

19-8284
No. _____

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 09 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re: _____

Michael A. Young - PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

17-4011 Vernon Oliver Et. Al.

18-1775 Thomas Duncan Et. Al. "AN" OTHERS" - RESPONDENT(S)

On "RULE 20" Petition for "WRIT" Mandamus and Prohibition to

U.S. Court of Appeals for "SECOND CIRCUIT"
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON "BYPASS" OF YOUR CASE)

Petition for Extraordinary "WRIT"

Michael A. Young
(Your Name)

Cheshire CT. 900 Highland Ave.
(Address)

Cheshire CT. 06410
(City, state, zip code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. After willfully invoking "SELF"-executing sections 3 and 4 of the 14th amendment becoming a "NAMED" defendant in 3:17-cv-20(AWT), did U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut "ERROR" in "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSALS" upon "JUDGEMENT" ordered for "ALL" defendants, in "DISCARD" of 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) "MANDATED" self-enforcing "RECUSAL" ???
2. Whether U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut intentional "STAGED" timely "CRYPTIC" rulings "ORDERED" are appropriately construed with "AS TO DO JUSTICE" requirement ???
3. Should petitioners requested preliminary "RELIEF" be "GRANTED" while case pending entitled "FINALITY" ???
4. Whether "EQUITABLE TOLLING" doctrine of the "STATUTE" of "LIMITATIONS" is applicable to case 3:18-cv-857(AWT) ???
5. IF "NOT" should "THIS" continuing "VIOLATION" theory of "REALITY" doctrine, "OR" other "APPLICABLE" jurisdictional "SAVING" qualifications be "APPLIED" ???
6. Whether U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut "MISUSE, ABUSE," in this "CRYPTIC" D.Conn.L.Civ.R. "DISCARD" of "IMPARTIAL" judicial "REASONABLE INQUIRY" provisional "STANDING ORDER," under "BOTH" these civil "RICO" cause of "ACTIONS" pursuant 18 U.S.C. § 1961-68 "ENABLES" the courts jurisdictional "REQUIREMENT" ???
7. Whether "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court "ERRORED" on any "RULINGS" in "DISHONOR" of "TIMELY" binding contractual "COLORING OF LAW" agreements ???

8. Whether prior "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel members judicial "IMPROPRIETY" constitute a "VIOLATION" of 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), (b), and "OR" RENDER "ANY" or "ALL" subsequent U.S. District "CHIEF" and "CIRCUIT COURTS" decisions "VOID" ???

9. Whether "ALL" extraordinary "EXISTING" circumstances "RENDER" case consolidation and petitioner appointment of appropriate counsel with "RELEASE" pending entitled "FINALITY" ???

10. Whether "EMERGENCY" 28 U.S.C. § 2106 supervisory "CORRECTIVE ACTION" should be additionally "ENFORCED" in "BOTH" these "CASES" under "OUR SUPREME" Court exercise "POWER" ???

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

#17-4011

Petitioner: Michael A. Young #232802, Cheshire CT, 900 Highland Ave,
Cheshire CT 06410.

For the Respondents: #17-4011

Vernon Oliver:

Connecticut Attorney General, William Tong, 55 Elm Street,
Hartford CT 06106.

Matthew Emond: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

David Channing: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Edward Joy: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Christopher DUBY: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Patrick White: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Joseph Brown: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Safia Syed: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Larry THOMPSON: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Carol Chapdelaine: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Shelia Prats: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

James Graham: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Janice Dagestino: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

III.

William Bright, Jr.: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

William Salvatore: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Samuel Sferrazza: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Mary Clark: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Alvin W. THOMPSON:

U.S. Attorneys Office for District of Connecticut,
Connecticut Financial Center, 157 Church Street,
New Haven CT. 06510.

18-1775

Petitioner: Michael A. Young #232802, Cheshire CT, 900 Highland Ave,
Cheshire CT. 06410.

For the Respondents:

Thomas Duncan:

Connecticut Attorney General, William Tong, 55 Elm Street,
Hartford CT. 06106.

William Utermarck: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Timothy Begley: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Veronica Carpenter: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Benjamin R. Langevin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Jhon Barrows: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Michael Zella: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Kenneth J. Albert: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Tillman Cormier: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Jeffery Duda: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Richard Charland: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Jhon Doe #1-#4: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Rui Silva: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Frank Prochaska: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Mathew Gedansky: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Andrew Durham: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Annette Griffin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

IV.

Shaffer Griffin: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Brian Rioux: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Jessica Reed: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Susan Vlitch: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Edward Mullarkey: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Huncho Kwak: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

John F. Newson: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Norman Pattis: The Pattis "LAW" Firm LLC, 1st Floor 383 Orange Street,
New Haven CT, 06511,

Daniel Erwin: The Pattis "LAW" Firm LLC, 1st Floor 383 Orange Street,
New Haven CT, 06511,

Laura Baldini: Law Offices of Laura "FLYNN" Baldini LLC, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 887, 74 Batterson Park Rd, Farmington CT, 06034,

Sheila Huddleston: Shipman/GOORWIN" LLP, 1 Constitution Plaza,
Hartford CT, 06103.

OTHER RESPONDENTS:

Linda S "FURGUSON": U.S. Attorneys Office for District of Connecticut,
Connecticut Financial Center, 157 Church St, New Haven CT, 06510.

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe: U.S. Attorneys Office for the Southern District of
New York, 1 Saint Andrews Plaza, New York, NY, 10007.

Atasha Joesph: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Robert A. Katzmann: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Reena Raggi: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Peter W. Hall: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Richard J. Sullivan: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Pierre N. Leval: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Guido Calabresi: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

Debra Ann Livingstone: "SAME" as "ABOVE"

V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2.
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4.
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	10.
CONCLUSION.....	14.

