the Chevron Doctrine, gave the little guy a chance for healing when the chief district judge Hon. William Campbell granted Dustin Kittle motion to amend and for his case to proceed in Kittle v. Biden (1:24-cv-00025).[20] The case is now proceeding to case management and trial. Mark should be no difference and should have his rights protected in the Court and the rights of every American and the younger generation their rights should be protected against special interest and lobbyists.

3. The Supreme Court in another APA case stayed the entire title ix regulation under the Biden administration, they stayed the injunction against it in a 5-4 decision issued on August 16, 2024, the Court rejected ED's request. The Court was unanimous that a stay of the Challenged Provisions was proper but split on whether the injunctions should apply to the remainder of the 2024 Regulations. Writing in dissent for herself and Justices Kagan, Gorsuch and Jackson, Justice Sotomayor argued that the injunctions were overly broad, and any alleged injuries flowed from the Challenged Provisions. Therefore, enforcement of the entirety of the 2024 Regulations went beyond what was necessary to redress plaintiffs' alleged injuries. Still the Supreme Court stayed the injunction against the entire regulation, the laws work in parable, the other justices saw this new title ix regulations is just terrible for America and brings destruction, it doesn't matter which rule was challenged and which is not, that is called "legal lawfar and technicality within the procedures" See *Dep't of Educ. v. Louisiana*, 603 U.S. --- (2024).[21]

4. The granting of the petitions for writ of certiorari in similar cases raising the same and similar issues with regard to APA when it comes to overruling the Chevron Doctrine is sufficient to warrant rehearing of the order denying certiorari in Mark Bochra's case who is a Coptic; see

[20] See https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.tnmd.98763/gov.uscourts.tnmd.98763.6.0.pdf see docket history https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/68371069/kittle-v-biden/

[21] https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/603/24a78/case.pdf

23-133 *Foster v. U.S. Department of Agriculture et al*; 22-863 *Diaz-Rodriguez v. Garland*; 22-868 *Bastias v. Garland*; 22-1246 *Edison Electric Institute, et al. v. FERC et al*; 23-413 *Michael Lissack v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*; 23-538 *Moises Cruz Cruz v. Merrick Garland*; 23-558 *United Natural Foods, Inc. v. NLRB*; 23-876 *KC Transport, Inc. v. Secretary of Labor*; and 23-913 *Cesar Solis-Flores v. Merrick Garland*. The granting of the petitions in those cases indicates that the Court intended to remind for further procedure and consideration in light of *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* No. 22–451 and *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors* No. 22–1008 and denial of similar petitions raising similar challenges indicates that the Court intended to deny such petitions only when the requested relief is not related to overruling the "chevron doctrine". Mark Bochra, therefore requests that he Court grant rehearing of his petition and grant his petition because he raised challenges supported by the overruling of the "chevron doctrine" now Mark has a standing in this lawsuit. The Supreme Court asked the solicitor general to respond and she waived her right to respond because she has nothing to say in this matter.

5. The IHRA definition did not become the law of the land yet it is still on the department of Education website with the words "Jews didn't kill Jesus Christ" an endorsed Government view point discrimination just as another Federal Court in Texas declared signed by Judge Robert Pitman in *Student for Justice et al v Greg Abbott et al* 1:24-CV-523-RP. One case is before the Supreme Court is Mark's case and the other case is going through the judicial channel in Texas. Illinois 7th Circuit Court through Jim Richmond threatened Mark explaining how his future appeal will be fixed by certain judges, he also told Mark "the judges won't talk about Jews" the issue were not the Jews per se, but the evil behind the IHRA definition and those promoting it through Israel and here motives of corrupting the Court was revealed by Jim Richmond himself.

6. In order for this Honorable Court to do justice in this case, they should first address this petition 23A1078 *Mark Bochra, Applicant v. United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois* which is due in 60 days from December 9, 2024 per a Supreme Court letter to fix few errors within the petition and refile it within 60 days.[22] After addressing it by healing this journey, then they can render justice in *Mark Bochra, Petitioner v. Department of Education, et al* 24-5703.

[22] Copy of the petition https://www.scribd.com/document/805717365/Petition-23A1078-related-to-7th-Circuit-Judges-targeting-Mark-the-Coptic

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioner Mark Bochra prays that this Court (1) grant rehearing of the order denying his petition for writ of certiorari in this case, (2) vacate the Court's November 25, 2024, order denying certiorari, and (3) grant the petition for a writ of certiorari, vacate the judgment and remand to the Seventh Circuit for further consideration in light of *Loper Bright Enterprises, Inc. v. Raimondo* No. 22- 451, and *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors* No. 22–1008 for the purpose of determining

(I) how the IHRA definition is unconstitutional under the Administrative Procedure Act ("the APA") on four bases: (1) arbitrary & capricious, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); (2) "contrary to a constitutional right, power, [or] privilege," id. § 706(2)(B); (3) exceeding statutory authority, id. § 706(2)(C); and (4) promulgated "without observance of procedure required by law," id. § 706(2)(D);

