

No. 18-1147

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

—◆—
DERON G BRUNSON,

Petitioner,

v.

HONORABLE L. DOUGLAS HOGAN; AND
BAYVIEW LOAN SERVICING, LLC

Respondents.

—◆—
**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To The Utah State Supreme Court**

—◆—
PETITION FOR REHEARING

—◆—
Deron G Brunson

Pro se

138 East 12300 South #C-196

Draper, UT 84020

Telephone: (801) 571-3199

Petitioner in pro se

PETITION FOR REHEARING

1. The doctrine of equitable maxim, a case law by the Supreme Court Of The United States, is a doctrine that unjustly thrashes and contradicts the right of due process. It does this by allowing the discretion of trial courts to completely ignore, refuse to hear, or disregard a party's pleadings. This doctrine continues further by stopping any controlling case law including the United States Constitution. In this instant case, the said doctrine was exercised by the trial court when it refused to hear, address, and disregarded Petitioner's pleadings without any hearing and against any legal controlling case law produced by Petitioner. At the same time, under this said doctrine, the trial court granted every request of Respondent, Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC, and awarded them attorneys fees without their request. *See page 6 of the Crt.*

2. Despite the fact that Petitioner paid a filing fee to have his pleadings addressed, they were not, which is consistent as to how the other Utah courts/judges ruled against Petitioner in his other cases. The right to have your pleadings addressed—to be heard—is a fundamental right of the due process clause of the United States Constitution and upheld by the said Supreme Court. In other words, the right of due process is a unfettered Constitutionally protected right.

3. The unfettered Constitutionally protected right of due process must be maintained and cannot be controlled by the doctrine of equitable maxim. If

this judgment is affirmed Utah courts will continually deny Petitioner the right of due process, and no doubt other courts will continue to follow. This truth pushes for a rehearing to stop the doctrine of equitable maxim. Regardless of Petitioner's argument, Petitioner has the right to have his argument addressed. Failure of this strips Petitioner's right to be in court while keeping his filing fee money—this contends that he has no Constitutional right of due process—the right to be heard.

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reason, and in the protection of due process, this Court should grant this petition for rehearing, vacate the order dismissing the writ of certiorari by granting it. The trial court must be controlled to address Petitioners pleadings, otherwise other courts will continue to follow and the violation of due process right will continue to grow.

Dated: May 15, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Deron G Brunson

Deron G Brunson

138 East 12300 South #C-196

Draper, UT 84020

Phone 801-571-3199

Petitioner in pr se

CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER

This petition is restricted to the grounds specified in rule 44.2 of the Supreme Court Of The United States, and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

/s/Deron G Brunson

Deron G Brunson

138 East 12300 South #C-196

Draper, UT 84020

Phone 801-571-3199

Petitioner in pr se