


CH

CASE # 17-9317

In the
Supreme Court of the United STATES

Richard Hall - Petitioner



VS

City of Detroit John Doe 1-3 City officers

Respondents

Rehearing

Petition / Motion for Reconsideration / Rehearing

I AM ASKING for reconsideration, my case
WAS dismissed in error; CASE # 16-2738

NOV 29, 2017

Richard Hall PLAINTIFF

VS

City of Detroit Michigan Defendants

1-3 John Doe City officers

Reason. Dismissed: Barred by Statute of Limitations
AS the complaint was filed more than 3 years after
Alleged incident of brutality AND Hall's Attempt to
discover the identity of the officers could not have
remedied this defect. This case was dismissed in ERROR
Court of Appeal applied wrong law, and Incorrectly decided that
Statute of Limitations is a law that sets a deadline for
initially filing a lawsuit. The Court of Appeals CASE # 15-2541
June 17, 2016 VACATED the district court judgment AND Remanded
the matter to the district court for further proceedings

Exhibit A
& B

As to Hall's Claims Against the "John Doe" Police officers

This order Motion To Compel the identity of 1-3 City of Detroit John Doe-officers was ignored. Sanctions Are Mandatory for Not producing on a Discovery Request.

The grounds that apply: C R 59(6)(1), (2)(4)(5), (6), (7), (8)(9)

- (1) Irregularity in the proceedings of the court, jury or Adverse party, or any order of the court or abuse of discretion, by which such party was prevented from having a fair trial;
- (2) Misconduct of the prevailing party or jury;
- (4) Newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application, which he could not with reasonable diligence have discovered and produced at the trial;
- (5) Damages so excessive or inadequate as unmistakably to indicate that the verdict must have been the result of passion or prejudice.
- (6) Error in the assessment of the amount of recovery whether too large or too small, when the action is upon a contract, or for the injury or detention of property.
- (7) That there is no evidence or reasonable inference from the evidence to justify the verdict or the decision, or that it is contrary to law
- (8) Error in law occurring at the trial and objected to at the time by the party making the application; And
- (9) That substantial justice has not been done.

Rule 2.313 Failure to Provide or Permit Discovery; Sanctions

Court of Appeals Remanded the identity of 1-3 John Doe officers but District Court And defendants disobeyed orders

Motion to Compel discovery and identity was ordered by Court of Appeals which was disobeyed

~~2.313(B)(a)(b)(c)(d)~~

~~2.313(2)(B)(a)(b)(c)(d)~~

~~2.313(1)(2)(B)(a)(b)(c)(d)~~

~~2.313(B)(1)(2)(a)(b)(c)(d)~~

B) Failure to Comply with Order

(1) Sanctions by Court Where deposition is taken. If a deponent fails to be sworn or to answer a question after being directed to do so by a court in the county or district in which the deposition is being taken, the failure may be considered a contempt of that court.

(2) Sanctions by Court in Which Action is Pending. If a party or an officer, director, or managing agent of a party, or a person designated under MCR 2.306(B)(5) or 2.307(A)(1) to testify on behalf of a party, fails to obey an order to provide or permit discovery, including an order entered under subrule (A) of this rule or under MCR 2.311, the court in which the action is pending may order such sanctions as are just, including, but not limited to the following:

- (a) An order that the matters regarding which the order was entered or other designated facts may be taken to be established for the purpose of the action in accordance with the claim of the party obtaining the order.
- (b) An order refusing to allow the disobedient party to support or oppose designated claims or defense, or prohibiting the party from introducing designated matters into evidence.
- (c) An order striking pleadings or part of pleadings, staying further proceedings until the order is obeyed, dismissing the action or ~~proceedings~~ proceeding or a part of it, or rendering a judgment by default against the disobedient party.
- (d) In lieu of or in addition to the foregoing orders, an order treating as a contempt of court the failure to obey an order, except an order to submit to a physical or mental examination.

CASE # 15-2541

United States Court of Appeals
For The Sixth Circuit

Richard Louis Hall
Plaintiff

v.

City of Detroit; John Doe, 1-3 City officers

ORDER

Before Cole, Chief Judge; Siler and Stranch, Circuit Judges

Filed June 17, 2016 Deborah S. Hunt Clerk
ON APPEAL from the United States
District Court For the Eastern District of
Michigan

The district court, however, dismissed the complaint in its entirety, without addressing Hall's claim against three "John Doe" police officers. "Plaintiffs are permitted to bring suit against unnamed 'John Doe' defendants until discovery or other information reveals the identity of the party." *Brown v. Owens Corning Inv.* Review Comm., 602 F.3d 564, 572 (6th Cir. 2010). True. Naming "John Doe" defendants cannot be used to circumvent the applicable

Statute of limitations, see *Cox v. Treadway*,
75 F.3d 230, 240 (6th Cir. 1996), and
Hall's complaint concerns events that happened
in October 2011. But while Hall's complaint
may be time barred see *Harrison v. Michigan*,
722 F.3d 768, 772 (6th Cir. 2013)
(Noting a three year limitations statute in
Michigan), and a district court has the
authority to raise a limitations bar sua sponte,
see *Alston v. Tenn. Dep't of Corr.*, 28 F.
App'x 475, 476 (6th Cir. 2002), we
decline to address the limitations question in
the first instance.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's
judgment insofar as it dismissed Hall's
claim against the City of Detroit but
VACATE the district court's judgment and
Remand the matter to the district court
for further proceedings as to Hall's claims
against the "John Doe" police officers.

CASE# 17-9317

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Richard Louis Hall . Petitioner

vs

City of Detroit. John Doe City Officers 1-3
Respondents

The grounds are limited to intervening
circumstances of substantial or
controlling effect or to other substantial
grounds not previously presented.

Richard Louis Hall

Signature

3-19-2019

Date

MSG # 17-9317

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Richard Louis Hall - Petitioner

vs

City of Detroit, John Doe City Officers 1-3
Respondents

This Petition for rehearing is presented
in good faith and not delay.

Richard Louis Hall
Signatures

3-19-2019
Date