
IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

JAMES J. MAKSIMUK
38325 6th St. E., Palmdale, CA 93550
Tel. 1-323-420-6794

Petitioner,
Pro se

v.

Connor Sport Court International, LLC
Respondent

In re: James J. Maksimuk, Petitioner

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit, Case# 19-
1156

*****-----*****

REQUEST FOR REVIEW BY THE JUSTICES

Questions Presented

1. Did the letter of Scott S. Harris, Clerk dated Jan. 13, 2020 uphold the denial of Due Process and violate the Equal Protection Clause?
2. Is the Writ of Certiorari and subject Due Process, Equal Protection, etc. issues of "*exceptional importance*" and/or "*imperative public importance*"?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Authorities.....	Page 2
Reasons for Request for Review.....	Page 2
Reason: Maintain uniformity of the court's decisions.....	Page 2
Reason: Proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance.....	Page 4
Exhibit A.....	Page 12
Exhibit B.....	Page 13
Certificate of Service.....	Page 14
Certificate of Compliance.....	Page 15
Certificate of Good Faith.....	Page 16

TABLE AUTHORTIES

STATUTES

28 U.S. Code § 1651. Writs

JUDICIAL RULES

SUPREME COURT RULE 10. Considerations Governing Review on
Certiorari

SUPREME COURT RULE 11. Certiorari to a United States Court
of Appeals Before Judgment

SUPREME COURT RULE 20. Procedure on a Petition for an
Extraordinary Writ.

Fed. R. App. P. Rule 35. En Banc Determination (a) When Hearing
or Rehearing En Banc May Be Ordered

Fed. R. App. P. Rule 35. (b) Petition for Hearing or Rehearing En
Banc.

REQUEST FOR REVIEW BY THE JUSTICES

1. Did the letter of Scott S. Harris, Clerk dated Jan. 13, 2020 uphold the denial of Due Process and violate the Equal Protection Clause?

[This is a resubmission of the Request for Review per letter of dated Feb. 12, 2020 by Jeffrey Atkins Exh."A"] That, the letter of Scott S. Harris, Clerk, (Exh."B") does not conform to "...maintain uniformity of the court's decisions" The issue of judicial conformity, due process and equal protection is well elaborated on the Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari.

The letter of Scott S. Harris, Clerk just like the Dist. Court and Court of Appeals did not provide due process and equal protection to the petitioner. As of this writing all the courts have bestowed a legal advantage in favor of Connor Sport Court International. The legal advantages the courts have given by default to Connor Sport Court International are well discussed in this Request for Review page 6, #1-8.

As well, the legal burdens imposed by the government against of James Maksimuk and CWF Flooring, Inc. are well documented in the writ of certiorari. p. 17, a-g.

That the letter of Scott S. Harris, Clerk dated Jan. 13, 2020 (Exh "B") which states "The petition for writ of certiorari is denied" conflicts with Rule 35. En Banc Determination (1)(A) which reads:

(A) the panel decision conflicts with a decision of the United States Supreme Court or of the court to which the petition is addressed (with citation to the conflicting case or cases) and consideration by the full court is therefore necessary to secure and maintain uniformity of the court's decisions; or

The Dist. Court and Court of Appeals has failed to answer an important question of federal law; which is why the District Court respondent / SC petitioner can't self-represent itself in court without hiring a lawyer? (See Exh. "A" p. 5 line 7 court transcripts, writ of certiorari and Question #1, page. V, writ of certiorari)

The petitioner has referenced *'conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.'*

(See conflicts on p. 13 & 14 writ of certiorari)

The most weighty conflict of laws with the supreme court are other SC rulings and conflicts with the Equal Protection Clause.

Supreme Court Rule 10(c) "a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or

has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.”

2. Is the Writ of Certiorari and subject Due Process, Equal Protection, etc. issues of “*exceptional importance*” and/or “*imperative public importance*”?

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 35(a), (b) “*proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance.*” and Supreme Court Rule 44.1, Rehearing and Rule 11 Certiorari to a United States Court of Appeals Before Judgment, and Rule 20. Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ

The writ of certiorari is “imperative public importance”

because:

[Subject “*question[s] of exceptional importance*” is listed as Questions Presented 1-4 in the Petitioner’s Writ of Certiorari. page V.]

