


In re 24-5920

No. 4:24-cv-132-WS-MJF

OUTGOING LEGAL MAIL
PROVIDED TO TAYLOR C.I. FOR
MAILING ON

9-24-24, [Signature] L.W.
DATE (CONFINEMENT-MAIN UNIT) OFFICER INT.

International Court of
Justice



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WORLD COURT
For The Court - By Direction

In re: Robert Lee Wright III — PETITIONER Lawgiver
(Your Name)

vs.

Martin A. Fitzpatrick — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
Supreme Court of The United States
United States Court of Appeals Eleventh Circuit Court
United States District Court Northern District of Florida
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

Supreme Court Rule 28 U.S.C. 201(1)



PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Supreme Court Rule 4.1, 2, 3 - Sessions and Quorum

Robert Lee Wright III
(Your Name)

8501 ~~Hampton~~ Hampton Springs Road
(Address)

Perry, Florida 32348
(City, State, Zip Code)

Taylor C.I.
(Phone Number)



WORLD COURT
QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

One:

Can I settle this case in my favor as the Pro se plaintiff, that was granted Lawsuit without prejudice in a plea abatement. See, case 4:24cv132 ws MJF. Under Oath?

Two:

Is this a particular query directed to a witness — compare interrogatory Federal question?

Three:

Does this motion fall under the jurisdiction of a Federal court because it requires a resolution of the construction or application of federal law — see also Federal question jurisdiction at jurisdiction?

Four:

Am I a graduate of a High school diploma or G.E.D.?

Five:

Am I a United States Citizen?

Six:

Am I a Legal Alien in America? Do I have a Daving Lawsuit?

Seven: My Name is The same as my father and grandfather can the Judge use immunity in this case my Father and grandfather are dead Does question 4, 5, 6, 7 mean anything To The economy of Filling in an application to sue someone in court? Does question 4, if answered no requires assistance to proceed as a Lawyer, or is there an infraction Prima Facie to proceed as a Lawyer without a school Certificate?

s/B. Wright

WORLD COURT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX G

WORLD COURT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

See, Kentucky Union Co. v Kentucky	219 U.S. 140, 161 (1911)
See, Rockefeller v. United States	257 U.S. 176 (1921)
See, Atlas Bank v. Doyle	9 R1 78
See, Huff v. State	622 So. 2d 982 (1993)
See, Hosey v. Burgess	890 S.W. 2d 262 (1995)
See Pulsifer v. United States	601 U.S. 2024 Lexis 1215 (2024)
See First Nat'l Mortgage Corp v. The Manhattan Life Ins. Co.	360 So. 2d 264 (1978)
See Wright v. Fitzpatrick	42 U.S.C. § 1983
See Rockefeller v. United States	
See Daemar v. Gilliland	1981 1 N.Z.L. R. 61.

STATUTES AND RULES

See Wright v. Fitzpatrick	Rule 42 U.S.C. 201 (1983)
Fed. R. Evid. 201 § 772.101 et seq	
Supreme Court Rule 42.1, 2 et seq	U.S.C. § 1982 Rule 14.1(e)(v)
Under Oath Supreme Court Rule 42.12	U.S.C.A. § 2000cc-1(a)
quasi-offense—compare offense/	Rule 42 U.S.C. 201 (1983)
See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34 and 36	request to Admit
In re D.L.B., 429 N.E. 2d 615	(1981)—total breach
Supreme Court Rule 5. et seq.	(Merriam-Webster CL-735-P4-9140 EDL)
See 28 U.S.C. § 451	Rule 14.1(e)(v) Supreme Court Rule
See Supreme Court Rule 42.12	U.S.C. § 1983 Rule 14.1(e)(v)

OTHER

Fed. R. Evid. 201 Lawsuit., IRS code 123 | digress digression
 Prima Facie IRS Primage In re Robert Lee Wright, III
 Sue out, total breach, ad damnum, immunity. ~~digress digression~~ Digression
 See supersedeas bond Also coupon bond. U.S. Code's C.I.D.

s/ R. Wright

WORLD COURT LIST OF PARTIES

[•] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

January 2024 4:24-cv-00006-MW-MAF/4:24-cv-00011-AW-MAF/42 U.S.C. 201 (1983)
4:24-cv-00012-MW-MAF/4:24-cv-00017-WS-MAF/4:24-cv-00051-AW-MAF/
4:24-cv-00060-WS-MAF/4:24-cv-00088-MW-MAF/4:24-cv-00107-AW-MAF/
4:24-cv-00108-WS-MAF/4:24-cv-00132-WS-MJF/4:24-cv-00142-MW-MJF/
4:24-cv-00155-WS-MAF/4:24-cv-00212-WS-MAF/4:24-cv-296-MW-MAF/
4:24-cv-00235-MW-MAF/4:24-cv-00310-MW-MAF/4:24-cv-314-WS-MAF/
4:24-cv-321-MCR-MAF All Filed in The United States District Court
Northern District of Florida Office of The Clerk, 111 NORTH Adams
Street, Suite 322, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7717, Official Business

