

25-5255

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUL 17 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

OCT. Term: 2024

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

I.

IN RE Alex Anderson

— PETITIONER —

against

Desiree Perez, Mgt.

— RESPONDENT(S) —

ON Petition FOR A writ OF Mandamus, "or"
A writ OF prohibition, and-or in the al-
ternative both under Supreme Court Rule
20.1; Supreme Court Rule 21; and authorized
by Title 28 United States code, Secs []
1651(a); 1251(a) & 1251(b)(2).

Off. Counselor for
Alex Anderson Jr.
21-10 Borden Ave.
Long Is City, NY 11101

RECEIVED

JUN - 5 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

A.

Question(s) Presented

Q.1: Wasn't the U.S. district court's ruling under "Rule 24(a)" res judicate of "Alex Anderson, petitioner vs. UMG Recordings, Inc., et al., No. 13-9092 May 19, 2014 & Index No. 13-9091 81?"

Q.2: Didn't the court permit the herein Andersons' too proceed to the court "together" under section [8] 1915A; and Supreme Ct. Rule 28; 39; ex rel Index No. 13-9091 & No. 13-9092 ?!

Q3: Didn't the 11th Circuit Court panel at July 12, 2021 attempt to redo or undo the law and merits of A): A matter already having been decided ?? AND B): A Decree of marriage entered and pursuant too Section 1915A screening ?!

Q4: Removed, as repetitious.
see Supreme Court Rule 14.1(a).

Q 5: WASN'T THE OPINION OF
THIS COURT UNDER CASE NO. 18-9092
& 18-9091 TO BE A U.S. PRECEDENCE ?!

Q. 6: DIDN'T THE COURT HOLD IN
ONERGETELL vs. HODGES THAT SOME SEX
"AND" OTHER NON-TRADITIONAL MARRI-
AGES WERE SKIN MILK MARRIAGES
BY THE MATERIAL FACT OF CO-HABITAT-
ION, AND WERE IDENTICAL TO PURE
BLOOD MARRIAGES ??

Q 7: REMOVED AS REPETITIOUS.
SEE SUPREME COURT RULE 14.1(A).

Q.8: IN the United States Court OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL Circuit "isn't it true that A QUORUM under SEC. 46(d) et. seq. must consist of three (3) or more Judges?"

Q.9: IN accordance with Title 28 U.S.C. SECTION 46(d) "isn't it a matter OF A FACT that the number OF Judges too constitute A QUORUM under 28 U.S. Code, SECTION 46(c) is three (3)?"

Q.10: Wasn't the October 13, 2001 ruling perpetuated without effect OF LAW?

Q.11: Wasn't the October 21, 2001 judgment in essence fraud committed upon the Court?

Q. 12: Shouldn't the ruling and decision of Alex Anderson Jr. and Mariah Angela Carey's Decree of Marriage be considered A True Bill ?!

Exh. "ONE"
P. VI. THRU XVI(3),
Subpart II.

B.

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:

Plt. Appellant Alex Anderson [a/k/a
Alex Anderson Jr.]]

DEFT.-Appellee Desiree Perez is the former manager of Epic Recording Artist Mariah Carey;

DEFT.-Appellee UNKNOWN ["CPA"] certified Public Accountant and/or ["MLP"] Master Limited Partner ["Antelo Road"];

DEFT.-Appellee UNKNOWN Legal Counsel in his official capacity as a hired hand by the UNKNOWN certified Public Accountant;

Gelfand, Rannert, Feldman LLP ("GRF")
"MC's" Business Management; UMG Record-
ings, INC. (UMG); Island Def Jam Record-
ings, (IDJ); Chairman Antonio "LA" Reid
(UMG/IDJ);

Xvii.

Kevin Flanagan; Bennie Medina; Nick Cannon; Vivendi (UMG's) [OWNER] and C.E.O. Lucian Goringe; Shakir Stewart, ["DECEASED"]; Antonio Reid in his official capacity as chairman of Epic Records. ALSO Epic Records Corporation; DAVID A. KIRKINBLUM Support Magistrate; John M. Hunt, Judge; Dwayne B. Paul, Family Court of New York State, Queens County (File #: 171891);

Chesyle Chambers, L. Priscilla Hall, Sandra L. Schol, Betsy Barros, Judges; Index No. 2017-09321 (File #: 171891); Mark C. Dillon, Leonard B. Austin, John M. Leventhal, Colleen D. Duffy, Judges; Index No. 2019-04201 (File #: 171891) Supreme Court (NYS) Appellate Div., Second Dept;

Martin, Branch, and Luck, Circuit Judges, United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit, Case #: 20-13610.

["Interested Party"] R.M.P. 2425 Michigan Ave., Beverly Hills, California 90210. Also Mariab Carey Anderson is an interested party.

C.
RELATED CASES

United States vs. Windsor, 133 S.Ct.
2675 (2013).

