NO. 24-6869

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Evelyn Thomas-Petitioner

v.

QuikTrip, Inc-Respondents

Judicial Neglect Notice – Lower Courts and Defense Counsel Silence

Evelyn Thomas
1413 Tree Creek Pkwy
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
Email: thomasevelyn@ymail.com
Mobile: (404) 914-2618

May 16th, 2025

To: U.S. District Court (Northern District of Georgia) & U.S. Court of Appeals (11th Circuit)

RE: Evelyn Thomas v. QuikTrip, Inc.
District Case No: 1:23-cv-3964
Appellate Notice: 24- 90033-A
Related Supreme Court Case No: 24-6869

Dear Clerks and Officers of the Court,

This notice is submitted as an official record of procedural failure and systemic denial of due process.

As of this writing, my petition in Supreme Court Case No. 24-6869 has been distributed for conference on May 29, 2025. The Supreme Court set a response deadline of April 28, 2025, for the respondent (QuikTrip, Inc.), and neither a waiver nor a response was filed. Additionally, no rulings or acknowledgments were issued by the lower courts regarding the constitutional and fraud-on-the-court filings I submitted on March 24 and March 28, 2025.

The silence from the defense counsel, the Northern District of Georgia, and the Eleventh Circuit is unjustified and undermines the credibility of the judicial process. These are not procedural delays — they are deliberate failures to engage with timely, relevant, and constitutionally grounded filings.

The actions (or inactions) of the courts and the respondent constitute:

- Violation of my First and Fourteenth Amendment rights;
- Dereliction of duty and obstruction of justice;
- Fraud on the court by omission;
- And a systemic denial of access to legal remedy.

This Court has long held that procedural due process requires courts to engage with filed motions (Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970); Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)), particularly when they allege fraud on the court or judicial misconduct (Hazel-

Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944); Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991)).

As a pro se litigant, I am also protected by the holding in Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), which mandates that my filings receive review, not institutional silence. In Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), the Court emphasized that judicial bodies must not ignore or overlook serious constitutional issues.

As I have stated throughout this case, paraphrasing Pulitzer Prize winner Kendrick Lamar, "you can try to rig this case, but you can't fake the truth." In addition to Chancelor Johnathan Bennett, "stop playing with me." Additionally, the motion to supplement submitted on March 28th and the legal insufficiency document filed with the Supreme Court on April 15th are not reflected in the case file.

I am requesting the following:

1. Written confirmation that my March 24 and March 28 filings were received and reviewed;
2. Explanation for the lack of response or entry on the docket;
3. Immediate acknowledgment of this letter in the official record of both the district and appellate courts.

This is not a passive request. It is a demand for accountability and for the courts to meet their constitutional and procedural obligations.

To emphasize, as outlined in my legal insufficiency filing, I am strongly confident that I justifiably won my case. The facts and the law were on my side, supported by the exhibits presented to the court. The challenges I faced are not merely legal oversights; they stem from malicious intent and overwhelming judicial misconduct, which led to the false misclassification of my filings and a violation of my constitutional protections. The defense counsel intentionally misled the court, and the lower court's silence and disregard for my filings on March 24th and 28th are part of a deliberate abuse of process. This situation is not simply a legal error; it represents a systemic denial of justice.