

No.17-6621

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

CARMEN NAOMI WATSON - PETITIONER

VS.

**MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, MYLAN INC. -
RESPONDENT(S)**

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
TENTH CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

**CARMEN NAOMI WATSON
12175 S. BLACKBOB RD.
OLATHE, KANSAS 66062
913.961.6642**




TABLE OF CONTENTS

PETITION FOR REHEARING	1-PASSIM
U.S. AMENDMENT I	1-2
LIBERTY & JUSTICE	2-3
AMICUS CURIAE	3
SUPREME RULE 10	3-4
COLLUSION, BILL...	4-5
CORPORATE DISC.	5
CLOSING ARGUMENT	6
CONCLUSION	7
CERTIFICATE OF COMP	8
CERTIFICATE OF SERV.	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

SUPREME RULE 44; 1. Any petition for the rehearing of any judgment or decision of the Court on the merits shall be filed within 25 days after entry of the judgment or decision, unless the Court or a Justice shortens or extends the time. The petitioner shall file 40 copies of the rehearing petition and shall pay the filing fee prescribed by Rule 38(b), except that a petitioner proceeding in forma pauperis under Rule 39, including an inmate of an institution, shall file the number of copies required for a petition by such a person under Rule 12.2. The petition shall state its grounds briefly and distinctly and shall be served as required by Rule 29. The petition shall be presented together with certification of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel) that it is presented in good faith and not for delay; one copy of the certificate shall bear the signature of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel). A copy of the certificate shall follow and be attached to each copy of the petition. A petition for rehearing is not subject to oral argument and will not be granted except by a majority of the Court, at the instance of a Justice who concurred in the judgment or decision.

<i>U.S. CONT. AMENDMENT I;</i>	1
<i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	3

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Rule 44, the unrepresented party, humbly petitions for rehearing of this case before a full nine-Member Court.

"He who represents himself has a fool for a client"-Abraham Lincoln.

With the up-most respect as I understand what work ethic and dedication each Justice must individually possessed that placed them at such level of authority, the Judicial System has failed the pro se` party. Before deciding to file pro se` in the Kansas district court, I almost feel into a state of dementia attempting to understand precisely what the former President meant. However, after my own endeavors with our judicial system, I come to fully understand the timeless quote. I now know, the client is a fool to believe going before any U.S. Courts pro se` would be logical, as equal rights are simply not granted to the unrepresented. Thus, that would only be the aftermath as, the U.S. Courts didn't deceive me into consuming Amnesteem, the drug in question, which lead me to stand before them. The court does have the authority to right the wrongs of the willing. I Come now on the 21st of January 2018, to petition for rehearing before the Supreme Courts for case number 17-6621, Carmen Naomi Watson (pro SE`) v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals.

U.S. CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. _____

June 26th 2016, I Carmen N. Watson, petitioned the government for a redress of grievances caused by respondent Mylan

Pharmaceuticals, and was denied U.S. Constitution Amendment I. I sought compensation under general, special, and punitive damages that totaled in the amount of \$110 million-dollars. The amount did not stem from greed but for life-long damages sustained, on-going treatments, and my lost livelihood as I am no longer able to work nor function as the person I once was prior to. The respondent failed to give accurate warnings, failed to update the packing, and failed to provide some warnings at all, not complying with state or federal laws, remaining the sameness with Hoffman La Roche` brand Accutane. Even with having Mylan Pharmaceuticals admitting to failing in providing warnings, the lower courts dismissed the civil claim without due process, deeming the respondent inherently exempt as a generic drug maker. The lower courts also stated, the decision to abruptly dismiss the claim, which interrupted the discovery planning, was warranted on the mere grounds the plaintiff was a pro se` party, henceforth, not being granted the rights by the courts as a plaintiff with representation.

“LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL”

I've never been a burden to this country's society and I deserve my right to be heard. “Liberty and Justice For All”, the pledge of my country but is there really. Is justice considered for all, when of the 7000-8000 petitions that are submitted to the high court each term only 1% percent will be granted, NOT including the pro se` party like myself. Is “Justice for All” when the District court can interrupt the usual federal rules of civil procedure, specifically because a party is unrepresented. Has there been any justice when I have spent almost two years convincing each court why I'm worthy to be heard or deserve the right to sue, when in fact, there

are Constitutions and laws that declare I'm already entitled to. I'm owed justice, the high courts should renew the accountability the respondent has scarcely become unfamiliar with. At minimum I believe the case should be reissued to the lower courts, having the opportunity to follow the usual federal rules of civil procedure.

AMICUS CURIAE

Latin for, for friend of the courts. A person or group who is not a party to an action but has a strong interest in the matter, will petition to courts for permission to submit a brief in the action with the intent of influencing the courts decision, such briefs are called "amicus curiae". _____

II

Today US Courts consistently declare equality for the pro se` party, yet any support or amicus curiae` filed on behalf of the pro se` party is forbidden by the courts. I belong to a support group for accutane victims, the group consist of an estimated 730 people, 33 members wished to submit a supporting brief or amicus curiae` on this matter, however the courts only allow these supporting briefs to be filed in support of represented parties, filed by attorneys. The scenario further proves, equality for the pro se` or Justice for all maybe just the pledge some take but not fulfill. The courts have clobbered the pro se` party who is failed before attempt, the actions are misbegotten and therefore until re-addressed the pro se` parties should be prohibited from filing before the courts.

SUPREME COURT RULE 10

Supreme Rule 10 states, your petition for writ may be granted depending on if it would impact future claims in lower court or pertains to matters that have not been ruled on. Henceforth the court should take great consideration when deciding on whether or not to grant the petition, the impact it will have on the future quality of generic drugs and how the respondent and other drug

makers will receive the denial of the petition and continue with ignoring laws and regulations pertaining to manufacturing and distributing. Also will other drug makers view the denial as a "green light" to began cutting cost and not providing all the detailed warnings and insertions.

The Supreme Court's decision, to refuse to hear this petition will give the respondent and all drug-makers the approbation to proceed at the companies discretion and not federal regulations. I believe the message the Supreme Court declares by denying the first petition is that, because the majority, which is presumably the middle and lower class citizen, cant afford the higher cost brand medication, they don't deserve equal protection from the our government. By denying the petition assures the generic drug makers, as long as the pharmaceutical company provides the consumer a similar form of the brand-drug, the warnings, labeling and packaging are not a factor. Yet the profits are equivalent to brand-makers.

COLLUSION, CONSUMER BILL OF RIGHTS

The Consumer Bill of Rights, right to safety, protects the consumer over any product besides vehicles. The Consumer Bill of Rights, Right to be informed, covers fair packaging and labeling.

The petitioner was never informed when purchasing the respondents generic drug, she would be waiving all her rights as a consumer should she be injured, she could not seek damages. It is unconstitutional for the government to have acted in collusion with these pharmaceutical companies. There is no clause, in the U.S. Constitution nor Consumer Bill of Rights, that states, generic drug makers are exempt from all liabilities. If there is, then we the

people have the right to be informed. Is unjust, to inform after the fact and one sets to before the court. The petitioner was denied the right to choose by the respondent. The respondent deciding to withhold the severe warnings and side-effects from the consumer. Therefore the respondent took on ALL liabilities when aborting acceptable practices. Thus, would explain the extreme measures the respondent has taken the entire duration of the case to defend against a pro so` party, including of the 98 petitions for writ of certiorari filed before the Supreme court, only respondents filed reply briefs, the respondents were 1 of the 8 that hired additional counsel that specializes in Supreme Court matters.