Alex Anderson vs. UMG Recordings, Inc.,
Et AL, 134 S.Ct. 2301 (2014).

Obergefell vs. Hodges, 135 S.Ct. 2584
(2015).

In the matter of Alex Anderson and
Mariah Carey, matter of A support/
proceeding, Family Court, State of New
York, County of Queens (File #: 171091)
Docket No. F-07170-17. Present David A.
Kirschblum Support Magistrate and Hon-
orable John M. Hunt, Judge.

In the matter of Alex Anderson Jr.,
Appellant vs. Mariah A. Carey, Motion No.
2018-535, State of New York, Court
of Appeals, Hon. Janet DeFioré, Chief
Judge presiding.

IN The Matter of Alex Anderson and
Mariah Carey, Matter OF A Support Pro-
ceeding, Family Court, State OF New
York, County OF QUEENS (File #: 171091)
Docket NO. F-2011-18. Present David A.
Kirschblum, Support Magistrate and HON-
orable Dweynie E. Paul, Judge.

IN the matter OF the Andersons'
Appeal in Docket NO. F-2011-18 Sup-
reme Court OF the State OF New York
Appellate Division and Department,
Case NO. 2019-04201.

Alex Anderson Jr. vs. Gelfand, Reniest,
Feldman ("GRF") LLC Supreme Court
OF the State OF New York Index
No. 2000-17.

Exh. "ONE" p. XXI.
via xxvii
Support III.

XX

D.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Alex Anderson (and Mariah Carey)
vs. UMG Recordings, INC., ET AL No.
13-9092 and 13-9091 (05/19/14);

Mariah Carey (Anderson), et al, Plaintiffs,
vs. Desiree Perez, et al., Respondents
Case No. 20-13810 U.S.C.A. 11th Cir. (10/21/2021);

[cont...]

STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) 28 U.S.C. § 1251(b)(2)
28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) 28 U.S.C. § 1251(a)
28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)
28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3)
Fed. Rule Civil Procedure 60(b)(3), (4).
Rule 60(d)(1), (3).
Rule 60(c)(1).

[cont...]

OTHER

Anderson's personal Letter to Associate United
States Supreme Court Justice Honorable Ruth
Bader Ginsburg of New York (12/04/17), App. G

LXXXVIII.

Cases

Mariah Carey (Anderson), et al., Plts.
vs. Desiree Perez, et al., United
States District, Southern District
of Florida, No. 1:20-cv-23496 (09/
10/2020) ["dismissal Order"]; (10/21/
2020) ["Order ON Motion TO Appeal
in Forma Pauperis"];

Estelle vs. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106
(1976);

Haines vs. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519,
520-21 (1972);

Dean vs. Barber, 951 F.2d 1210 (11th
Cir. 1992);

Statutes AND Rules

42 U.S.C. § 1983 Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000e

42 U.S.C. § 1985(3)

§ 1 of the Ku Klux Klan Act of April 26,
1871

§ 2 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act

Other

LXXXIX.

Alex Anderson's personal Letter to the
Supervising Justice of the States of Vermont,
Connecticut and New York (08/27/19). Add. G

Cases

Peterson vs. Smith, 762 F. App. 585,
598 (11th Cir. 2019);

Offutt vs. United States, 340 U.S. 11, 14,
75 S. Ct. 11, 13 (1954);

Liteky vs. United States, 114 S. Ct. 1147,
1162 (1994);

[Cont...]

Statutes AND Rules

18 U.S.C. 1501

18 U.S.C. 1509

18 U.S.C. 1593A

19 U.S.C. 1592

18 U.S. Code secs, 1961 through 1968,
Federal RICO Act

Sections; 895.01 - 895.66 Florida
RICO Act

Sup. Ct. Rule 12, 13.1, Rule 14, Rule 17

Sup. Ct. Rule 20, Rule 21

Sup. Ct. Rule 39

XC.

Cases

People of the State of Illinois vs. Fred E. Sterling 357 Ill 354; 192 N.E. 229 (1934);

Alb F. Moore vs. Stanley F. Stevens, 336 Ill 316, 168 N.E. 259 (1992);

In re Village of Willowbrook, 37 Ill App 2d 392 (1962);

Durham vs. Durham, 57 Ill App 475 (1994) affirmed 162 Ill 589 (1896); Skelly Oil Co. vs. Universal Oil Products Co., 338 Ill App. 79, 86 N.E. 2d 875, 8834 (1949); Thomas Stages vs. The America Home Security Corporation, 362 Ill 350, 199 N.E. 798, (1935);

United States vs. Edith Windsor, 133 S.Ct. 2675 (2013);

Obergefell vs. Hodges, 135 S.Ct. 2584 (2015).

