IOM92719062 United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Yi Tai Shao
Processed: 9/20/2025 7:25:29 PM | 559

25-1345

No._____

IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

--oOo--

IN RE YI TAI SHAO

Yi Tai Shao, Petitioner

vs.

Respondents Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice Samuel A. Alito, Associate Justice Elena Kagan, Associate Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice Neil M. Gorsuch, Associate Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh, Associate Justice Kantaji Jackson, Ex-Vice President Kamala Harris, Chief Judge Padmanabhan Srikanth "Sri" Srinivasan, Judge J. Michelle Childs, Judge Florence Y. Pan, and Judge Bradly N. Garcia at D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia, Judge Barry Silverman, Judge Ryan D. Nelson and Judge Patrick J. Bumatay, Clerk Molly Dwyer, Judge Anthony D. Johnston, Judge Andrew D. Hurwitz and Chief Judge Brian M. Morris at U.S.D.C. for Montana who was appointed for Appeal No.22-15857, at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Jia M. Cobb and Chief Judge James Boasberg at the U.S.D.C. for the D.C., Judge John A. Mendez for the Eastern Cal., Hon. Jim Jordan as Chair of House Judiciary Committee, Hon. Chuck Grassley as Chair for Senate Judiciary Committee, Mark Rubio in the capacity as Secretary of State, Scott Bessen in the capacity as Secretary of Treasury, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services, Leah Wilson, Executive Director at State Bar of California, David Kilgore at California Department of Child Support Services, Noel Murrey, Narjeet Randhawa at Department of Child Support Services, Santa Clara County Court then-Presiding Judges Theodore Zayner, then-Presiding Judge Patricia Lucas, Presiding Judge Beth McGowan, Judge Maureen A. Folan, Civil Clerk Alex Rodriguez, Sixth District Court of Appeal Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood, Ninth Circuit, Presiding Judge Thomas Nixon, Judge Victoria Kolakowski, Judge Mark Fickes, CEO Chad Finke at Alameda County Superior court of California, California Attorney General Rob Bonta, and Tsan-Kuen Wang, James McManis, California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero and Clerk Jorge Navarre, McManis Faulkner law firm, Michael Reedy

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Yi Tai Shao, Esq., PO Box 300; Big Pool, MD 21711 (408) 873-3888
attorneyshao@aol.com [Application re-filed simultaneously]

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 12 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IOM62082562 United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Shao
Processed: 11/4/2025 7:20:16 AM | 548

IOM15002533 United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Shao
Processed: 3/4/2026 9:01:34 PM | 589

IOM [illegible] United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Shao
Processed: 1/12/2026 5:24:24 PM | 512

IOM16328095 United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Yi Tai Shao
Processed: 9/6/2025 7:14:34 PM | 559

IOM12249935 United States Supreme Court
Recipient: Clerks Office
Sender: Linda Shao
Processed: 5/17/2026 7:49:47 PM | 547

RECEIVED
SEP 23 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

11 QUESTIONS PRESENTED

QUESTION NO.1:

Shall a writ of habeas corpus be issued when Petitioner has been completely barred from *any* access to the court about her grievances that arose from the vexatious litigant orders and dismissal in Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel (Santa Clara County, California, 2012-1-cv-220571) in the past 14 years, including, but not limited to, California Supreme Court's 5/16/2024 order in Petition No.S283308 where the court misused "summary denial" of a Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Application to block filing of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus No.S283308 when the court had no legal basis to require such Application when the vexatious litigant orders were directly at issue, such that California courts, at all levels, conspired in avoiding a decision, for 3+ years, on her uncontested motion to vacate the dismissal that was ordered, without notice, by Judge Christopher G. Rudy who was/is an officer of James McManis's club, American Inns of Court, and motion to vacate the vexations litigant orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan who was James McManis's attorney and was sponsored by McManis to be a judge, when Folan's order had been used to block Petitioner from filing any motion to change child custody, when all justices at California Supreme Court are officers of the same club, and California Supreme Court **concealed** Petitioner's motion to vacate

5/16/2024 order and refused to decide the motion, **purged** all court records in S283308, **concealed names** of James McManis and his partners from **all** Petitioner's cases (App.78-81) while eight Justices of this Court are also officers of the same club, and had a good history of blocking Petitioner from seeking grievance (e.g. in the related Petition No.21-881, six[1] present Justices of them conspired in each not deciding on his/her recusal in order to illegally keep their voting rights and did vote for closure of 21-881 at odds with the laws and

---

[1] See discussion of Petition No.21-881 in the next section of "Related Proceeding". This is the case where Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., for the first time, took the responsibilities of 400+ incidents of Supreme Court crimes in Petitioner's case with the legal effect that the entire Request for Recusal filed therein became truth.