13 VOLUMES with 978 pages INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: "MY" letter of "REQUEST" dated 12-19-18 then "MANDATE" dated 12-21-18 issued by "CHIEF" Clerk of "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court !!!

APPENDIX B: "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel courts 18-1775 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" an "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX C: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" to "RECALL" and "STAY" of "MANDATE", appointment of counsel, and "ORDER" of "RELEASE" !!!

APPENDIX D: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "MANDATE" !!!

APPENDIX E: "SECOND CIRCUIT" Courts 17-4011 "MISCHARACTERIZE" reconsideration in "DENIAL" !!!

APPENDIX F: "MY" 17-4011 motion for "RECALL" and "STAY" of "MANDATE" with appointment of counsel an "ORDER" of "RELEASE" !!!

APPENDIX G: "MY" binding "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel Courts 17-4011 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreements !!!

APPENDIX H: "MY" binding "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" 17-4011 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreement !!!

APPENDIX I: "SECOND CIRCUIT" panel courts 17-4011 "ORDERS" of "DENIAL" an "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSAL" !!!

APPENDIX J: "MY" binding "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" 18-1775 contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreement !!!

APPENDIX K: "MY" 18-1775 motion for consolidation of cases !!!

APPENDIX L: "MY" 17-4011 motion for consolidation with Appointment of Counsel !!!

APPENDIX M: "MY FIRST" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX N: "MY SECOND" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX O#1: "MY TIMELY" 3:16-cv-1720 (SRU) motion for Discovery and "ORDER" of "AQUITAL" or "JUDGMENT" set aside and "NEW TRIAL" filing !!!

APPENDIX O#2: Above "EXHIBITS" A-G !!!

APPENDIX O#3: "MY OTHER" intelligent motions with U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:16-cv-1720, 1744, 1748 (AWT) "RULINGS" in "DENIAL" an "ORDERS" of "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSALS" !!!

APPENDIX O#4: U.S. District Court of Connecticut 3:16-cv-1720, 1744, 1748 (AWT) Judgements "VOID" !!!

APPENDIX P: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:17-cv-20(AWT) initial "REVIEW" ORDER !!!

APPENDIX Q: Case 3:17-cv-20(AWT) "CORRUPT" [D.O.C.] CM/ECF "NOTICES" !!!

APPENDIX R: "MY" intelligent "RULE 6D" with other "RELIEF" 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX S: "MY EMERGENCY" joining motion for "RELIEF" 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filing !!!

APPENDIX T: "MY TIMELY" amended 3:17-cv-20(AWT) complaint filing!!!

APPENDIX U^{#1}-U^{#7}: Above "EXHIBITS" #1-#50!!!

APPENDIX V: "MY PROPER" appointment of counsel 3:17-cv-20(AWT) filings!!!

APPENDIX W: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:17-cv-20(AWT) "RULINGS" in
"DENIAL" an "ORDER" of "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL"!!!

APPENDIX X^{#1}: "MY THIRD" Civil "RICO" Case statement 3:18-cv-857(AWT) filing!!!

APPENDIX X^{#2}: Above "EXHIBITS" #1-#7!!!

APPENDIX Y: U.S. District "CHIEF" of Connecticut 3:18-cv-857(AWT) initial
"REVIEW" order in "PREMATURE" Case "DISMISSAL"!!!

APPENDIX Z: U.S. District Court of Connecticut 3:18-cv-857(AWT)
judgement "VOID"!!!

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Baily v. Glover 88 U.S. (21 Wall) 342, 349-50 (1874)	8
Cadav. Baxter Healthcare Corporation 920 F.2d 446	8
"GILBERTSON" at 501 U.S. 350, 363, (1991)	8
"EQUITABLE TOLLING" Congressional "INTENT" Analysis 64 Wash L. Rev. 681, 689	8
"YOUNG" v. Herring 917 F.2d 858	12
"YOUNG" v. Pickett 917 F.2d 869	12
"YOUNG" v. Biggers 917 F.2d 873	12
Simmons v. Lockart 856 F.2d 1144	12
Haines v. Kerner 404 U.S. 519	12
Cooper v. Pate 378 U.S. 546	12
Dioguardi v. Durning 139 F.2d 774	12
Bayron v. Trudeau 702 F.2d 43	13
"ROOK" v. "ROOK" 233 Va. 92, 353 S.E.2d 756	14
STATUTES AND RULES	
Civil "RICO" 18 U.S.C. § 1961-68 "ACT"	4-9
28 U.S.C. § 455 (a), (b)	7-9
28 U.S.C. § 1915A (a), (b) / 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e)(1)	5, 6 / 12
28 U.S.C. § 2106 / 28 U.S.C. § 1331 / 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (1), (2), (3), (4), (b)(1), (b)(2)	4-14
42 U.S.C. § 1983-85	4, 7, 8
D. Conn. L. Civ. "STANDING" E-File "ORDER"	5
D. Conn. L. Civ. "STANDING" protective "ORDER"	5
F.R.C.P. 15(c)(1)(B), (2)	6
F.R.C.P. 60	5
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 1-105(a)	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 1-201(36)	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 2-207	9-14
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 2-209(a)	9-14
OTHER	
Statute of "LIMITATIONS" period	7
"FRAUDULENT" concealment "DOCTRINE"	8
Other "EQUITABLE TOLLING" applicable "DOCTRINE"	8

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix Bon I to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,

has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

18-1775 The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 11-14-18.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

17-4011 A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: August 16, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) in "AID" of appellate jurisdiction as "EXCEPTIONAL" circumstances "WARRANT" the "EXERCISE" of 28 U.S.C. § 2106 "SUPREME" authorized "POWER", and adequate "RELIEF" can "NOT" be "OBTAINED" in "ANY" other "FORM" from "ANY OTHER COURT" !!!

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

"FEDERAL"

- "FIRST" Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
- "SIXTH" Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
- "EIGHTH" Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
- "FOURTEENTH" Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!
- "OH" "AN" The "FOURTH" Amendment to U.S. Constitution !!!

