

No. 24 - 1053

---

In the  
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

*In re* Sara Ann Edmondson, Petitioner

---

*ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO  
THE  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT*

---

**PETTITION FOR REHEARING**

---

Sara Ann Edmondson, Pro Se  
71 Rainbow Trail  
Pittsgrove, NJ 08318  
609.501.2249

Pursuant to Rule 44.2, Petitioner Sara Ann Edmondson respectfully requests that the Court grant the Petition for Rehearing and hear for the first time the Petition for Writ of Mandamus. This Petition for Rehearing is presented and submitted in good faith and not for delay, as the Certificate of Counsel appended to this Petition attests.

According to the Supreme Court of the United States, under our system of justice, the opportunity to be heard is the most fundamental requirement. *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314, 70 S. Ct. 652, 657, 94 L. Ed. 865 (1950) (“The fundamental requisite of due process of law is the opportunity to be heard.”) An administratively terminated summary judgment motion without the offer of (1) reinstatement and (2) the contemplation of further proceedings is the denial of the most fundamental requisite of due process of law: the opportunity to be heard. The procedure of this directive/requisite is found in Local Civil Rule 41.1.

The purpose of Mandamus Petition is supervisory in nature and is to issue a judicial writ commanding an inferior court to perform a duty under the rule of law. The Third Circuit itself has a litany of citations both conducting reviews on and supporting the issuance of writs for matters of the exact same nature and circumstance. The failure to do so in this instance supports judicial disparate treatment and is inconsistent with due process. As set forth in *Mullane*, the Petition asks the Supreme Court to use its supervisory authority to

command the lower courts to do what the law requires of it, which is Petitioner's Constitutional Right to be heard.

For the reasons and laws set forth in the Petition, for the reasons set forth in *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co*, for the reason set forth in 28 USC § 1257 and for the precedents already established in Third Circuit writs of mandamus, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Petition for Rehearing be granted and the Petition for Writ of Mandamus be heard, reviewed and resolved under the Rule of Law pursuant to 28 USC § 1361.

### CONCLUSION

This Court should grant the Petition for Rehearing and review the Petition for Writ of Mandamus pursuant to 28 USC § 1361, which is supported under 28 USC § 1257 (Judgment is a void judgment if court that rendered judgment ... acted in a manner inconsistent with due process.)

Respectfully,

Dated: August 7, 2025

  
*Petitioner*

## CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER

I hereby certify that this Petition for Rehearing is presented in good faith, in support of the rule of law (*Mullane*) and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2.



Sara Ann Edmondson

August 7, 2025

No. 24 - 1053

---

**In the  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

*In re* Sara Ann Edmondson, Petitioner

---


*ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
THIRD CIRCUIT* \_\_\_\_\_

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

---

**CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT**

I certify that the word count of this Petition for Rehearing complies with the rules at 511.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sara Ann Edmondson", written over a horizontal line.

**Sara Ann Edmondson, Pro Se**

71 Rainbow Trail  
Pittsgrove, NJ 08318  
609.501.2249

Dated: August 7, 2025

Copies of the Petition for Rehearing in Docket 24-1053 were forwarded via regular mail  
USPS to:

Clerk  
Third Circuit Court of Appeals  
US Courthouse  
601 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Dated: August 13, 2025



Sara Ann Edmondson