Cases

People vs. Zajic, 88 Ill. App. 3d 477, 410 N.E. 2d 626 (1980) ("A judge is not the court");

Liljeberg vs. Health Services Acquisition Corp. 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988); United States vs. Balistreri, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985)

Levine vs. United States, 362 U.S. [cont.]
Statutes AND Rules

Code 28: 1991 bc ("Fed Question") [Breach of Contract]

Code 18 0241 "Conspiracy against Citizen rights"

New York State CPLR 3215 [default statute]

Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a)

610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960) citing
OFFUTT vs. United States, 348
U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 18 (1954)

Kenner vs. CIP, 387 F.2d 1089
(1968); ("Fraud upon the Court"
has been defined by the 7th Circuit
Court of Appeals to "embrace that
species of fraud which does, or
attempted to, deceive the Court itself
"); 7 Moore's Federal Practice,
2d ed. p. 512. The 7th Circuit further
stated "a decision produced by fraud
upon the Court is not in essence a decis-
ion at all, and never becomes final;"

[cont...]

Statutes AND RULES

Acts of October 15, 1970, PL 91-
452, SEC 901(a), 84 Stat. 941,
18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-through-1968

NEW YORK PENAL LAW SECTIONS
460.00 THRU 460.00. Title 10,
OF ARTICLE 460

CASES

The Supreme Court has also held that if a judge was against the Constitution, or if he acts without jurisdiction, he has engaged in treason to the Constitution. If a judge acts after he has been automatically disqualified by law, then he is acting without jurisdiction, and that suggests that he is then engaging in criminal acts of treason..

Statute AND RULES

Colorado Revised Statutes: Colorado Statutes: §14-15-104; §14-2-110; §14-2-106; §14-15-103

Other

Alex Anderson's personal Letter to Associate Supreme Court Justice Hon. Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and on behalf of Himself and Marian Carey Anderson (11/15/2018).

XCIV.

STATUTES AND RULES

SECTIONS 895.01 VIA 895.08
OF THE FLORIDA RICO (RACKETEER
INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGAN-
IZATION) ACT.

Fed. R. App. P. 24(a).

Other

△ Appellant's initial Legal Letter
to the Supervising Justice of the
Second Judicial Circuit, The Hon-
orable Justice Ruth Bader
Ginsburg. Appendix G.

Florida, Civil RICO and Treble
Damages; § 772.104

under Federal RICO (18 U.S.C.
§ 1964 (c)) acts; for Treble Damages

XCV.

For contents also see Exhibit "one" page's
VI. thru LXXXVII.

E.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1 - 2;
JURISDICTION.....	p. 3-6;
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	p. 7-8;
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	p. 9-2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	p. 25-28
CONCLUSION.....	30 (here)

Exhibit one:

Subpart I, § 1651(a),
§ 1251(a) & § 1251(b) (a)
Contents; (p) 9 thru 24

Subpart II, § 1651(a),
§ 1251(a) & § 1251(b) (a)
Contents; (p) VI thru XVI (3)

Subpart III, § 1651(a),
§ 1251(a) & § 1251(b) (a)
Contents; XIX thru XXV

Three (3) United States Precedence:

- A) Alex Anderson vs. UMG
Index No. 09-40201a
(Dec. 28, 2009). FIND LAW:
page's 128(d) - 146(d); Appendix
"D"
- B) Alex Anderson, Petitioner
vs. UMG Recordings Inc., ET AL.,
No. 13-9092 & No. 13-9091.
U.S. Sup. Ct. (May 19, 2014). FIND
LAW: page's 265(g) - 307(g); Appen-
dix "E"
- C) In re of Alex Anderson
(September 10, 2020) Document
#5; Order U.S. Dist. Ct. S.D. of
Fla. FIND LAW: page's 1A-5A
Appendix "A"
- xcvii.

F

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A U.S. District Court, Southern Dist. of Fla.,
Order of 10 Sept. 2020.
- APPENDIX B U.S. District Court "recused" Order of 21
Oct. 2020. App. Bt U.S. 11th Cir. Ct. decision of
12 July 2020.
- APPENDIX C U.S. 11th Cir. Court; No. 20-13810. Also the
Court's Mandate; Oct. 21, 2021. AND App. Ct
RULING after rehearing; Oct. 13, 2021.
- APPENDIX "D" ACCUSATIONS OF RACKETEERING; Fed., NYS, &
Florida (Appendix D).
- APPENDIX "E" ANDERSON vs. Carey, In the matter of A
Support Proceedings (New York State).
- Appendix "F" matters of Gelfand, Reinert, Feldman,
LLP, "GRF" Carey's Business Mgt.
- Appendix "G" INFORMATION CONCERNING except-
ional CIRCUMSTANCES.
- Appendix "H" In re Mariah Carey Anderson, Alex
Anderson, 11th Circuit Court of Appeals
No. 24-12407-D (Oct. 8, 2024).