"STATE"

- Connecticut Constitution Artical 1 § 8 !!!
- Connecticut Constitution Artical 1 § 20 !!!
- Connecticut Constitution Artical 5 § 1 !!!
- Connecticut Constitution Artical 20 § 1 !!!

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

"FEDERAL"

- Civil "RICO" 18 USC § 1961-1968
- 28 USC § 455(a), (b)
- 28 USC § 1915A(a), (b)
- 28 USC § 1915(e)(1)
- 28 USC § 1331
- 28 USC § 1651(a)

28 U.S.C. § 1343 (1), (2), (3), (4), (b)(1), (b)(2)

28 U.S.C. § 2106

42 U.S.C. § 1983-85

UNIFORM COMERCIAL CODE

(1) UCC 1-105(a) (2) UCC 1-201(36)

(3) UCC 2-207 (4) UCC 2-209(a)

"STATE"

- Connecticut General Statutes § 52-466(b)
- Connecticut General Statutes § 52-470(a)
- Connecticut General Statutes § 52-493

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This JOINT THIRD petition is MY ENABLED singular OFFSHOOT to the TWO prior GOOD FAITH U.S. SUPREME attempts, BY PASSED here at No. 18-8223 | 18-8765 submitted under TIMELY certiorari judicial discretion... SO... Once AGAIN prior questionable IMPARTIALITY of SECOND CIRCUIT court PANEL members RULINGS have NOT ONLY become SUSPECT to REVIEW under RULE 10 (a) provisions... BUT... Clear Judicial applicability RIGHTS NOW pursuant this U.S. SUPREME Court RULE 20.1 provisional ENTITLEMENTS in AID of appellate jurisdiction are AUTHORIZED in accordance 28 U.S.C. §1651(a) subsequent ENABLER... MORE IMPORTANTLY... Court personnel ACTIONS have so FAR departed from the ACCEPTED and USUAL course of judicial proceedings as to CALL for EXERSIZE of OUR U.S. SUPREME constitutional AUTHORIZED 28 U.S.C. §2106 POWER. [APPENDIX A-L]... AN... Further support thereof as follows !!!

2^A JUST BRIEFLY... This INDEPENDENT 42 U.S.C. §1983-85 ACTION commenced on 1-4-17 mistated upon 3:17-cv-20 (AWT) entry, BUT was COMPETENTLY initiated at [Doc. 1] under applicable Civil RICO 18 U.S.C. §1961-b8 ACT, with MY FURTHER provisional compliance DEEMED at [Doc. 4] RICO case STATEMENT filing. [APPENDIX M, N]... Nevertheless, IS ALL liberal construed ORIGINAL jurisdictional SUBJECT MATTER appropriately RELEVANT to RECOVERY and REDRESS, yes, set forth by 28 U.S.C. §1343 | 1331 Connecticut U.S. District CHIEF (AWT) obligatory ACTION !!!

2^B IMPORTANT NOTE: Subsequently, DESPITE this established MANDATE of clear judicial RECUSAL from 2-22-17 ORDERS written with LIE of DECEIT upon PREJUDICIAL 3:16-cv-1720 (AWT) DISCARD of NON-DUPLICATE [Doc. 1] entry... WHERE Connecticut U.S. District CHIEF Judge DENIED [Doc. 8-13] at [Doc. 14] with simultaneous 3:16-cv-1744, 1798 (AWT) PREMATURE case DISMISSALS in HIS BAD FAITH after ETHICAL business hours PARTY with CORRUPT U.S. District DEPUTY Clerk FURGUSON. [APPENDIX O^{#1} - O^{#3}]... SO... These MISCONDUCTED judicial NON-applicable E.R.C.P. 54 judgements SUA SPONTE in FAVOR of STATE were ALL through 3-10-17 FILE an ENTRY in BAD FAITH of SECOND pre-organize UNETHICAL business hours SECRET PARTY by U.S. District DEPUTY Clerk FURGUSON. [APPENDIX O^{#4}] !!!

3. Anyways, after SEVERAL months of this BIAS U.S. District 3:17-cv-20(AWT) CHIEF (I.R.O) DELAY, here in MOCK on May 10th 2017 is YET another MIMIC date of Connecticut STATE POLICE attempted MURDER PLOT, initiated by continued SECRET HEAD NOD gesture used in COVER UP for 17-4037 ILLEGAL arrest/conviction clarified in 18-1775 NOT SIX but (5)... SO... Here in STAGE SET 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), (b), MISUSE an ABUSE with fundamental F.R.C.P. 8 an OTHER provisional DISCARD at [Doc.10] is MORE of DELAY in tribunal GAME issued FORUM. [APPENDIX P]... Also pre-organize May 10th 2017 in CORRUPT [D.O.C.] CM/ECF notice MIMIC is 12-9-17 DISCOVERY due DATE with DISPOSITIVE motions DUE by 1-8-18, intentional written deception NOT included upon effective DENIAL of efficient RELIEF at [Doc.10] filing. Then STAGE SET 5-11-17 MIMIC at [Doc.11] with 5-10-17 EMERGENCY motion a meaningless GRANT filing ENTRY by U.S. DEPUTY District Clerk FERGUSON an HER unethical MOCK of BOTH attempted MURDER and ILLEGAL GA# 19 at ROCKVILLE arraignment dates, [APPENDIX Q]... YA... Immediately followed by MY SPECIAL SECRET intelligence at [Doc.12-14], filed in MY COMPETENT compliant MANDATORY relief under RULE 60 exercise with MY OTHER intelligent PROPER response, although pre-organize AGENT [D.O.C.] THOMPSON an the Dept. of CORRUPT others DENIED an impeded in LIE and DECEIT these TIMELY submitted filings. [APPENDIX R, S] !!!

