

No. 20-5659

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

GABRIEL M. ROBLES,

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)


ROBERT L. WILKIE, vs.

Secretary of Veterans Affairs,

**ORIGINAL**

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**for the Federal Circuit**



(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

GABRIEL M. ROBLES

(Your Name)

1243 SW Western Avenue, Apt. B-18

(Address)

Topeka, Kansas. 66604

(City, State, Zip Code)

(785) 224-8195

(Phone Number)

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

### QUESTION # 1.

Did the fact that a response from the Respondent was not required in the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims cause the court to assume the Petitioner's "Extraordinary Writ" for relief was filed in retaliation for an adverse decision by the Respondent for Veterans benefits?

### QUESTION # 2.

Did erroneous ex parte communication between the Respondent and the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims cause the court to view the "Extraordinary Writ" as "...the Court construes as a request for a writ of mandamus..." ?

### QUESTION # 3.

Is it appropriate or even legal for the Federal Circuit Court to ignore obvious Civil and Constitutional rights violations by the Respondent simply to shield the lower court from embarrassment?

## 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:

## RELATED CASES

ROBLES v. U.S.A., No. 17-6118, United States Supreme Court.  
Petition refused. (Rules 13.1, 29.2, and 30.1) August 29,  
2014.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

Decided: June 11, 2020.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

### APPENDIX B

Decided: August 14, 2019.

United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

### APPENDIX C

### APPENDIX D

### APPENDIX E

### APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

ROBLES v. U.S.A. (SC No. 17-6118)

5.

### STATUTES AND RULES

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article 1. Sec.9 p. 3.

3.

Article 4.

3.

Amendment 1.

3.

Amendment 4.

3.

Amendment 5.

3.

Amendment 8.

3.

Amendment 14.

3.

SCOTUS Rule 10.

3.

### OTHER

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   A   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~~ <sup>court of Appeals for Veterans Claims</sup> appears at Appendix   B   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**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was June 11, 2020.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals 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. § 1254(1).

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

### ARTICLE I. Section 9, paragraph 3.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed. (Appendix A and B)

### ARTICLE VI.

"This Constitution.., shall be the supreme Law of the Land;.."

### AMENDMENT I.

Religion.

### AMENDMENT IV.

"The right of the people to be secure..."

### AMENDMENT V.

"..without due process of law;.."

### AMENDMENT VIII.

".. nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

### AMENDMENT XIV. Section 1.

"..nor deny... the equal protection of the laws."

### SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a)

"..has so far departed from the accepted..."

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner's "Notice of Appeal" and "Declaration of Financial Hardship" were faxed to the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims on June 3, 2019, after an employee of the Veterans benefits "Hotline" informed the Petitioner his "Statement of Case" and "Decision" on his benefits could be "withheld indefinitely". That call took place May 27, 2019.

The Petitioner's filing for "Rule 21. Extraordinary Relief" was based on the above related communication.

The lower courts ruling was based on an assumption or some unknown communication, or some quid pro quo protocol that the Petitioner was not aware of.

The Respondents "Statement of Case" and "Decision" was not issued until June 8, 2019.

Subsequent statements made to the Federal Circuit Court by the Respondent further implicate that Court and the lower court in a false narrative that the Petitioner was simply acting in retaliation to a decision he did not agree with. This Veteran submits that this process was and is the result of the "VA Scandal" that did and still does result in the deaths of thousands or even millions of our Veterans!

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Based on the 100% disability rating given to the Petitioner by the Social Security Administration on April 17, 2015, (Timothy G. Stueve, Administrative Law Judge, SSA) Judge Stueve based his decision on Petitioner's disability on medical evidence the Petitioner has served on the Respondent.

The Petitioner currently lives in housing somewhat subsidized by the Veterans Administration. Rife with prostitution, drug abuse, stabbings, and shootings that go uninvestigated and unpunished. Petitioner's wife Bonnie suffered a heart attack this past Easter that was more than likely a result of fear, anger, stress, and anxiety due to our living conditions. We feel the Respondent has placed us in harms way in order to sweep under the rug the medical malpractice Petitioner has suffered.

The Federal Judge (Kathy Vratil) that ruled on Petitioner's medical malpractice case allowed five (5) attorney's to sue Petitioner as a white female named Jennifer Ruth.

Ms. Ruth was known to associate with Latinos. (USDC, Kan. Case No. 2:10-cv-02310-KHV. July 7, 2011.)

Local, state, and federal law enforcement refuse to look into crimes that violate Petitioner's rights.

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date: August 31, 2020.