Exhibit ONE:

Δ's §1651(a) - Statement of the case
pages 9 thru 24;

Δ's §1251(a) & §1251(b)(2) contents for
the §1651(a); Writ (p.) VI thru XVI (8);

Preliminary statement of Δ's §1651(a);
Writ of mandamus and prohibition (p.) XIX
thru XXV.
XCVIII.

G.
OPINIONS BELOW

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

A PETITION FOR A writ under 7(b)(1) MOTION and
Practice via Rule 60(b).

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ under 28 U.S. Code, § 1251
(a), issue in this matter of the Supreme Court's exclusive
jurisdiction of controversies between two or more
states in the territory of the U.S. and, too which the Court has

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix B+ to
the petition and C, 471 & C.

☐ reported at _____; 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 A to
the petition and D B.

☐ reported at _____; or,

☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

Original but not Exclusive Jurisdiction by Title 28 U.S. Code,
Section 1251(b)(3) and in the Appellate Ct. matter of Appellant
Alex Anderson vs. Desiree Perez, United States
Court of Appeals for the Federal 11th Circuit court
Index No. 20-13810 (Decided: 07/12/2021); also via
"Mariah Carey (Anderson), et al., Plaintiffs vs.
Desiree Perez, et al.," [Order on Motion to
Appeal in Forma Pauperis], U.S. District Court
Southern District of Florida under Rule 24(a)
Oct. 21, 2020 (idiom < matter of) Alex Anderson
(and Mariah Carey) Petitioners, U.S. Sup.
Ct. internal citations No. 13-9091 and No.

13-9092 on writ of certiorari October Term: 2013 "Granted May 19, 2014."

Moreover indeed the Court has also exclusive jurisdiction under Section 1251 (controversies between two or more states) by virtue of Alex Anderson vs. Mariah Carey Anderson. (NYS, QNS, County Family Court Jurisdiction, Docket No. F-07178-17 (June 7, 2017) "and" Docket No. F-20111-18 (October 31, 2018). And by virtue of Colorado Revised Statutes § 14-15-104 (Requisites of a valid Civil Union); § 14-2-110 (Prohibited marriages); § 14-2-106 (License to marry) and; by virtue of the State of Colorado requisites for common law marriage.

Finally the Court has jurisdiction up under section 1251(a)(2) by virtue of the decision reached May 19, 2014 and by way of Supreme Courts United States Precedence and controversies between two or more states.

H. Jurisdiction

A. Standard Of Review.

(1), (4) Federal Rule Of Civil Procedure 60(b) Motion to vacate a judgment for fraud on court states that nothing in Rule 60 limits a court's power to set aside a judgment for fraud on the court.

The United States Supreme Court has also noted that the courts have the inherent power to vacate judgments on basis of fraud upon the court.

The Court generally reviews district court rulings on Rule 60 motions for post judgment relief for abuse of discretion. E.g. Jones vs 11 cent RR Co., 617 F. 3d. 843, 850 (6th Cir. 2010). Also United States vs. Pauley, 341 F. 3d. 578, 581, (6th Cir. 2003).

Finally under Federal Rule Civil Practice Rule 7(b) (1) the petitioner request by motion A court order granting the relief to vacate the judgment pursuant too Rule 60(b) on the basis of fraud committed upon the court.

I.

JURISDICTION

X For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 06/12/21. U.S. District Decision 09/10/20.

U.S. district court's 'recused' order based on Δ's \$1915 (a) \$ 700.00 income; U.S. Sup. Ct. IFP, case NO. 13-9092 & 13-9091.

X A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: 10/13/21, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C+.

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. § 1251(a) in which provides the Court original and exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more states, also; the Court's jurisdiction is invoked under § 1251(b)(2) in which the Supreme Court has original but not exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between the United States and a state. Moreover, jurisdiction of the Court is propelled via 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) in aid of the Court's respective procedural jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law accord of Rule 60(b)(1)(4); 60(d)(1)(3); Rule 60(c)(1)(3); For relief from judgment or order pursuant Fed. R. Civil Procedure Rule 7(b)(1), and Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 40a. Furthermore the Appellant's writ of Mandamus ["mandate"] and/or writ of prohibition would be appropriate usage and principles of law of which would prohibit the Lower Courts; the dept... [and others]; from failing too abide by the Law. Finally the matter(s) are pursuant of Supreme Court Rule 20, 21 "and" Rule 39 & 29.

4.

^{J.} The United States Supreme Court's Jurisdiction For An Extraordinary Writ

The Court's Extraordinary petition via Sec [§] 1651(a) is by Vetur of the Original Jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and Under Rule 10. Id an Extraordinary Writ is not a matter of a right, but of discretion sparingly exercised. To justify the granting of any such writ, the petitioners must show that the writ will be in aid of the Court appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the court's discretionary powers and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court. See referendum of Sup. Court-Rule 17 procedure in an original action invoking the Court's Original Jurisdiction under Article IV of the Constitution of the United States Idiom 20 U.S. Code § 1251 (1) (2) and U.S. Const. Amend 14th "Due Process."