4. NOW... Eventhough MY ongoing GOOD FAITH business practices were intentionally thorted AGAIN by AGENT [D.O.C.] THOMPSON and OTHERS in VIOLATION of JANET C. HALL standing E-FILE 6-22-16 MIMIC date MOCK an STANDING protective ORDERS entered at [Doc. 5, 6]... NOTE: Clearly another SECRET standing CRYPTIC CODE written in MOCK of Connecticut's SECONDS 6-22-13 STATE POLICE attempted MURDER PLOT, clarity FOUND in 18-1775 (5) NOT SIX (6)... YUP... Is just another TELLING intrusive SECRET SIGNAL use in DENIAL of MY EQUAL protection in LAW an BIGHTS to FAIR expeditious RELIEF from COVER UP of 17-4044 ILLEGAL arrest/conviction !!!

5. "BACK" to "TRACK" where on 6-12-17 "ENTERED" at [Doc. 15] was "MY GOOD FAITH" efforts in fundamental compliance of "AMENDED" complaint "TIMELY" filing, where upon "ALL" tribunal "BLIND EYE" an "DEAF EAR" syndrome "CHIEF" Judge "ALVIN W. THOMPSON" willfully "CHOSE" state "CO" CONSPIRATOR status, an "NAMED" as "CONSPIRING" defendant pursuant F.R.C.P. 15 (c)(1)(B), (2) by "HIS" own "ORDERED" amendment filing. [APPENDIX T U]... "MORE SHOWN" verified constitutional "PROOF" corroborating "MERITS" of "MY" outline December 2016 Samuel Sferazza "CORRUPT" pre-organize "ACTIONS" see pending here No. 18-7321 at [APPENDIX H]... "YUP" Same "PATTERN" of "CRIMINAL" misconduct by "RECENT" state "HABEAS CAST" an Melisa "MILLER" in "COLLUSION" with "DEFENDANT" William Salvator Esq. "REPLACEMENT" character "DEPUTY CHIEF" Clerk "GINA MANCINI PICKET" Esq. at "BEDROCK GA #19!!!

6. "YA" Moving on to "MY FAIR" business counsel appointment practice at [Doc. 16] "REQUEST" once "AGAIN" was submitted by "E-FILE" delay in another [D.O.C.] "LIE" and "DECEIT" manipulative of "ACCURATE RECORD", so followed by "MY" [Doc. 17] "MAIL" submission. [APPENDIX V]... Nevertheless after "SEVERAL" more "MONTHS" of Connecticut "BIAS" U.S. District "CHIEF" (AWT) "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "REITERATION" in "DELAY" with "NO DISCOVERY" nor "DISPOSITIVE" motion filing their was "YET" another "MIMIC" of "STAGE SET" as so "NOT TO DO JUSTICE"... "HERE"... In "MISUSE", "ABUSE" an "DISCARD" of "SEVERAL" fundamental provisional "RULES" of "FEDERAL" practice a "MORE DELAY" of "GAME" at [Doc. 18] in "PROMOTION" of... "NOT PREVENTION" of "THIS" manifest "INJUSTICE". [APPENDIX W]!!!

7. "NOW" Even though this (AWT) "LIE" in "DECEIT" manipulating an "ACCURATE RECORD" enabled "STAGE SET" [D.O.C.] "CORRUPT" "AGENTS" immediate protective "ORDER" relief of Civil "LIABILITY" it does "NOT" in "ANY WAY" excuse "ANY" of their "CORRUPT" corporate "COLLUSION"... "YES"... Deliberate institutional "VIOLATIONS" of "STANDING" protective "ORDERS" at [Doc. 5, 6]... at "LEAST TWICE" was "CLEAR" intentional "FELONY ACTS" with "CRIMINAL" liability set forth under "FEDERAL" U.S. District Courts "MANDATE" in "MY CAUSE" of "ACTION" here... "SPECIAL NOTE: This organize [Doc. 18] "RULING" an "ORDER" issued simultaneous upon "PREMATURE" 3:16-cv-1720, 1744, 1798 (AWT) case "DISMISSALS", was pre-organize "CRYPTIC" D. Conn. L. Civ. R "DISCARD" of "IMPARTIAL" judicial "REASONABLE INQUIRY" provisional "STANDING ORDER",

made "TIMELY" applicable at [Doc. 1, 4]... in "THIS" Civil "RICO" 18 U.S.C. § 1961-1967
"CAUSE OF ACTION"... Indisputably "MISCHARACTERIZE" under 3:16-cv-20 (AWT)
U.S. District "FEDERAL" Court "CHIEF" of Connecticut and "HIS CAST" of unethical
"CHARACTERS" in this "STATE" of ongoing criminal "CORRUPT" organize "ENTERPRISE"!!!

8. "MORE"... "SO"... With "NO" reasonable "TIMELY" civil summons ever "ISSUED" for
"ANY" defendants "SERVICE", was avoidance "ACTION" with "CORRUPT" intent to clearly
"ELIMINATE" Connecticut U.S. District Court "FAIR" business practices in
"RESPONSE" to "MY TIMELY" applicable "RICO" claims. Where this 11-13-17 "RULING"
in "BAD FAITH" [Doc. 18] "NON"-applicable F.R.C.P. 54 judgement "VOID" was "ORDERED"
by "CHIEF" (AWT) "SUA SPONTE" in "FAVOR" of "ALL" defendants including "HIMSELF"... "YES"...
Was indisputable "CORRUPT" organization "ACT" in deliberate "DISCARD" of "SUA SPONTE"
constitutional "ALVIN W. THOMPSON" obligational "DUTY", an exercise "BEYOND" limited
"SCOPE" delegated by "OUR PROPER" judicial "RECUSAL" set forth in "MANDATE" of
28 U.S.C. § 455 (a), (b) "FEDERAL ACTION"... "SO"... Even with "CRYPTIC" [Doc. 18] CM/ECF
notice "REFUSAL", an "ELIMINATION" by clear "COLLUSION" in "CORRUPT" [D.O.C.]
"VIOLATION" of U.S. "FEDERAL" District [Doc. 5, 6] "REQUIREMENTS", this
"ACCURATE" record "STILL" exist of "BAD FAITH" [Doc. 18] "ENTRY" by U.S. "DEPUTY"
Clerk "FURGUSON" at 7:55pm in "HER SELF" again "AFTER" the "ETHICAL" business
hours "SECRET PARTY". [APPENDIX W]... "AN"... "LASTLY"... Unfortunately, "MISSING"
from "MY RECORD" so obviously "NOT" in technical compliance with "RULES" governing
"PROPER" mechanics of "SERVICE", is "WHEN" ??? that "VOID" judgement in "BAD FAITH"
file entry "PARTY", an "SECRETLY" hidden by "WHOM" ??? "LOGGED" this "CORRUPT"
exercise upon the Connecticut U.S. "FEDERAL" District Courts "DOCKET"!!!