The law mandates the 2/22/2022 order denying certiorari which Chief Justice participated in voting to be automatically vacated when he recused on 4/18/2022. Yet, retired Justice Stephen Breyer as well as the six present Justices **conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal but voting case closure of Petition 21-881**. They are Associate Justices Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Elena Kagan, Sonia Sotomayor, Neil Gorsuch and Bret Kavanaugh.

Chief Justice admitted his directing concealment of the names of James McManis and his partners from being shown as "Respondents" on the dockets of 17-82, 17-256, 18-800, 20-524, 21-881, 22-350.

practice, and blocked seven filings a Petition for Writ of Mandamus under 28 U.S.C.§1651 regarding 21-881's irregular closure)?

QUESTION NO.2:

Was Petitioner denied her civil right to access the court on her second case of Shao v. Roberts, et.al. (E.Cal. 22-cv-00315) when the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal blocked Petitioner from accessing the docket by 13 months while simultaneously this Court also concealed Petition No.22-350 from being released to Westlaw until August 2023, refused to change venue under The Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1], but deliberately assigned 22-15857 appeal to the judges who are members/officers of Appellee American Inns of Court in violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i), and conspired with California State Bar and California Attorney General in forming their legal teams being from attorney members of Appellee American Inns of Court and jointly raised a new factual argument first time on appeal arguing *illegally* that the judge/justices defendants did not violate 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) as the American Inns of Court is a professional bar, in affirming the bribed dismissal of the District Court, in refusing to decide ECF 121 for 80+ days and in an order 11/12/2024 (App.23) stating that "the appeal is closed and **no more filing is allowed**" to avoid a decision on both ECF 121 and ECF 122(App.24-39), i.e., "Motion to Decide the Motion filed as ECF 121 and Motion to Immediate Certify Transfer of

Venue to Northern District of New York Pursuant to the Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1]" (filed on 11/10/2024), and further **trespassed into Petitioner's CM/ECF account** to *physically* **block Petitioner from being able to do efiling**, while US Supreme Court Justices Appellees had conspired in ***refusing to decide*** the crimes occurred in both lower courts for 3 years and even blocked Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding these issues by an illegal ***anonymous docket order*** for both the Application No.23A617 and Petition No.23-6140?

QUESTION NO.3:

Was Petitioner completely barred from access to the courts concerning her RICO complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (Appeal No.25-7004 and D.C.District Court Case No.24-2814), where the D.C. courts at all levels, conspired in the racketeering activities of the American Inns of Court Enterprise with direct conflicts of interest, where the D.C. Circuit **pre-determined dismissal**, *concealed prior related appeal dockets of 19-5014 and 21-5210 for years*, refused to decide Motion to Change Venue (ECF 2103465) in violation of **Guide to Judiciary Policies §3.3-6[1] and 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(1) and (a) and Due Process**, concealed names of **all defendants/respondents**, and, beyond the scope of all motions (App.101-107), irregularly issued an order to **summarily affirm** (App.88) the District Court's illegal sua sponte dismissal on 10/8/2024

(24-2814), the first day of case docketing, and further summarily denied rehearing *without an opinion,* despite District Court Judge Jia M. Cobb had tacitly admitted that she is an officer of Defendant American Inns of Court, that her dismissal of the case on 10/8/2024 was based on **ex parte communications** with defendants, that she secretly ordered Clerk's Office to conceal all names of 200+ defendants, that she blocked filing of Petitioner's First Amended Complaint on 10/20/2024 which would have automatically viciated her 10/8/2024 dismissal, that she failed to decide Rule 60 motion and further spoliated the court records (ECF 9), when these crimes [8 U.S.C.§241, §242, §1506, §1512(b) & (c), §1962, §2071(b)] were premeditated following the District Court's trespass into Petitioner's CM/ECF account to disallow efiling of the RICO complaint in Sep.2024 that Petitioner was completely blocked access to the courts9999999
3?

QUESTION NO.4:

Does Due Process, First, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution justify vacating the conspired dismissal of Shao Law Firm, PC v. Yushan Huang and Joshua Hsia (HG20065475 at Alameda County Court, California) which is a case of petition for foreclosure of Petitioner's secured debt plus attorneys' fees in enforcing the stipulated lien in the total amount of secured debt of about $800k,

where the court used dismissal to avoid decision on Petitioner's five ***uncontested*** motions with the dismissal being based on **predetermined ground of Petitioner's bar license suspension** that 9 courts and government agencies conspired in avoiding a decision for 3+ years, including this Court's blocking Justice Amy Coney Barrett from rendering a decision (e.g., Petition No.23-6140 and Application 23A617), when evidence shows that the Alameda court did conspire with James McManis and defendant Yushan Huang in vacating Huang's default in Feb. 2021, that they conspired with Petitioner's attorney in betraying Petitioner by purging Petitioner's reservation on motion for default judgment , by forging an antedated efiling stamp to falsify Huang's opposition such as to frame an excuse for 2/8/2024 order to deny Petitioner's motion for summary adjudication, when the uncontested motion *should have been granted but for the conspiracies*, when the court further conspired in purging Judge Victoria Kolakowski's Order Change Venue of 7/18/2024 such as to confine this case in the exclusive control of James McManis, and in purging **all court records** in interfering the trial from proceeding?