The petition is authorized by procedures For an Extraordinary Writ under Title 20 U.S. Code SECTION 1651 - All Writs...

[As A judicial Notice § 1251 (a) provides the court with Original jurisdiction and Exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more states. Moreover § 1251 (b) (2) provides For all controversies between the United States and a state.]

The Court's petitioner Alex Anderson Jr. Section 28 U.S. Code § 1651 (a) writ "is pursuant of Federal Rule Civil Practice 60 (b)(3)(6) and makes void the orders and judgments of the United States District Court and the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals.", The Appellant's writ "is propelled by Federal Rules of evidence, Rule 402, and by and through Rule 21, 7(b)(1) and For A Court Order to vacate the judgment on the basis that the Order-and-judgment is void."

wherefore Appellant's Writ should be Granted too serve as an aid of the court's jurisdiction of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals "for compelling reasons under the 14th Amendment Rights of Due Process and Equal Protection of Laws in the United States." wherefore, the courts, dept., and all others ought to be prohibited from failing to abide by the Law... and the writ of prohibition and mandamus ("mandate") should to Granted.

K.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

14th Amendment Rights of Due Process
Under the United States Constitution;

14th Amendment Rights of Equal Protection under the United States Constitution;

8th Amendment Rights of Prohibition of Cruel and unusual punishment under the United States Constitution;

Article 4, New York Family Law
§411 (Jurisdiction); §412 (married persons duty to support spouse); §415 (Duties to support receipt of Public assistance or Welfare); §425 (agreement to support); §442 (Order of Support by A spouse);

Colorado Revised statutes

Colorado Revised statutes §14-15-104 (Requisites of a valid civil union); 14-2-110 (Prohibited marriages); §14-2-100 (License to marry); §14-15-103 (Definitions)

Organized Crime Control
Act of 1970; Public Law 91-452,
Section 901(a) 84 Stat. 941;
18 U.S. Code Secs. 1961 through
1968.

New York Racketeer Influenced
and Corrupt Organization Acts;
(NYS) Penal Law 9.20; Sections
460.60 thru 460.80; Title 10,
Article 460.

28 U.S. Code §1915(a) applicat-
ion, filed January 14, 2014;
ANDERSON vs. UMG [short title]
Supreme Court of the United
States, No. 13-9092.

Sections 895.01 via 895.08 of
the Florida RICO (Racketeer
Influenced and Corrupt Organ-
ization) Act.

Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)

Subpart I.

Δ's §1651(a)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

46. The Def. is Desiree Perez, the Δ-Appellant's wife's management; who is ultimately responsible for the management of the "CPA" and the "Attorney" who is also counsel to the "CPA" and management.

In or about 2001 Recording artist Mariah Carey was diagnosed at that time as suffering from A bipolar disorder.

47. In April of 2005 and after having lived together for 2 1/2 years in Apts in NY & NJ Mariah Carey (Anderson) and Alex Anderson Jr. were engaged to be married.

48. In effect of the decision pertaining to Δ's wife Mariah Carey's decision to marry Appellant Alex Anderson Jr., Carey's Employer Def Jam/Universal Music Group sought after The EMANCIPATION Album (04/12/05) to intervene; up until Carey was released from UMG/Def Jam and signed with Epic Records ["in 2014"].

49. In Feb./March of 2007 Appellant Alex Anderson signed A 4-6 year record deal for Ten (10) studio Albums, Worldwide distribution of records,

Merchandise, and FOS management. The afore-
stated contract was accepted by UMG/
Def Jam Music (former) President and C.E.O.
Shawn "Jay Z" Carter.

50. Our 19. year Marriage ["2007-2025"]
with the exceptions of close friends and
relations... such as veteran News Journalist;
Katie Couric, ABC News Journalist Diane
Sawyer as well as the Uniformed Court
System... For the most part has been kept
out of the public eye. Idiom see United
States District Court Federal complaint para-
graph 24.

51. From the inception of 2005 the com-
plaintiff Alex Anderson has sought money
in connection with cost & management
of his, and his wife's legal cost of legal
litigation affairs against Carey's former
Employer UMG Recordings, Inc.

52. Whereas Appellant Alex Anderson
handled the entire cost of his wife's
legal defense against her former Employer as
it pertains to the plaintiff-appellant Oct. Term
2014 Writ of Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals and regarding Federal &
state →

allegations of racketeering of the
Employer UMG / Def Jam Music.

53. After the briefing of the United States Supreme Court in the matter of the Andersons' Writ of Certiorari, International Recording Artist Mariah Carey was permitted to option out of her \$80 Million U.S. Dollars contractual obligations to Def Jam Music.