18-1775 (5) "NOT SIX" (6)

9. "SUBSEQUENTLY"... Within the "THREE (3) YEAR" statute of "LIMITATIONS" period
after "ALL" of state court "DISMISSALS" cited herein on 5-22-18 this "OFF SHOOT"
42 U.S.C. § 1983-85 "ACTION" commenced... "YES"... Once "AGAIN" on 5-24-18 mistated
upon 3:18-cv-857 (AWT) entry, "BUT" initiated at [Doc. 1] under applicable Civil

"RICO" 18 U.S.C. § 1961-68 "CAUSE OF ACTION" with "MY COMPETENTLY" compliant "RICO" case "STATEMENT" filing. [APPENDIX X^{#1}-X^{#2}]... Whereupon 6-4-18 "MORE" Connecticut "FEDERAL BIAS" U.S. District "CHIEF" (AWT) "MISCONDUCTED" judicial "REITERATION" of "LIE" and "DECEIT" in "MISUSE," "ABUSE," and "DISCARD" of fundamental provisional "RULES" of "FEDERAL" practice, in "PROMOTION" of "NOT PREVENTION" of "THIS" manifest "INJUSTICE" at [Doc. 7] issued "FORUM" [APPENDIX Y]!!!

10. "MORE IMPORTANTLY"... This "PREMATURE" case "DISMISSAL" with "PRJUDICE" by "CHIEF" of Connecticut inappropriate "TIME BAR" (AWT) "ORDER" is "CLEARLY" inapplicable, therefore "BOTH" these civil "ACTIONS" can and "MUST" proceed. As "HERE" when "FRAUD" has been concealed, "OR" is of "SUCH" a character as to "CONCEAL" itself, the statute does "NOT" begin to "RUN" until the "FRAUD" is discovered by, or becomes "KNOWN" to the "PARTY" suing. Baily v. Glover 88 U.S. (21 wall) 342, 349-50 (1874)... "MORE"... "SO"... Despite this "ANCIENT" (AWT) "MAXIM" of "LAW" that "NO ONE" "MAY" take advantage of "HIS OWN WRONG"... Obviously "MY CLEARLY" applicable "EQUITABLE TOLLING" jurisdictional "SAVING" qualifications "HERE" as set forth by Cada v. Baxter Healthcare Corporation 420 F.2d 446... "AN"... Appropriately "MORE" constitutional "EXTENSION" by "OUR" precedent "SUPREME" Courts "DOCTRINE" predated at "GILBERTSON" 501 U.S. 350, 363, 111 S.Ct. 2773, 115 L.Ed.2d 321 (1991)... "YUP"... "MY OTHER"... Applicable examples "HERE" are where a plaintiff's disability, such as "MY" imprisonment "OR" infancy, prevents "HIM" from "ACTING" within the "TIME" limitation, "OR" as "HERE" where external event "SUCH" as "THIS" pre-organize "FORCED WAR" has in "FACT" closed the "DOOR" to "ACCESS" any "COURTS RELIEF". see Comment, "EQUITABLE" "TOLLING" of statutory Benefit Time "LIMITATIONS": A congressional "INTENT" "Analysis" 64 Wash L. Rev. 681, 683 (1989) !!!

11. "YUP"... Resulting in "SAME" pre-organize "PATTERN" of "NO" defendant "SERVICE" and "BAD FAITH" [Doc. 11] "NON"-applicable F.R.C.P. 54 judgement "VOID" in "FAVOR" of "ALL" perpetrators, with "YET" another "NON"-monitor file "ENTRY" by U.S. DEPUTY

Clerk "FURGUSON" at 7:57pm in "HER SELF" again "AFTER" the "ETHICAL" business "WEEKS" 7-14-18 "SECRET" Saturday "SCAM PARTY". [APPENDIX Z,] !!!

12. AN. LASTLY. Here "BOTH" these independent 17-4011/18-1775 (5) "NOT" SIX (6) civil "ACTIONS" once "AGAIN" ended with "PREMATURE" case "DISMISALS" in "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court "DISHONOR" of binding "COLOR OF LAW" contractual "AGREEMENTS" in "SERIOUS" structural "VIOLATIONS" of "MY" appropriate "UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE" applicable citations. [APPENDIX G, H, J] !!!

