


No. 24-7362

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



Christine Louise Kensinger — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

**ORIGINAL**

vs.

Michelle King, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration  
Judge Walter Hellums, Administrative Law Judge — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States 8<sup>TH</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Christine Louise Kensinger  
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 236  
(Address)

Republic, MO 65738  
(City, State, Zip Code)

413-399-3862  
(Phone Number)

APPENDIX A  
QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Is there sufficient evidence to establish a casual link between black mold exposure and the Plaintiff's damages to Plaintiff's health issues?
2. Can the Plaintiff's claimed health issues be scientifically linked to the specific type of mold identified in Plaintiff's medical records from Zeal Integrated?
3. Did the landlords and OACAC Housing Authority violate the implied warranty of habitability of failing to provide a safe and healthy living environment for Plaintiff and her family?
4. Did the landlords and OACAC Housing Authority act in bad faith by delaying or refusing remediation in Plaintiff's rental properties?
5. Did the ALJ err in failing to consider Plaintiff's medical records from Zeal Integrated Doctor of Chiropractic with test results that pointed to Plaintiff's black mold exposure which is Plaintiff's underlying health issues?
6. Did the ALJ err in discounting the medical questions on Plaintiff's OACAC Housing Authority assistance forms that Plaintiff underlying health issues Plaintiff suffers from is from mold and other environmental toxins and this is the cause of Plaintiff's severe health issues?
7. Did the Plaintiff take every reasonable step to receive medical attention from licensed primary care physicians before seeking out other medical alternatives due to unknown results of what was Plaintiff's severe chronic pain through her primary physicians before seeking other medical help?
8. Did the ALJ improperly discount or fail to adequately consider the opinions of the Doctor of Chiropractic with Zeal Integrated that Plaintiff's underlying health issues was caused by severe black mold exposure?
9. Did the ALJ misinterpret or mischaracterize the Plaintiff's findings or medical records?
10. Was there a violation of the Plaintiff's right to a fair hearing or due process due to the ALJ's errors regarding Plaintiff's Doctor of Chiropractic evidence with Zeal Integrated?

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

[ SEE ATTACHED ]  
[ ]  
[ APPENDIX A ]  
[ ]

## 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:

[ ]  
[ ]  
[ ]  
[ ]

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	#17
JURISDICTION .....	#20
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	#21
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	#21
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	#21
CONCLUSION.....	#21

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	QUESTIONS PRESENTED
APPENDIX B	OPINION and JUDGMENT
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## CASES

## PAGE NUMBER

[Case name and citation.....]	5]
[ Neb. Rev. § Statute 71-107	]
[ people v Christie, 95 Cal. App 2nd Supp. 919, 212 p.2d 629 (1949)	]
[ Page v. Astrue, 484 F.3d 1040, 1044 (8th Cir. 2007)	]
[ KRC v Colvin, 818 F.3d 364, 371 (8th Cir. 2016)	]
[ Miller v Colvin, 784 F.3d 472, 478 (8th Cir. 2015)	]

## STATUTES AND RULES

[Statute number or Rule number and citation.....]	4]
[ Amdt 14. S.1.5.4.8 Statute of limitations and Procedural Due Process	]
[ Fifth Amendment	]
[ Neb. Rev § Statute 71-107	]

RSMO 536.140

## OTHER

[ 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1) Social Security Act	]
[ Craig v Apfel, 212 F.3d 433, 436 (8th Cir. 2000)	]
[	]
[	]

## SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

## 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 B to the petition and is

☒ reported at United States 8<sup>th</sup> 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 \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; 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.

**JURISDICTION**

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was

February 12, 2025

☒ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. *due to State of Missouri Legal Justice System being Dishonest*

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals 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. \_\_\_\_\_.

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

☐ 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. \_\_\_\_\_.

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

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- [ 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) ]
- [ 5th Amendment ]
- [ Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 404.1505 ]
- [ The 12 month Rule of Staying gainfully employed ]

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- [ Severe Black Mold Exposure led up to Petitioner's life long disability of mold illness ]
- [ Petitioner's mold illness has kept her from staying gainfully employed 12 months ]
- [ Petitioner has severe thyroid condition to include severe migraine headaches due to ]
- [ environmental toxins in her place of residences to include black mold ]
- [ Mold Exposures and other toxic exposures in Petitioner's environments keeps ]
- [ Plaintiff unwell and always moving from job to job and relocating to new residences ]

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- [ This case affects a large number of people ]
- [ This case could affect a substantial portion of the economy ]
- [ National Importance ]
- [ Precedential Value - Important question of federal law ]

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Louise Kensing

Date: April 22, 2025

[Click here for the content of this form.](#)