QUESTION NO. 5:

Whether Due Process justifies a writ to vacate the conspired child support orders of 5/3/2013,

4/24/2023 and 7/16/2025[2] which were all conspired among James Mcmanis, judges, commissioner and Noel Murray at Santa Clara County Child Support Service and California Department of Child Support Services who are defendants in Petitioner's RICO complaint of Shao v. Roberts et al.(see Question No.3), with denial of Petitioner's Due Process, right to discovery and trial for the purpose to victimize Petitioner with robberies of all financial accounts, all tax refund (including recent conspired robbery of $1,400 on 12/30/2024 to launder Petitioner's money from U.S. Department of Treasury to California Department of Child Support Services and refused to return in disregard of Unfair Debts Statutes; App.111

---

[2] 7/16/2025 proceeding was created by California Department of Child Support Services without any legal basis, and beyond jurisdiction of the court (venue should be Maryland pursuant to Cal.Fam.Code§17400(n)(1)(D)) in conspiracies to create an order when Retired Judge Gregory Saldivar disclosed the goal in creating an order to rob the church's bank accounts and her mother's accounts where Petitioner is entrusted as their power of attorney.

Despite repeated requests, Noel Murray and the Court jointly blocked Petitioner from knowing what happened on 7/16/2025 where Santa Clara County Court blocked Petitioner from accessing her divorce case docket, blocked from releasing a minute order, and Noel Murray refused to give Petitioner his proposed order for 7/16/2025 hearing that was without jurisdiction. The entire matter was kept in strict "SECRET."

&116), faking accounting reports including money disappearing with usury interest of 35 percent in creating debt against Petitioner, restraining Petitioner's liberty by suspending her bar license and driver's license 5+ times and disallowing passport renewal for already 3+ years, where 5/3/2013 order was void per se based on judicial child kidnapping of 8/4/2010), never "verified" by a judge, based on Tsan-Kuen Wang's perjured Income and Expense Declaration, when its being affirmed on appeal (H039823) was a conspiracy with James McManis's Justice members at California Court of Appeal and then-California Attorney General Kamala Harris (Officer of McManis's club) in violation of Cal. Family Code §17407 and AG Guidelines, with fraudulent enforcement of 5/3/2013 order for 10+ years, when Justices at this Court further conspired in **refusing to decide these issues in the past 15 years**, where the April 24 2023 order and the secret July 16, 2025 order were both frivolously made without jurisdiction and without notice after Lydia had reached 18?

QUESTION NO.6:

Whether Due Process justifies this Court to vacate California Supreme Court's May 18, 2023 order suspending Petitioner's bar license with case No.S280063, when (1) it is unreasonable to require Petitioner to pay bar dues after her bar license was illegally suspended "automatically" based on conspired enforcement of the void 5/3/2013 order,

without jurisdiction, and Petitioner was systematically blocked any form of review, (2) 5/18/2023 order violated due process in lack of a notice nor hearing, (3) the suspension is a predicate act repeating the frauds in S263527[3] where ex-California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye admitted many times since 8/25/2021 that S263527 case was created on 7/27/2021 out of her conspiracy with James McManis to retaliate against Petitioner appeal from the conspired dismissal of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et. al, was closed on 8/14/2021, but fraudulently reopened after 2/15/2022 by adding 79 fraudulent orders of "cancelling" suspension of 79 deceased California lawyers to spoliate evidence of her admission that Petitioner was the only target for S263527, and (4) just like S263527, the May 18, 2023 order in S280063 is *void as being* based on a State Bar's Board of Trustees' Resolutions that did not exist?

QUESTION NO.7:

---

[3] See related proceeding of S269711 and related appeal No.21-5210 and Petition No.22-350 (S.Ct.) about Tani Cantil-Sakauye's 20+ times' admission on conspiring with James McManis and retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy on 7 conspiracies, including using S263527 to suspend Petitioner's bar license on 7/27/2021 when Petitioner got her appeal (H048651) filed on the conspired, unnoticed dismissal of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bechtel.