(II) how the removal of the appeal process, a major rule within the OCR manual without going through the regulatory channels is (1) arbitrary & capricious, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); (2) "contrary to a constitutional right, power, [or] privilege," id. § 706(2)(B); (3) exceeding statutory authority, id. § 706(2)(C); and (4) promulgated "without observance of procedure required by law," id. § 706(2)(D);

(III) the overruling of the chevron doctrine provides Mark with a standing to challenge OCR findings when they intentionally tempered with his case witnesses and evidence after being in a resolution agreement for 2 years telling him if a resolution is not signed by the petition the next step is "enforcement action" said by OCR Atlanta director Melanie Velez.[23]

September 19, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark Bochra
Petitioner, Pro Se

[23] See senator Durbin's letter on behalf of Mark to the Department of Education https://www.scribd.com/document/712046044/Senator-Dick-Durbin-Letter-related-to-Bochra-v-U-S-Department-of-Education

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Petitioner hereby certifies that his petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark Bochra
Plaintiff, Pro Se

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

APPENDIX

Exhibits	Description
A	A copy of Ms Sarah Terman's emails the counsel representing the Defendants telling him she will consider settlement negotiation if the 7th Circuit sent the case back to the District Court. The 7th circuit Ended up fixing Mark's appeal fulfilling the threats of Jim Richmond and what he told Mark during judicial misconduct proceedings in Nos. 07-22-90048 through 90041 (The origin).[1]
B	A copy of two letters from Office of Inspector General (OIG DOJ) related to both Ms Sarah Terman and Ms. Elizabeth Prelogar the Solicitor General. One counsel said she will settle if the case is returned to the district court knowing too well the 7th Circuit was targeting Mark, the other is the solicitor general waiving her right to respond yet the Solicitor General has a duty to correct seeking justice not to "cover". Defendants' counsels don't want to respond in this journey, they want the Justices to rule on this case for Mark. That is the meaning of waiver to respond. One counsel said "I will settle if the case returns, the other said I have nothing to say in this case."
C	A copy of Mark's petition for rehearing and en banc hearing in ECF 47 in consolidated appeal 22-2903 and 23-1388
D	A copy of the En banc denial order
E	The threats of Jim Richmond telling Mark how his future appeal will be fixed by the 7th Circuit Judges long before the appeal was actually filed, showing evil motives, is the same as when a Federal Judge commended on a pending case before the Supreme Court, an outside circuit was appointed and an order was entered against the Federal Judge Michael A Ponsor who called Justice Alito "foolish" in complaint No. 04-24-90094.[2] Well Jim Richmond said "file your appeal when are you going to file it? Oh you will see what action we will take, then you can go to your favorite supreme court justice and see how they rule for your case". This was actually corrupting a court procedure, not just commenting on a pending case.

[1] See https://www.scribd.com/document/717275139/Judicial-Misconduct-Reporting-Jim-Richmond-of-the-7th-Circuit see https://www.scribd.com/document/789856149/Petition-7th-Circuit-Judicial-Council-in-Nos-07-22-90041-through-90048 and see https://www.scribd.com/document/716159090/Brief-Related-to-The-Executive-Committee-and-a-Coptic-in-22-1815-121-Cv-06223

[2] See Order https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/25461816/ponsor-order.pdf

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that I have mailed the foregoing documents via UPS on December 19, 2024. Notice of this filing will be sent by operation of the Court's electronic filing system to all parties indicated on the electronic filing receipt. Parties may access this filing through the Court's electronic filing system. A courtesy copy was e-mailed to opposing Counsel Ms. Sarah Terman as well as the Solicitor General Ms. Elizabeth Prelogar.

Ms. Sarah F. Terman
Assistant United States Attorney
219 South Dearborn Street, Suite 500
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Pronouns: she/her
(312) 469-6201
sarah.terman@usdoj.gov

Ms. Elizabeth Prelogar
Solicitor General
elizabeth.b.prelogar@usdoj.gov

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark Bochra
Plaintiff, Pro Se

5757 North Sheridan Road, Apt 13B
Chicago, IL 60660
elohim.coptic@outlook.com

CC

MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE.

Members of the Judicial Conference Committee.[3]

Judge Robert J. Jonker (Michigan-Western) as chair of the Committee on Codes of Conduct robert_jonker@miwd.uscourts.gov

Judge William B. Traxler, Jr. (Fourth Circuit), as chair of the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. william_traxler@ca4.uscourts.gov

MEMBERS OF THE 7TH CIRCUIT

Chief Judge Diane Sykes chambers_of_judge_sykes@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Joel Flaum jflaum@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Frank Easterbrook frank_easterbrook@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Kenneth Ripple kenneth_ripple@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Ilana Rovner ilana_rovner@ca7.uscourts.gov

[3] See members https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/jcus_members_2024-mar-3.pdf