54. Since after the decision of the Andersons' matters in Alex Anderson (and Mariah Carey) No. 13-9092 and No. 13-9091 May 19, 2014; complaintiff Alex Anderson Jr. has repetitively sought inasmuch of \$30 million U.S. dollars from his wife International recording Artist Mariah Carey who has and estimated net worth of \$750 Million and, \$1.2 Billion, e.g., (-ly) \$1 Billion, \$200 Million U.S. Dollars.

55. Whereas repetitively in words and figures since 2017 the Epic Recording Artist Mariah Carey has advised or instructed

the (certified Public Accountant) [i.e. the Master Limited Partner of the Partnership; Record Label, Business Management, Personal Manager and Counsel] too provide spousal support "or" financial maintenance too her legal spouse and legal husband [of 19 yrs] \$30 million dollars.

56. And at 2019 Movant had advised the Appellee - deft. Desire Perez, Mgt. by, through and in his capacity as Carey's lawful and legal husband to fire the accountant.

57. The pretense for the certified Public Accountant is pretextual discrimination under Mariann Carey (Anderson's) Employment rights via the 14th Amend, Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000e (1964) invoked by Classification of Religious and work situation(s), via the Civil Rights Act... and would be that international recording artist Mariann Carey and Movant Appellant Alex Anderson Jr are not married. And, indeed that the pretextual reasoning is in violation-

ION of the United States Supreme Court October Term: 2013 decision reached in Alex Anderson vs. UMG Recordings, Inc, Et AL, 134 S.Ct. 2301 (2014); and is not inherent of the decision, opinion, and ruling Following from Obergefell vs. Hodges, 135 S.Ct. 2584, 2607-2608 (2015); and this Court's earlier decisions rendered in the matter of United States vs. EDITH WINDSOR cited as 133 S.Ct. 2675.

58. The aforementioned unknown CPA ["certified Public Accountant"] and master Limited Partner of the Partnership; Record Label, Business Management ["GRF"], Personal Manager, and management over Legal Counsel has repetitively made the "claim" concerning the United States Supreme Court's decision "In re" [Latin phrase meaning in the matter of] "Alex Anderson and Mariah Carey Section 1915(d), *** pauperis application by and through IFP No. 13-9092" that the "Andersons' declaration of Marriage May 19, 2014 was fraudulent." [Emphasis and Quotations intended]. Also the companies unknown Attorney has "repetitively claimed" that the Appellant is a 'CON MAN' (id., translation "A man who cheats or tricks someone by gaining their trust and persuading them to believe something that is not true." [Emphasis and Quotation marks intended]. 13.

59 Idiom Anderson's Education:
Anderson's accelerated LAW Degree
in Higher Education ["Transcripts"]
was acquired via Durham Technical
Community College, Durham North
Caroline. And, while he was incar-
cerated within the Federal Bureau
of Prisons. By Learning And Em-
ployment Records [LER's] the Δ's
Appellant's Legal education [1975-
2025] represents by the accredita-
tion of academics to be an Honorary
Juris Doctorate. FNI:

Footnote 1: Find LAW: page's i thru xcvi;
Page's 1 thru 30. Also, Find LAW at Append-
ix "A," "A+," "B," "B+," "C+," "D," "E,"
also at Appendix "F," & "G," and at
Exhibit ONE.

40. At June 7, 2021 Recording artist
Marian Angela Carey Left RBC NATION
management (2017-2021) For Range
Media Partners.

IV.

"Timeline" concerning the
ANDERSONS' 18 U.S.C. §1961 thru
1968 Federal R.I.C.O. ["2001 via
2025"] ACCUSATIONS: "AND"
18 U.S.C. §1501; 18 U.S.C. §1509;
18 U.S.C. §1593A; & 19 U.S.C. §1592.
Also; Sections 895.01-895.06 Florida
RICO ACT; and 9.20 (NYS), Title 10,
Article 460 racketeering.

41. ON January 4, 2007 "interested party"
Marian Carey Anderson and Alex Anderson
Jr., were a physically married couple
by common law for the state of
Colorado where the parties lived and
where Marian Carey payed taxes for
A home in Aspen Colorado.

At Feb/Mar of 2007 Shawn Jay-Z
Carter, President and C.E.O. of UMG
Recordings, INC/Def JAM Music label

accepted A Contract; valued at \$52 Million dollars, For recorded music and distribution of records. Also for an advancement of \$100,000.00 and For day to day management.

62. By September 2007 the Δ Alex Anderson Jr. had not been paid or called up on the Contract.

63. ON April 20, 2008 'interested party' Nick Cannon accepted on behalf of himself A Commercial bribe in the first degree estimated to be in excess of \$20 Million dollars, in violation of New York Consolidated Laws, Penal Law §180.08 paid by UMG / D&F UAM Chairman Antonio LA Reid and also in violation of section 180.08 Commercial bribe in the First Degree.