Also, Case Pulsifer v. United States. 601 U.S. 2024 Lexis 1215 (2024).

s/B. Wright

International Court of Justice
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WORLD COURT
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix ^G~~12~~ to the petition and is

☒ reported at 11th Circuit Court of Appeals; or,
has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix ^G~~12~~ to the petition and is

☒ reported at 11th Circuit court of appeals; or,
has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

WORLD COURT JURISDICTION

[•] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was ~~06-14-2024~~ 06-14-2024

[•] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[•] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: effective 06-14-2024, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix G.

[•] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including July 31, 2024 (date) on August 15, 2024 (date) in Application No. USCA 11, 24-11595 (USCA11 No. 24-11595)

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

• Date on which USCA decided my case 06-14-2024

• An extension of time to file the petition for a writ... 06-31-2024 and August 15, 2024. 90 days. also, August 22, 2024 and Sept. 12, 2024.
Application No. USCA11 No. 24-11595.

[] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix —.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
—, and a copy of the order denying rehearing
appears at Appendix —.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including — (date) on — (date) in
Application No. — A —.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

WORLD COURT
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
Proof for Approval

Rules Of The Supreme Court of The United States
Pro Hac vice Due Process §§ 772.10-772.19 Rico Act.

Adopted December 5, 2022

Effected January 1, 2023

1 First Street, N. E.

Washington, DC 20543

Civil Rights Complaints Pro Se Litigants In Action Under 28 U.S.C.
§1331 or §1346 for 42 U.S.C. §1983 Pursuant To 42 U.S.C. §1997e (a)
Granted Lawsuit, to inform classification of Lawsuit abatement.

§ 772.101 et seq. Supreme Court Rule 42.1, 2 U.S.C. §1983 et seq. v. 601
U.S. 2024 Lexis 1215 (2024)

Civil Remedies For Criminal Practices Acts Laws.

Petition For Writ of Certiorari Wright vs. Fitzpatrick 4:24-cv-132 WS, MSJ

Under Oath. Supreme Court Rules See et seq. Lawsuit abatement.

Name: Robert Lee Wright, III D.O.B.: 02/22/1982 SS#: 353-70-3527 B: Chicago, IL

See 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f) Application for Stay Rule 23.

Also see Rule 22 and 33.2; 42 U.S.C. 201(a) 772.10-772.19 (1983),

28 U.S.C. 201(a) 772.10-772.19 (1346 a1), 26 U.S.C. 201(a) 772.10-772.19 (7433 a)

Also see Rule 39.7 Criminal Justice Act of 1964 18 U.S.C. § 3006(A)

* Merriam-Webster Inc. CC-902-A03-9980; CC-735-P4-9140
Sorinafield MA 01102

www.com AOL Keyword Merriam

Supreme Court Rule 28 et seq. U.S.C. A § 2101(f) Rule 23. et seq.

Morgan & Morgan Complex Litigation Group Phone # 212-738-6800
Attorney Eli Lidsky #16022205

850 Third Ave. Suite 402
Brooklyn, NY 11232

s/ R. Wright

WORLD COURT STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Now Comes entity if a judgement for money in a Civil case is affirmed any interest allowed by Law is payable from the date the judgement under review was entered. If a judgement is modified or reversed with a direction that a judgement for money be entered the Courts may award interest to the extent permitted by Law. Interest in cases arising in a state court is allowed at the same rate that similar judgements bear interest in the courts of the State in which judgement is directed to be entered. Interest in cases arising in a Court of the United States is allowed at the interest rate authorized by Law. In This case money has been affirmed abate. When a petition for a writ of certiorari an appeal or an application for other relief is frivolous the Court may award the respondent or appellee just damages and single or double costs under Rule 43. Damages or cost may be awarded against petitioner or appellant or applicant against the partys counsel or against both party and counsel. To prosecute this case the defendant has violated these and further Rules of the United States Supreme Court Fed. R. Evid. 201 Mr. Fitzpatrick has dismissed cases as Frivolous while in the proceeding of a Lawsuit of someone sued with go model or clarity. See the plaintiffs electronic case files case management folder, (pro and con.) civil Complaints United States District Court Northern District of Florida Tallahassee Division. This is for the Court by Direction. In the year of 2024 Under Oath. Defendant was sued yesteryear. Mr. Fitzpatrick claimed to redact my Birthday.

s/ R. Wright

WORLD COURT
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION
Rule 42 U.S.C. 201 (1983) et seq.