13. "BRIEF SPECIAL NOTE"... In "YET" another derivative "OFF SHOOT" to "MY GOOD" "FAITH" attempted U.S. "SUPREME" Court "RELIEF" see: [No. 18-8765 Immediate "RULE 44" Petition "BY PASS" pages 7-9 at #18, #21, #24]... Where upon that [ATTACH #21] unauthorized "RULE OF EVIL" Clerk "RETURN", outside of the "LIMITED" constitutional "SCOPE" of "SUPREME" clerks "RULE 1.1" provisional compliance of "DUTIES" set forth by "RULE 17.4"... YES... Immediately "MY REFILE" along "LEGAL" binding "JEFF ATKINS" / "JACOB LEVITAN" / "SCOTT HARRIS" contractual "COLOR OF LAW" agreements dated 7-15-19 followed... AN. This "TIME" obstructed in "VIOLATION" with "NO" Clerk "IMMUNITY" attached "RIGHTS", yes, apparently "NO PROPER" ethical placement on "DOCKET" clearly "MISSING" in "COMBAT" with "NO MYSTERY" recovery in "RETURN"... AN. For "MY" most "RECENT" in "GOOD FAITH" attempted "ENTITLEMENT"... see 3:20-cv-00194 (MPS) at [Doc #1, #11, #12]... YA... I'm "STILL" awaiting "CORRECTIVE ACTION" to be "TAKEN" !!!

Declaration Under 18 U.S.C § 1621 / 28 U.S.C § 1746

I Michael A. Young declare in "TRUTH" affidavit process, certified under penalty of "PERJURY" that "ALL" information in this petition is "TRUE" and "ACCURATE" to the "BEST" of "MY" knowledgeable intelligence and "CAN ONLY" be "REBUTED" by "SAME" in "RESPONSE" thereto... The undersigned further declares under Congress encouraged "SERVICE" as "ENABLED" Attorney General "PRIVATEER" that "HE" is the petitioner in this forgoing "ACTION"... AN... The forgoing petition was mailed first-class postage prepaid on April 8th, 2020 placed in the institutions "LEGAL" mail system...

Executed at Cheshire C.I. Cheshire CT on April 8th, 2020...

by MA "Factual Innocence" !!!
Michael A. Young "PRIVATEER"

17-4011 / # 18-1775

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TO: COURT OF LAST RESORT,...

1st MY SUPREME JUSTICES... Starting RIGHTS NOW with MORE of MY SPECIAL updated SECRET intelligence NOTE... Without articulating ALL the intentional PATTERN of corporated in HOUSE CORRUPTION in ongoing MISCONDUCTED entity COLLUSION, as the COURTS and (D.O.C) MY CAPTORS indisputable records SPEAK for THEMSELVES... Instead sticking to the SOLE issue invoking THIS subsequent WRIT of MANDAMUS to CERTIORARI filings in ABOVE mention CASES, so as FOUND at [Doc. 72] in 17-4044 it is NOT DUPLICATE of 9-11-18 ENTRY at [Doc. 69] as DEPICTED in RECORD of LIE an DECEIT,... AN... With MY actual DUPLICATE [Doc. 77] EMERGENCY 911 filing RETURNED at [Doc. 76] YOU ALL SEE at manipulated [Doc. 74] RULING adjudicated on ONLY [Doc. 69]... Then SAME exact PATTERN of CORRUPTION in 17-4037/17-4040 was ENTERED, then MY FEELING the NEED to REITERATE here IS... Along this MISCONDUCTED joint-entity COLLUSION of corporate CORRUPTION in pre-organize TACTICAL non-interdepartmental mail MANEUVER, with U.S. POSTAL SERVICE signal 8-18-18 MARK used in SECRET CODE for intentional DENIAL of MY MEANINGFUL court ACCESS RIGHTS... The indisputable FOCUS here IS on this FOURTH 17-4011 NO SHOW 8-16-18 ORDER [Doc. 40], then 8-24-18 REITERATED with [Doc. 41] NO SHOW ORDER, and BOTH STILL missing in COMBAT along with MY OTHER FAIR procedural request... YET... Another DECEITFUL calculated joint-entity ACT to ELIMINATION of ANY possible BENEFIT of MY EQUAL protection RIGHTS to RELIEF, in deliberate DENIAL of TIMELY inmate LEGAL mail filing with SERIOUS fundamental VIOLATION of MY MEANINGFUL court ACCESS RIGHTS!!!

1st SO... HERE... Pre-organize with 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 depicted MY 51st BIRTHDAY based on INCORRECT prior/current case information, was ALL inappropriate June 21st 2018 motion DENIALS with PREMATURE appeal DISMISSALS... With THIS 17-4011 case ATASHA JOESPH assigned NEW CASE manager ENTERED in COLLUSION for a CORRUPT 6-26-18 NOTICE of DEFECT written in LIE of DECEIT intentionally submitted to manipulate the ACCURATE RECORD... MORE FRAUD FOUND... Written in TACTICAL submitted LIE of DECEIT in 17-4037 at [Doc. 59],... 17-4040 at [Doc. 46],... 17-4044 at [Doc. 47],... As THAT courts PANNEL decisions ALL were ORDERED in DICARD of MY FOUR (4) TIMELY

Submitted "CHINESE BOX" filings "FOUND" in "THIS" 17-4011 "CASE" at [Doc. 32, 34, 38, ??, ??, ??]...
Absolutely "ALL" these "ORDERS" filed in undisputable "VIOLATION" of "LEGAL" binding
Contractual "COLORING LAW" agreement with "CHIEF" Judge "ROBERT A. KATZMANN" by
this "TACTICAL" maneuver made in "HIS" concession of "SUB SILENTO" acceptance... "YES"...
"MY HONORABLE" in "GOOD FAITH" and enforceable "RIGHTS NOW" of multiple "SCHEDULE" 7.b
"VIOLATIONS" in "THIS" 17-4011 "CASE, numerous \$10,000.00 Dollar amounts "NOW" due
with "NO FURTHER NOTICE", or in "SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" efforts immediate
"CORRECTIVE ACTION" be "TAKEN" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY"!!!