CORPORATE DISCLOSER

Bryan T. Pratt, of Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP. Kansas City, MO, lead attorney and counsel for Mylan Pharmaceuticals, failed to disclose that the reply brief filed in the U.S. Supreme Court, Mylan's response to the petition for writ of certiorari was prepared and filed by Mariana Braylovskiy who forged Bryan T. Pratt's signature and notarized Elias Melendez. Mylan Pharmaceuticals hired a private company called "Counsel Press" located in New York, NY, to file a reply brief on their behalf in this matter, the company employs' Ms. Braylovskiy and Ms. Melendez. The Counsel Press bio" promises to have inside knowledge that wins hard to beat Supreme Court cases. Failure to disclose maybe overshadowed by more serious matters but submission of forged legal documents should never be tolerated in any United States Courts.

CLOSING ARGUMENT

There have been over 50 plus filings between the parties throughout the case. I was born into poverty, and made a life for

myself that I was proud of, and it was done with hard work beginning at the age of 10. My willpower will forever be, but the respondents cosmetic treatment Amnesteem, has now stripped me from all physical abilities to maintain a life I worked so hard for or rebuild even if I wanted to. I had to dig deeper in my final plea as every motion I had filed in State, Federal and now Supreme Court, was my best attempt to oblige and conform to each court.

I realized there was a greater cause than my personal claim of injury. There is a great injustice to the pro se` party', who goes before the courts but unlawfully not granted the same rights as the represented parties. U.S. Constitution laws and the Consumer Bill of Rights are being violated against the unknowing, unaware American consumer similar to me. The consumer shall be given the option to waive rights, to safety, life, to be informed, right to be heard, and in this case right to sue if injured by an off-brand drug maker that failed to comply. I also realized, the importance of using my platform to be the voice for negligence prevention, for those like myself who have been suffering for years unknowingly from severe side-effects but because of no warnings, their injuries will result in death or permanent injury. Warnings, updating warnings, and labeling should be non-negotiable.

DEDICATION

I'm able to describe the feeling of my daily aches and pains, but in almost 3 years after taking the drug, I have yet to find any words to describe the feeling of the emotional and mental state once the drug begins to damage your mind, seemingly while "the old you" watches from afar. Living with long-term Accutane, Amnesteem side-effects can seem impossible most days, and I haven't given up. I've self-represented in all three courts for almost 2 years, continuous denials, being the opposing party to a mega firm, then

going against a Supreme Court specialist private practice and I didn't give up! Though the fate of the petition for rehearing is uncertain, my prayer is, each time I publicly published this petition for rehearing, it inspires someone to never give up.

I would like to dedicate my journey to, support group for victims of accutane with long-term side effects. Also to 4 victims of Accutane who's stories greatly impacted my life. Jack Bowlby-16 a talented horseman who hung himself, in his room at Cheltenham College on the 12th of October, complained he could not rid "very dark thoughts" while on the drug. Jon Medland-22, a promising medical student hung himself 3-weeks on the drug. Jesse James-24, talented musician who couldn't control his mental state or mood swings after discontinuing the drug, took his own life during a family vacation. Bart Stupak Jr. "B.J."-17, the football star shot himself in the head shortly after his school prom, with fathers' and former Congressman, Bart Stupak Sr.'s gun, six months after taking Accutane. Stupak Sr. proclaimed "BJ's" medication included no warnings, "if it can happen to our family it can certainly happen to you".

CONCLUSION

The courts should find the petitioner entitled to the sum total amount sought pursuant to damages requested or default judgment. The courts should no less grant the petition in part.

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

CARMEN NAOMI WATSON - PETITIONER

VS.

**MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, MYLAN INC.
RESPONDENT(S)**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

RULE 44.1 CERTIFICATE

**I certify that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith
and not for delay.**

RULE 44.2 CERTIFICATE

**I certify that the grounds for the petition for rehearing are limited
to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or
to other substantial grounds not previously presented.**

**I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing
is true and correct.**

Carmen Naomi Watson
January 21st 2018

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**