In re Robert Lee Wright III and shall follow insofar as applicable the form of a petition for a writ of certiorari prescribed by Supreme Court Rule 14. See Supreme Court Rule 42.

Interest and Damages, see Supreme Court Rule 5.3
See Supreme Court Rule 20.3 Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ. For writ of Certiorari to be granted.

The court should notice that the plaintiff has evidence admitting that there is a Lawsuit in this case See Wright v. Fitzpatrick Case 4:24-cv-132-WS/MJF. Document 4 Filed 03/22/24 Pages 1 thru 4

Rule 4.3 Sessions and Quorum

Criminal Justice Act of 1994 Appointment of counsel under Rule 9. et seq. Defendants was sued yesteryear.

Under Oath See Supreme Court Rule 5. et seq. Admission To The Bar
See. Huff v. State, 622 So. 2d 982 (1993) When an out-of-state attorney is allowed to practice in a case without the appropriate state bar license. pro hac vice.

The case stated a statement agreed upon by the parties to a Lawsuit that sets forth the facts of the case and parties request for a judgement by the court based on those facts of case law established by judicial decisions in cases as distinguished from law created by legislation — called also decisional law; see also common Law

In compliance to prima facie companion cases of (P and I) principal and interest and an implied promise of primage with an proposed order for an plea and abatement of \$1 trillion that the arbitrator of the court claims to have inheriting power over each case that's dismissed.

See Fidelity bond, injunction bond, judicial bond, payment bond, peace bond. In writ of a total breach petition to cancel a contract and sue for damages The Plaintiff is a paying Federal Prison Litigant.
See. Supreme Court Rule 28 et seq. U.S.C. § 451 (2002) Rule 14.1(e)(v)
See. Supreme Court Rule 42.1.2 U.S.C. § 1983 Rule 14.1(e)(v)

s/ R. Wright

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

For A Recommendation 42 U.S.C. 201(1983)

Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C. 201(1983) Rule 28 U.S.C. 201(1331 or 1346)

Federal Report Evidence Pursuant To Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C. 201(1983)

Several cases that the defendant Mr. Fitzpatrick has served Orders on For Mr. Wright to discover infractions has Federal Reports of Lawsuits evidence See Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C. 201(1983) et seq. or Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C.A. 201(1983) et seq.

There are cases here on the related cases that are not yesteryear sued Mr. Wright filed a Lawsuit on Mr. Fitzpatrick reason is that in several cases listed on related cases Mr. Fitzpatrick has served order or proposal of yesteryear suits, "someone sued." Therefore we're sure that Mr.

Fitzpatrick while claiming immunity he is aware that he has served orders statements For suits that are yesteryear using the word sued. in case Wright vs. IRS and several other cases as follows Mr. Fitzpatrick has said in ECF No. 1 "That as best can be determined Mr. Wright has sued." Dismissing cases that someone is sued in with the power to inherent is arbitration. Also Mr. Wright claims that he started filing complaints on The IRS to Mr. Fitzpatrick was For to stop their harrassment and give him the other half of the Covid-19 stimulus check. Other than that Mr. Wright claims that this is stimulus meaning instiating an arguement or denial in a Prima Facie case, and declares on relief, the other case numbers listed should have evidence that Mr. Wright cant explain, in support to an awarding court for Lawsuit arbitration. Mr. Wright claims immunity because he cant even take care of his own benefits. he doesnt recieve payment For the non-paying job that he is working for. Also while in the process of this complaint Mr. Wright has had a siezure on 07-28-2024 a.m. hrs. Due Process of Law.

See Federal Report Evidence Civil Rights Complaints Pro Se Litigants In Actions Under Supreme Court Rule 28 U.S.C.A. 201(1331 or 1346) For Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C.A. 201(1983) Pursuant To Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C.A. 201(1997) Also Supreme Court Rule 42 U.S.C.A. 201(2000 cc-1(a)) To drove digression in case. Wright, ECF.

s/R. Wright

WORLD COURT

Requested Relief

tort claim of an inquiry check.
tort claim of an payment check.
accredit disclosure of all claims.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

s/g. Wright (R.L.W. III)

Date: 08/22/2024

ROBERT LEE WRIGHT, III
BIVENS CASE 403 US 388 (1971)
SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

Authorized by the Criminal Justice Act
18 U.S.C. § 3006(a)