64. Because Appellant was not paid on his contract; as a material issue the petitioner's contract was considered

to be lost by way of criminality pursuant to New York State Penal Law §155.42 Grand Larceny of A Contract; in the First degree.

65. IN deed UMG Recordings Inc. defaulted in ANDERSON, Alex vs. UMG Recordings, Inc., Index No. 401972/2011; Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County October 20, 2011. BUT; by "bad law," [emphasis added] was theoretically [] able to acquire a default judgment by committing fraud upon the court. The defendants defaulted on the entire amount of \$52,000,000 (&) \$100,000.00 dollars.

FN:2:

FN:2: See Appendix D, page's 158(d) thru 160(d), ex rel page's 128(d) via 166(d) [Judicial Notice of p. 137(d), 140(d)]. Also Judicial Notice of page 152(d), 154(d) and 156(d). See also Δ's Judicial Notice p. 167(d) thru p. 171(d).

66. As A result of Anderson's legal problems Appellant sought LOANS FROM friends in the amount of \$100,000.00 Thousand dollars.

67. ONE of the People that Anderson sought \$100,000.00 dollars was Television host Wendy Williams.

V.

Article 4 of the Family Court Act Filed April 4, 2017 FOR Spousal Support and FCA 216-C

68. Anderson appealed the Support Magistrate's conclusions and based upon Family Court Judge John M. Hunt's order and ruling ("August 08, 2017"); Alex Anderson initiated an appeal too (NYS) Appellate Division Second Judicial Department.

69. ON October 20, 2017 the Office of the Clerk noticed corporation counsel w/papers & Mariah Carey w/papers seeking an Affidavit expressing their views concerning the appeal.

70. ON November 24, 2017 Appellant filed a request for adjournment w/papers noticing on behalf of Carey a dispute regarding the \$50,000. dollars "Cash" the Attorney had received from the accountant via money in my wife's bank account. The end date of the Notice... was December 4, 2017.

71. Also at December 04, 2017 Alex Anderson began to write too Hon. Ruth Bader. Ginsburg, Supervising Justice of the Second Judicial Circuit. This was Alex Anderson's

second Letter to Supreme Court
Associate Justice Ginsburg.

72. The legal letter concerned the Family Court of QNS (county) New York attempting to reduce the ruling, decision, and merits rendered by the U.S. Supreme Courts October Term 2013; In the matter of the Andersons' Decree of Marriage under Index NO. 13-9091 & 13-9092.

73. Also At June 4th, 2018, the Plaintiff Appellant also appealed the NYS QNS (county) Family Court (File #: 171091) to the New York State, Court of Appeals. (Cited as Motion No. 2018-0535).

74. Alex Anderson matter in the New York State Court of Appeals was dismissed without cost in effect; the order appeal from did not finally determine the proceeding within the
20,

meaning of the state's Constitution. Also insofar as the Court held that Anderson's motion to expedite the Appeal was dismissed as academic.

75. Thereafter Δ -Appellant Filed a-
gain For Spousal Support in New York
State Family Court under Index No. F-
2011-18. And again Anderson went
before magistrate Judge David A.
Kirshblum "October 31, 2010."
Judicial Notice: Based upon Magis-
trate Kirshblum's "Findings of Fact"
and the Court's "Order of dismissal"
» the NYS Family Court declared
«... while acknowledging that any
marriage to the Respondent was
common law in nature at the very
most.» [Emphasis and Quotation
marks included].

76. Although preamble the State
of New York was required to

recognize the Andersons' common law marriage created by and through the state of Colorado. And based more significantly up on the fact; that although New York State → does not have a common law marriage statute. However, in the instant matter of the Andersons' case where the Andersons' had lived in a common-law state and have moved to the state of New York, the marriage is recognized as legal, providing where Marian Carey and Alex Anderson had formed a common law marriage under the state of Colorado to be recognized in New York state.

77. Moreover the Andersons' Decree of marriage May 19, 2014 under Section [§] 1915 by the material evidence of allowing them to proceed to the U.S. Supreme Court in forma pauperis status had been preceded by title

20 U.S. Code, §1915A—Screening. And that the marriage Decreed was in fact after the decision and ruling in the matter of United States vs. Windsor, Supreme Court of The United States March 27, 2013 argued; June 26, 2013 decided.

21. It would suffice to judicially note that in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals matter of NO. 13-178 the Andersons' selected March 27, 2013 as the due date to argue the [] Appeal... the Second Circuit Court's Appeal was denied March 28, 2013. However, the United States Supreme Court 'pick-up' Anderson's RICO case March 27, 2013 Oct. Term: 2012 ex rel. Edit Windsor 133 S.Ct. 2675 And, that the U.S. Supreme Court entered the United States Precedence in the matter of (Mariah Carey,) Alex Anderson, Petitioner vs. UMG Recordings, Inc., ETAL at 134 S.Ct. 2801; 139 L. Ed. 185; U.S. Sup. Ct. NO. 13-9092 (May 19, 2014).