2. Regarding "MY TIMELY" submitted ancient "CHINESE SECRET" filings, here upon "MY CURE" of
"ALL" pre-organize "FOUR" (4) inappropriate "LABLE" of "DEFECTS" issued in "TACTICAL" unethical
"CORRUPTION"... "MOST IMPORTANT NOTE"... Is about the "IMPOSSABLE" task of a "RESUBMIT"
document when in "FACT" the original documents have "NEVER" been "RETURNED" back with
"ANY" of these "FOUR" (4) "NOTICE" of "DEFECTIVE" filing written in "LIE" of "DECEIT" intentionally
manipulating "FOUR" (4) "ACCURATE RECORDS"... "YA"... It is unclear to "ME" while "THIS" 17-4011
cases other "THREE" (3) "TIMELY" filed 6-14-18, 6-18-18, then 6-21-18 "BEST CHINA" submitted
an "STHIL" are "LEGALLY" binding, "WHY" ??? in "FACT" a "RE-SUBMISSION" is even
"REQUIRED"... "BUT"... As always in "MY FOREVER" format conducting "GOOD FAITH" business
"EFFORTS" as "NOT" to "RESULT" in "ANY" court "STRIKEN" documents, "NOW" on 7-5-18
"SUBMITTED" missing "STHIL"; "MY FOURTH" (4) "TIMELY" filed motion for "CHIEF" Judge
"ROBERT A. KATZMANN" already conceded to "COLORING LAW" agreement, once "AGAIN"
in "MY HONORABLE" summary procedural "PROPER FORUM"!!!

3. Furthermore, "THAT" panel "COURTS" preliminary appointment of counsel "DENIAL" with "NO"
articulation conflicts with "THIS" and "OTHER" circuit courts decisions set forth by
Greenov. Daley 414 F.3d 645 and in Parham v. Johnson 126 F.2d 455... as "HERE" in
"MY CASE" where case has "MERIT" and most "FACTORS" have been "MET", Courts
should "MAKE" every "ATTEMPT" to "OBTAIN" counsel. Even "MORE" applicable "SECOND"
"CIRCUIT" court "CRITERIA" as "FOUND" in "MY CASE" where litigant is "UNABLE" to
"EMPLOY" counsel set forth by Hodges v. Police Officers 802 F.2d 58... "YUP"... As "SHOWN"
by "MY CAPTORS" [D.O.C.] conducting "SECRET" outgoing "LEGAL" correspondence
"ELIMINATION" an "MY" being "DENIED" directory assistance to adequately
obtain "Foundation" for "JUSTICE" attorney Jeffery Deskovic "LEGAL" phone

communication assistance... Now... Unexcusably BOTH in "SERIOUS" structural "ERROR",
an "ROAD BLOCK" of "ANY" meaningful court access in "SEVERE" fundamental "VIOLATION"
of "MY" unalienable "EQUAL PROTECTION" and "ACCESS RIGHTS" !!!

4. "MOST IMPORTANT REITERATION"... Is on this "PROPER" case consolidation "REQUEST"
in that "PANEL" courts "IMPROPER" order of "DENIAL", of course "AGAIN" with "NO PROPER"
cited articulation "ISSUED" in "SERIOUS" conflict with "YOUNG v. Herring 917 F.2d 858...
"FOUND" consolidated at "YOUNG v. Pickett 917 F.2d 869 (footnote #2)... YUP... MY FIVE(5) "CASES"
are "ALL" the "SAME" constitutionally "VERIFIED" demonstration "FOUND" set forth in
"YOUNG v. Biggers 917 F.2d 873... Then "EVIDENTLY" hearing upon "REMAND" set forth by
"Simmons v. Lockhart 856 F.2d 1144" also in accord with "SAME" prejudicial "CAUSE" as "FOUND"
in "ALL" FIVE (5) "MY" forgoing "ENTITLED" cases... AN... Pursuant to 28 USC § 1915(e)(1)
"ENABLES" counsel "PROPER" appointment... YES... Immediate "JUSTICE" for "ALL" in the
"INTEREST" of judicial "ECONOMY" with "EFFECTIVE" expeditious an administration of
"PROPER" business in "THIS COURT"... AN... With "MORE" appropriate case consolidation
see 3:18-cr-857 (AWT) at [Doc. 1] "FOUND" at 18-1775, "BY PASS" here 18-8765 "STILL" awaiting "PROPER"
preliminary "ACTION TAKEN" in accord with "THIS SUPREME" COURTS "GOOD FAITH"
immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY" !!!

5. "NOW"... In "SERIOUS" fundamental structural "ERROR" with "NO" Loc. FRAP 31.2(a)(1)(A)
"SCHEDULING" opportunity "SECOND CIRCUIT" court "PREMATURE" appeal "DISMISSAL" is
in "ALL" prejudicial "VIOLATION" of "THIS" and "OTHER" circuits uniformity decisions
because "it" "LACKS" an arguable "BASIS" either in "LAW" or "FACT"... As inappropriately
"ORDERED" in conflict with "BEDROCK" principles of "WELL" establish "RULES", that
the complaint of a "PRO SE" litigant should be liberally construed in "HIS FAVOR", see
"Haines v. Kerner 404 U.S. 519... That "HIS" allegations "MUST" be "TAKEN" as "TRUE" in
considering whether a "CLAIM" is stated, "Cooper v. Pate 378 U.S. 546... AN... The
complaint should "NOT" be "DISMISSED" for "FAILURE" to "STATE" a "CLAIM" unless it
appears "BEYOND DOUBT" plaintiff can prove "NO SET" of "FACTS" in "SUPPORT" of
"HIS" "CLAIM" which would "ENTITLED" "HIM" to "RELIEF" as depicted by "THIS"
"SECOND CIRCUIT" court in "Dioguardi v. Durning 139 F.2d 774... In "LIGHT" of
these principles... MORE... SO... "THAT COURT" has repeatedly "CLEARLY" cautioned

against "SUA SPONTE" dismissals of "PRO SE" civil "RIGHTS" complaints "PRIOR" to the court "REQUIRING" the defendant to "ANSWER". See Bayron v. Trudeau 702 F.2d 43, Fries v. Barnes 618 F.2d 988. "YES"... Only "ONE" of numerous \$10,000.00 Dollar "VIOLATIONS" due "RIGHTS NOW" with "NO FURTHER NOTICE" or in "SUPREME" Courts "GOOD FAITH" efforts immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" be "TAKEN" with "NO FURTHER" suffering in "ACTUAL" sustain "INJURY"!!!