Additional, “imperative public importance” is that:

1. It will provide an opportunity for low income corporations to participate in judicial proceeding without legal counsel that would not otherwise have the opportunity to do so.

Per District Court transcripts (Writ of Certiorari Exh. "A" p. 12, 13 and 16) the Supreme Court petitioner was forbidden to participate in the Dist. Court hearings. The violations of Due Process, Constitutional and Court Rules were cited in the petitioner's writ of certiorari p. 11-37 and legal errors p. 33 that violated the Equal Protection Clause.

2. Would even the playing field in the court room between low income corporations and wealthier corporations.

3. Would lessen the quantity of defaults judgments unfavorable to low income corporations.

4. Would increase the participation of low income corporations into the judicial system that would not have the previous opportunity to do so.

5. Minimize intimidating lawsuits by wealthy corporations vs. low income corporations because low income corporations can pray fully participate in the judicial process.

6. Minimize the payment of legal fees by the low income corporations to pay legal fees of wealthy corporations in default judgment cases.

7. Assure that the merits of cases between low income corporations and wealthy corporations will be introduced and decided upon.

8. Because the merits of the low income corporations can be pray fully adjudicated in the courts, this will increase the win lose ratio for low income corporations.

Petitioner recognizes that the legal definition of 'imperative public importance' is non-objective and if the Supreme Court denies this Writ of Certiorari this will be tantamount to legalizing the denial of due process against the petitioner; and legalizing the denial of due process against numerous of low income corporations in similar judicial circumstances. This is of 'imperative public importance'

Clearly, it is imperatively important to apply due process and equal protection to a marginalized group of people, corporation or classes. This is the essence of Equal Protection.

This added constitutional protection (the right for corporations to self-represent itself in court without hiring a lawyer) [or in this particular case, the right for the petitioner to self represent itself in a court room without hiring a lawyer in the Dist. Court] will minimize the legal advantage of wealthy corporations.

The above 1-8 can't be quantified but logical inference can be well thought-out; that low income corporations would benefit if this writ of certiorari is granted. As well, the benefits are indeed of *'imperative public importance'* for reasons stated above.

That if this writ of certiorari is NOT granted it would have a detrimental legal effect on the public and this also is of "imperative public importance" The legal detriments are:

1. Would embolden wealthy corporations against all kinds of aggressive legal tactics against low income corporations.

2. Encourage the Restraint of Trade against low income corporations because low income corporation can't afford legal defense.

3. Wealthy corporations would have more opportunity to covertly and overtly extort, manipulate and pressure low income corporations into business practices they would not be inclined to execute. This business pressure can be applied by the wealthier manufacturer, vendor, distributor or wealthier competitor against low income corporations.

Case in point: On Page 12 on the Respondent's COMPLAINT WITH JURY DEMAND dated 01/17/17, Case # 2:17-cv-00042-BSJ Respondent's PRAYER FOR RELIEF writes:

"J. That the Court require Defendant to transfer Defendant's Domain Name, plasticsportcourttiles.com, to Sport Court;"

The respondent attempted to confiscate the petitioner's domain name (private property) through legal intimidation knowingly that the corporate Dist Court defendant had an economic disadvantage.

This is an example of unequal access to our laws due to economic

constraints / one example of a wealthy corporation having an inherent advantage. This is a violation of Equal Protection. This occurs very often to low income corporations.

Fortunately, the Dist. Court did not rule to give away the private property of the defendant to the Dist. Court Plaintiff.

Quoting Hon. David Gass, Maricopa County Superior Court, Arizona when commenting in support of R-18-0004 which would amend Rule of Arizona Supreme Court which would permit some corporations to self-represent in courtrooms and to

“to improve access to justice for small business litigants and to reorganize and modernize the rule”

Hon. Gass writes *“the specters of legal fees or default judgments sink small business litigants before they even start.”*

(Writ of Certiorari p. 5 line 3)

Clearly and well documented in this writ of certiorari, the petitioner and countless of other needy corporations are in similar

legal doom. The petitioner motions the Hon. Supreme Court to provide Equal Protection for those in need.

Conclusion

For reasons stated above this Petitioner respectfully urge the Hon. Supreme Court to grant this Writ of Certiorari.

Date: Feb. 19, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,



James J. Maksimuk
Petitioner, Pro se
38325 6th Street East
Palmdale, CA 93550
Tel. 1-323-420-6794
Email: Sales@SportTiles.Pro