22.

79. However in the instant matter of the Andersons' case where Marian and Alex Anderson had lived together in a common-law marriage [2007-2025] relationship of co-habitation in Apartments, Homes, and Houses in the States of New Jersey, New York, Florida, Illinois, and Colorado. See For Reference - Marian Carey's & Alex Anderson (NYS) Article 4, FC Act §440 Application, For Spouse Support Notarized 21 February 2017.

80. It would suffice to also show that; Δ Appellant Alex Anderson applied for Civil Union Marriage status by and through the State of Colorado in "2019" App. D, p. 243(d)-245(d).

81. Indeed as previously stated the Anderson's common law marriage was required to be
24 [cont., paragraph 81;
p. 245]

L.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Rule 20 [U.S. Supreme Court]; 28 United States Code Section [§] 1651(a) ["all writs"] is the only codification too confer the → Petitioner's Extraordinary Writ; also as a material fact the Appellant's Writ is not a matter of a right but of discretion sparingly exercised. To justify the granting of any such writ the petitioner must show that the writ will be an aid of the Supreme Court's Appellate Jurisdiction; that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other Court.

Rule 17 [U.S. Supreme Court] governs actions based upon original and exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more → states. See 28 U.S.C. § 1251(a). In furtherance the High Court has original but not exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between the United States and a State. Id § 1251(b)2.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 60 provides automatic relief from an order produced by fraud, misrepresentation of facts, and by flags of "Bad Law" perpetrated under AN
25.

Order or Judgment of A Judge.
And-or Moreover that it is ultimate-
Ly also perfectly clear that the e.g.
grounds for relief from a final
Judgment, Order, or Proceeding,
is brought by and under procedures
of a new or independent action,
and by the effect of a motion
via Rule 60(b)(3)(4) for MISCON-
duct, Misrepresentation, and/or
fraud... and must be made within
a reasonably time or that is not
more than a year after the entry
of the judgment or Order of the
date of the proceedings id. Rule 60(c),
(1)(3).

Therefore based upon the
records of the 11th Circuit Ct. of Appeals
the Appellants respectfully pray
that the judgment is void. See
information statements up under (above)
Headnotes D; E; and F; (H.I.) pursuant
to Rule 60(b)(3)(4) based
upon the Supreme Court's juris-
dictional statement being
timely filed by Anderson that is

"October 12, 2022" e.g. (14) "within one year" [Quotation marks original]; after entry "October 13, 2021" "of the proceedings of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals" [emphasis furnished]. Also see the information statement by the direction of the 11th Circuit and at above Headnote D, E, and F; insofar that the decision and ruling is unconstitutional (on its face) under 28 U.S. Code Section [§] 46(d).

Wherefore by the diligence of the Court and by a writ of Prohibition... and A Mandate [Writ of "Mandamus"] Appellant... seek too prohibit the defendant and the lower courts of failing to abide by the Supreme Court's decisions in the matter of the Ct's Movant's Writ of Certiorari up under Alex Anderson, petitioner vs. UMG Recordings, Inc., NO. 13-9092 and NO. 13-9091 (May 19, 2014) OCT. TERM: 2013; and et. seq.

M.

RELIEF

The Appellant respectfully pray that the Extraordinary Petition authorized by Title 28 U.S. Code, §1651 be provided due allowance that the Appellant's Petition is filed under the status of pro se. And also by the fact that the Andersons' are friends too the Court idiom ANDERSON vs. UMG, ETAL, shoot Title for Index No. 13-9091 & 13-9092, and that; exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers and; that the Grant of the petition FN: will be an aid to the

FN FIND LAW: Under Article III of the Constitution the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases of controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with Federal Law and Filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court.

High Court's Appellate Jurisdiction.

Wherefore Appellant respectfully request the Supreme Court to Grant the application too proceed to the Court by and through Rule 39; and too the Court under 28 U.S.C. §1915A. And to disqualify the decision, ruling, and conclusion of the district court of Sept. 10, 2020 based upon the Dist. Court's order under Federal Rule Appellate procedure 24(a); at Oct. 21, 2020. Furthermore the High Court's FN3

^{N.} CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ by 28 U.S. Code §1651 issue.. And that the requested relief prohibiting the subordinate Courts; the depts; & all concern parties is Granted to the extent that they are prohibited from failing to abide by this Court's Opinion and the Mandate of May 19, 2014.

FN: Petitioners... respectfully pray that the ruling of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals entered at "July 12, 2021" be and is stricken. And that the ruling of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals at "Oct. 13, 2021" and decision of "Oct. 21, 2021" be and is overruled.

Dated: 07/17/25

Respectfully Submitted

By: OutCorder

aa.