"MY INDEPENDANT" 17-4011/18-1775 ACTION TO JUDGMENT VOID"

6. "EXPLICITLY"... A "STATE COURT" judgment as in 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 that is "VOID" may be "ATTACKED" pursuant "FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS" procedure... Then if or as here "WHEN" 28 USC § 2254 "FAILS", by "WAY" Fed. Civ. P. "RULE 60" motion, as "AGAIN" was "DONE" in "ALL THREE (3)" "ENTITLED" matters, or "AGAIN" as "DONE" in "THIS 17-4011 CASE" by an independent "SUIT" in "EQUITY", if for some "REASON" the "RULE 60" motion would "NOT PROVIDE" adequate "RELIEF"... At any rate a judgment "RENDERED" by "ANY COURT" that "LACKS" jurisdiction is universally characterized as "VOID" and traditional doctrine had been that "SUCH" a "JUDGMENT" is a "LEGAL" nullity... "BUT"... In modern decisions the problem is recognized as being "MORE" complicated, there "M.A.Y." be situations in which a court "LACKING" jurisdiction has rendered a judgment that should nevertheless be given effect. It is "IMPORTANT" to distinguish between jurisdiction over the "PERSON" and jurisdiction over the "SUBJECT MATTER"!!!

7. "HERE"... Regarding "MY" above "THREE (3)" "STATE COURT" judgments jurisdiction over "MY PERSON" is "LACKING" because the process employed did "NOT GIVE" adequate "NOTICE" before being "RENDERED". Walkerv. City of Hutchinson 352 U.S. 112... also U.S.v. Brand Jewelers, Inc. 318 F.supp. 1293... and because court "LACKED" the "REQUIRED" contacts with the case. Hanson v. Dencla 357 U.S. 235... Additionally because, although jurisdiction "M.A.Y." have been "SECURED" over "PARTY" purporting to represent "MY PERSON" that representation was fundamentally "INADEQUATE"... Unless "MY PARTY" made an appearance to contest the exercise of jurisdiction over "MY PERSON". Durfee v. Duke 375 U.S. 106... "OH"... "YES"... The "JUDGMENT" is "VOID" on "DUE PROCESS" grounds in "ALL" these circumstances. Many decisions also "HOLD" a

judgment "VOID" where "PARTY" obtains actual "NOTICE" from a court that had sufficient contacts with the case but the "PROCESS" as in these "THREE (3) CASES" was "NOT" in technical compliance with the "RULES" governing mechanics of "SERVICE". Central Operating Co. v. Utility Workers of America 491 F.2d 245 !!! As such is the "CASE" in "THIS" 17-4011 proceeding... "AN" 18-1775 as well !!!

8. "MOREOVER"... As set forth by the "SECOND CIRCUIT" Court of Appeals there is "ONLY" an immaterial procedural difference between the "RELIEF" sought pursuant "RULE 60" to be "TAKEN". see Hadden v. Rumsey Prods. 196 F.2d 92... A "JUDGMENT" is "VOID" as in "THIS" 17-4011 "ACTION" when circumstances of "COURTS ACTION" amounts to a "PLAIN" usurpation of "POWER" constituting a "VIOLATION" of "DUE PROCESS". U.S. v. Boch Oldsmobile Inc. 909 F.2d 657... "AN" "LASTLY"... Once "AGAIN" as in 17-4037, 17-4040, and 17-4044 where "RULE 60" is "PROPERLY" invoked on "BASIS" of underlying "JUDGMENT" is "VOID", the "RELIEF" is "NOT" a discretionary "MATTER", it is a "MANDATORY" exercise. Omer v. Shalala 30 F.3d 1307 (quoting) V.T.A. Inc. v. Airco Inc. 597 F.2d 220... These "JUDGMENTS" are "VOID" because "ALL HAVE BEEN" procured by extrinsic and collateral "FRAUD" entered by "COURT" that did "NOT" have "COMPETENT" jurisdiction over neither "SUBJECT MATTER" or "MY PERSON" see "ROOK V. ROOK" 233 Va. 92, 353 S.E.2d. 756 !!!

Wherefore under "MY COMPETENTLY" articulated "GOOD CAUSE" explicitly "SHOWN", in "GOOD FAITH" here under "FAIR" business practices of "THIS COURT" petitioner expressly request Constitutional "AUTHORITY" of "SUPREME" Court to "TAKE" immediate "CORRECTIVE ACTION" and "GRANT" this extraordinary "WRIT" of "MANDAMUS", with Appointment of Counsel, an "ORDER" immediate "EMERGENCY" release pending "FINALITY" in "ALL" the "ENTITLED" matters !!!

Respectfully Submitted
by MY Factual Innocence !!!
Michael A. Young Petitioner
DATE: 4-8-2020

Declaration Under 18 U.S.C. § 1621 | 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I Michael A. Young declare in "TRUTH" affidavit process, certified under penalty of "PERJURY" that the information in this petition is "TRUE" and "ACCURATE" to the "BEST" of "MY" knowledgeable intelligence and "CAN ONLY" be "REBUTED" by the "SAME" in "RESPONSE" thereto. Filed under "SUPREME" Court "RULE" 29.2 procedure for the benefit of "TIMELY" filing... The undersigned further declares that "HE" is the petitioner in this "ACTION" and "HIS" forgoing petition was mailed first-class postage prepaid on April 8th, 2020 and placed in the institutions "LEGAL" mail system.

Executed at MacDougal Ct. Suffield Ct. on April 8th, 2020...

by MY Factual Innocence !!!
Michael A. Young Petitioner