

1. Motion for rehearing

I Delester Scott the plaintiff request a motion for rehearing by rule 44. for reconsideration of a judgement denial of Writ of certification petition case number 24-6733 to admit the federal rule of evd. 403,301,302,402,901,706 and 1005 as admissible evidence by the U.S.C 15 49 document evd. Exbit A. Screenshot of the fault explained by experts on The National Library of Medicine and Exbit B. The receipt of insurance by the defdant report misdiagnosed of the injury to be reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court as conflict of interest by denied summary judgement from the District 129 Court,14th Appeals Court and Texas State Supreme Court from the plaintiff on (1) decisions in related cases to applied the federal civil procedure and rules to the cases of conflicted issues resolved while in federal jurisdiction. (2) Evidence of fact material to admissible reviewable. (3) The federal question involving the case .

In the Writ of certification filed for a rehearing on *July 31.2025* is timely filed before 15 days deadline from the notice sent from the U.S. Supreme Court on July.1.2025 last date to file a motion for a rehearing on was received on July 15.2025. postmarked date is in guidelines of the Rule 44.

Introduction to evidence

To determine the negligence by the respondent Dr. Steven M. by (1) The breach of service on the Amerigroup inc. is test and dates.(2) The fault explained by experts witnesses from The National Library of Medicine of the P.N.E. (3) The failure of treatment by the Dr. Steven M. Clinic notes from the dates on the visits. (4) A failed Standard Care Act. Is clearly shown by the respondent when examine for the cause.

Exbit A.

A. Type in an online search bar

“ A successful surgery on a numb penile.”

The document evidence screenshot from The National Library of Medicine website is stated by certified practice license specialist of the medical board. The correct surgical procedure explained. (1) The fault of the medical condition.

•

Exbit B.

Amerigroup inc.

Is the breach of service dates by the respondent from the claims on record.

Dates of claims on the insurance.

1. The respondent Dr. Steven

Office visit.

12/18/18 (2)

11/18/19 (2)

11/18/18 (2)

8/13/18 (2)

7/6/18 (1)

4/21/23 (1)



Total 14. Claims

2. Lab and Test

A. H.C.H. 10/18/18 and 10/19/18

B. Southloop M.R.I. 7/23/18

C. Bio Lab. 12/18/18 (9)

7/16/18 (21)

8/13/18 (6)

D. Corp Lab (15)

Total (57)

3. Mental health claims A. Sun

behavior 3/10/21 (1)

3/22/21 (1) B. Tex. West.

Oaks 2/28/18 (1)

C. C. Harris county ldd.

(12) year 18 to 21. (15)

William Mark A.

11/12/18 (5)

10/10/18

7/12/18 (3)

6/4/18 (3) and 6/19/18

Barbara M. 3/11/21/ (6)

3/18/21 (2)

3/20/21 (2)

3/7/18

Rachman, Jorge 3/3/18 Lopez

goody. 2/28/18.

Elhaho, Izzolda B. 2/26/18 (4)

2/28/18

Omanga, lovely 1/14/19

Pickering, Meliane. (1)

Total (102).

Health information disclosure

I Delester Scott request Dr. Steven M. to release Medical information while under care in the practice by H.I.P.P.I. law requirements.

Disclosure of Medical records request

I Delester Scott request the release of Health records from the medical board, Dr. Steven M. and Amerigroup to the U.S. Supreme Court Administrative Board of Justice and expert on examination to access the required report to the case.

Authorities

U.S.C.28 1257

U.S.C. 28 1332

U.S.C. 28 1331

U.S.C. 15 49

Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Ch.74. Medical Liability Tort. Title 4.Sub.Ch. I Expert Witnesses sec. 74.401, 74.403, 74.402.

Sub. Ch. F. Statue of limitations

Sec. 74.251(a)(b)

Sub.Ch.G. Liability Limits

Sec. 74.301 (a)(b)(c)

Texas Civil Procedures and Rules

166(l) (li) Summary Judgement

Exbit A.

The National Library of Medicine

Cited- type online search “ a successful treatment for penile numbness.”

Screenshot of an successful surgery by Expert Witnesses.

Dr. Stephen Hrubly

Dr. Ross Luther

Dr. Eva V. Vodegel

Dr. Nicola Adanna

Exbit B.

Amerigroup inc.

P.O.Box 62509

Virginia Beach, V.A. 23460- 2509.

Case related

Erie doctrine law

Berk v. Choy 24-440

Anderson v. Liberty 477 is 242 (1986)

Swift v. Tyson (1842)

Haines v. Kramer 367

Railroad v. Tompkins 304 us 64 (1938)

Anderson v. Liberty 477 us 242(1986)

Case pending in District Court 333. Delester Scott v. Peter Hinh and other defenders.
Case# 250533

Constitution and Federal Statutes involvement of the Writ of Certification.

Federal Civil Procedures and rules

Rule 46. To object.

Rule 59. To reconsider.

Rule 36. To admit.

Rule 56. Summary Judgement.

Federal rule of evidence

Rule 401

Rule 402 of evidence.

Rule 301 of evidence.

Rule 302 of evidence.

Rule 901

Rule 706 and rule 1005.

The 1366 U.S.C

The 14 th amendment of the Constitution due process.

Parties Involved

The plaintiff (Delester Scott)

6822 Cherrydale

Houston, TX.77087

Steven M. The respondent

Calvert and associates firm.

15201 Mason Rd. Suite 350

Cypress, TX. 77433

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Dolostor Scott — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

Stovon M. — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Dolostor Scott, do swear or declare that on this date, July 31, 2025, 20____, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.


The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Stovon M.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July, 2025

D. Scott
(Signature)



**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**