Judge Diane Wood dwood@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge David Hamilton david_hamilton@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Michael Brennan Michael_Brennan@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Michael Scudder Michael_Scudder@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Amy St. Eve amy_st_eve@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Thomas Kirsch II Thomas_Kirsch@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Candace Jackson-Akiwumi Candace_Jackson-Akiwumi@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge John Lee John_Lee@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Doris Pyror Doris_Pryor@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Joshua Kolar Joshua_Kolar@ca7.uscourts.gov

7th CIRCUIT STAFF

Mr. Frank Insalaco Docket Supervisor frank_insalaco@ca7.uscourts.gov
Ms. Sarah Schrup Circuit Executive sarah_schrup@ca7.uscourts.gov
Mr. Alexander Castaneda Deputy Circuit Executive alexander_Castaneda@ca7.uscourts.gov
Mr. Jim Richmond [Former Docket Supervisor] jim_richmond@ca7.uscourts.gov

MEMBERS OF THE 7TH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Chief Judge Diane Sykes chambers_of_judge_sykes@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Frank Easterbrook frank_easterbrook@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Michael Brennan Michael_Brennan@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Michael Scudder Michael_Scudder@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Amy St. Eve amy_st_eve@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Doris Pyror Doris_Pryor@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Joshua Kolar Joshua_Kolar@ca7.uscourts.gov
Judge Nancy Maldonado Nancy_Maldonado@ca7.uscourts.gov
Chief District Judge Nancy Rosenstengel Nancy_Rosenstengel@ilsd.uscourts.gov // njrpd@ilsd.uscourts.gov

Chief District Judge Holly Brady Holly_Brady@innd.uscourts.gov
Chief District Judge Tanya Walton Pratt tanya_pratt@insd.uscourts.gov
Chief District Judge Sara Darrow Sara_Darrow@ilcd.uscourts.gov
Chief District Judge James D. Peterson james_peterson@wiwd.uscourts.gov
Chief District Judge Pamela Pepper Pamela_Pepper@wied.uscourts.gov
District Judge Virgina Kendall Virginia_Kendall@ilnd.uscourts.gov
District Judge Thomas M. Durkin thomas_durkin@ilnd.uscourts.gov
District Judge Sara L. Ellis Sara_Ellis@ilnd.uscourts.gov

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IL

District Court Clerk Thomas Bruton Thomas_Bruton@ilnd.uscourts.gov
District Chief Deputy Clerk Clarke Devereux Clarke_Devereux@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Executive Assistant Gaby Kennedy Gaby_Kennedy@ilnd.uscourts.gov

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

Judge Virginia Kendal Virginia_Kendall@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Jorge Alonso Jorge_Alonso@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Marvin Aspen Marvin_Aspen@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge John Blackey John_Blackey@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Elaine Bucklo Elaine_Bucklo@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Edmond Chang Edmond_Chang@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Sharon Coleman Sharon_Coleman@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Jeffery Cummings Jeffery_Cummings@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Jeremy Daniel Jeremy_Daniel@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Robert Dow Robert_Dow@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Thomas Durkin Thomas_Durkin@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Sara Ellis Sara_Ellis@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Robert Gettleman Robert_Gettleman@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Joan Gottschall Joan_Gottschall@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Ronald Guzman Ronald_Guzman@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Sunil Harjani Sunil_Harjani@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Lashonda Hunt Lashonda_Hunt@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Lindsay Jenkins Lindsay_Jenskins@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Iain Johnston Iain_Johnston@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Matthew Kennelly Matthew_Kennely@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge John Kness John_Kness@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Charles Kocoras Charles_Kocoras@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Joan Lefkow Joan_Lefkow@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Martha Pacold Martha_Pacold@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer Rebecca_Pallmeyer@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Philip Reinhard Philip_Reinhard@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Mary Rowlan Mary_Rowland@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Steven Seeger Steven_Seeger@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Manish Shah Manish_Shah@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge John Tharp John_Tharp@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Franklin Valderrama Franklin_Valderrama@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Judge Andrea Wood Andrea_Wood@ilnd.uscourts.gov

Chief Magistrate Judge Young Kim Young_Kim@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Jeannice Appenteng Jeannice_Appenteng@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Jeffrey Cole Jeffrey_Cole@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Sheila Finnegan Sheila_Finnegan@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Gabriel Fuentes Gabriel_Fuentes@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Jeffrey Gilbert Jeffrey_Gilbert@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate judge Keri Hotaling Keri_Hotaling@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Beth Jantz Beth_Jantz@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Daniel McLaughlin Daniel_Mclaughlin@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Laura McNally Laura_McNally@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Heather McShain Heather_McShain@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Margret Schneider Margret_Schneider@ilnd.uscourts.gov
Magistrate Judge Maria Valdez Maria_Valdez@ilnd.uscourts.gov

"I came to complete not to refute. I came light to the World." Jesus Christ

Magistrate Judge David Weisman David_Weisman@ilnd.uscourts.gov

JUDICIAL INTEGRITY OFFICER

Mr. Michael Henry
Michael_Henry@ao.uscourts.gov
AO_OJI@ao.uscourts.gov