No. 17-6393

In the Supreme Court of the United States of America

Mary Lavelle

No representation

Vs

USBNA

K. Rivera

The US citizen asks the Court to reconsider Writ of Certiorari in Forma Pauperis.

Please review the 26784 Fairfax Lane contested, untried foreclosure proceedings of 13-8000578 in Cuyahoga County Ohio and Appeals of 14-101729 (reversed/ remanded) and 16-104234 and all the related cases: 07-615939 dismissed without prejudice on 9/20/07 by USBNA, CV 08-655896 dismissed without prejudice by court, CV 10-720201 dismissed without prejudice by USBNA. This is a matter of property and integrity. My only motive is truth and justice for surviving spouses. Marriage-protection laws as highlighted in your DOMA verdict were not followed in my case. I had $130,000 credit of my home on my credit report which I disclosed in a forced deposition 11/9/15 at opponent's law firm. My right to not perform marital testimony civil was disregarded. The credit now seems to be gone. I will dispute this. My $173,000 home is now up for $127,000. I was legally married to my husband since 6/12/99, never divorced and not remarried. He passed away 12/9/09. The bank asked me what my case was at the deposition. I told them that the bank went bankrupt. I did not go bankrupt- though the bank wanted me to as they encouraged me via my first lawyer to take this route.

I humbly request within my right and on time to the highest legal authority to review if the laws of the land were equally followed toward the citizen:

1) Look to the un-affirmed debt that was not ruled upon in 2016 affirmation. Ohio Supreme Court denied my 16-1904 case. The Ohio Supreme Court Justice is from Cuyahoga County.
2) I was not informed of En Banc Potential of the 2014 and 2016 Appeals Courts on my remanded case though I'd asked for staffing before verdict. From what I have read the judges could have voted whether to review.
3) The lower court accepted differing notes twice and the appeals court once.
4) My bench trial date of 12/2/15 was not allowed by Judge R. McClelland to proceed on a remanded, contested foreclosure. The same judge ruled not to allow a jury trial. The 7th Amendment says jury trial should be preserved. My side wanted to present the evidence to a jury of my peers. We believed a jury would have seen the differing notes, counted the dismissals upon my home, questioned why the bank did business with my husband and without my consent. Did the bank signers break the law? Was due process followed in my case?
5) Also, Judge McClelland dismissed my counterclaim in 2013 with prejudice partial and no explanation. My counterclaim was never assigned a number by Cuyahoga County.
6) For the record the validity of the mortgages were continually questioned by my five counsels retained between 2010 to 2016.
7) You will see upon review of my case the Double Dismissal rule was conveniently ruled out by the insistence of USBNA to the court. Look at the complicated way the

2016 Appeals Court came to its conclusion of affirmation 11/17/16. The Appeals court discounted some dismissals and grouped others. I was not allowed to speak on my behalf at the oral arguments 10/27/16.

8) I was not allowed an Ohio Supreme Court review, not allowed any En Banc, not allowed a trial trail and not allowed a jury trial. My husband won two dismissals and I won one. Another case has been left undecided. If you look I won in 2011 with when the bank dismissed. The bank did not have standing at that time. The bank came back on me and I fought with no help from the court to preserve my family home from seizure. Was the Constitution with its 5^{th} and 7^{th} Amendments followed in my case?

Sincerely,

Mary Lavelle

Mary Lavelle

Certificate

17-6393

USSC:

Per Rule 44-

Grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial and controlling effect.

But there are updated circumstances since the 11/17/16 affirmation by Appeals Court.

This is a contested, untried foreclosure case involving a surviving spouse against a national bank.

A court appointed lawyer would be helpful.

The petition is in 'good faith' and not for delay.

My 1/28/18 reconsideration request of last month was returned to me 2/2.

So help me God.

Mary Lavelle

Mary Lavelle

2/10/18

[sent 2/11 a.m. from ALPO "priority" to USSC ($7.17 on debit card) as per calls to Clerk (4) not received]

resent 3/13 a.m. from NO PO "certified" to USSC

(cc: K Rivera USBNA on 2/11) ML

RECEIVED
MAR 15 2018
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.