Whether Due Process, First Amendment, Thirteenth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution justify a writ of habeas corpus [28 U.S.C.§2241(a)] to order California State Bar and California Supreme Court to immediately re-activate Petitioner's bar license, and allow Petitioner to make payment of proportionate bar dues for 2026, in view of the facts that both orders to suspend her bar license were void; the "automatic bar license suspension" in 1/24/2022 order was based on a void order of 5/3/2013 and such enforcement was without jurisdiction (venue should be in Washington County, Maryland pursuant to Cal.Fam. Code §17400(n)(1)(D)), and the later S280063 order was void for lack of notice when Petitioner has been blocked from challenging these orders to regain her bar license for 3+ years by 9 government agencies and courts including this Court since February 2022?

QUESTION No.8:

Whether a writ of habeas corpus should be issued to require Tsan-Kuen Wang to immediately relocate Lydia D. Wang from California to Petitioner's home in Maryland, after 15 years' bribed judicial child kidnapping and inhumanely confining Lydia into unhealthy and dangerous child custody since 2011, to require US Attorney General to investigate the judicial abductions including the conspiracies of all nine courts and Attorney Generals in blocking Petitioner from

redressing her grievances, refusing to decide recusals and multiple applications for TRO, altering court records, and blocking ANY discovery over Tsan-Kuen Wang and avoiding a decision for 15 years[4], and in order to ensure Lydia D. Wang to

---

[4] See Related Proceeding in In re Marriage of Shao and Wang. Petitioner was barred from conducting any discovery since 6/18/2011, except that Petitioner propounded a subpoena to CIGNA Health Insurance in July 2014 and **obtained admitted evidence of Wang's dangerous mental disorder and 6 or 7 mental illnesses on 9/15/2014**. See expert opinion of Dr. Jeffery Kline on decoding CIGNA's psychological claims records of Tsan-Kuen Wang in ECF 75 (filed with the Ninth Circuit Appeal No.22-15857, link of http://1drv.ms/b/c/0e631fd091ed30a4/EaQw7ZHQH2MggA5qAgAAAAABHVnvXG62LUyiIZhsnRPGfg?e=N97o88), pp.31-34 and p.226,which corroborated Lydia's complaint of Wang's crazy physical abuses being caused by Wang's very dangerous mental disorder of "death" thoughts, but through bribes, **all nine courts, attorney generals, and Lydia's attorney BJ Fadem conspired in confining Lydia into this dangerous and unhealthy child custody when they are all** members of McManis's club with the judicial abduction events planned by McManis with his judicial members(ECF 75, pp.114-139).

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. also conspired in this scheme of child endangerment and judicial kidnapping, by altering the title of Petitioner's Application for Emergency Relief filed in Petition No.14-7244 and Application No.14A677 to **"Application for Stay."**

be **fully released her liberty without any electronic surveillance by Tsan-Kuen Wang or James McManis and their hackers**, that Wang should release all of her belongings to Petitioner, pay roundtrip air-tickets and give at least $1,500 cash to Lydia for her travel needs?

QUESTION No.9:

Whether Due Process mandates the Department of State to immediately issue a 10 years' US Passport to Petitioner as Petitioner had been forced to pay at least 7 emergency passport application fees in the amount of $1,353 based on the fraudulent enforcement of the void 5/3/2013 child support order without jurisdiction, when Department of State's action was initiated by Xavier Becerra as the Head of Department of Health Human Services who certified the debt at unknown time in enforcing the 5/3/2013 child support order that he conspired with Kamala Harris in affirming it in H039823 appeal with full knowledge that the order was void, was based on judicial kidnapping, and he was violating California Family Code §17407, when Petitioner was discriminatively required to pay these passport fees without statutory basis since 2022, when the present heads for these agencies also failed to make a correction?.

QUESTION No.10:

Whether an Order should be issued to require James McManis to disclose all of his contacts with Israel government agencies including its Border Control Officer in secretly changing Petitioner's

paid entry permit to be "denied" at 11:14 p.m. on 1/23/2025 when Petitioner was on the airplane and was 45 minutes before landing, and further directed the Israel border control to **pre-determine denial** Petitioner's 11th entry into Israel with a false ground of "risk of immigration," and that Department of State should be ordered to contact Israel Ministry of the Interior to correct the permit revocation?

QUESTION No.11:

Whether the Supreme Court's returning of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on 2/24/2025 requiring special margin requirement for 40 books violated Petitioner's civil right to access the court when efiling is prevailing and the peculiar size of 6/125" x 9.25" for printing 40 books is in fact not available on the market?

RELEVANT PROCEEDINGS

A. Petition No.21-881 at this Court:

21-881 is an appeal from California Supreme Court's Petition No.S269711, regarding the illegal quiet dismissal by Judge Christopher Rudy at Santa Clara County Court, who was later discovered to be an officer of the American Inns of Court, closely related to Defendant James McManis and his partner Michael Reedy, and specially sat in the Law and Motion Unit, when the judge was on vacation on 10/8/2019, for the sole purpose of dismissing the civil case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et. al. There is an issue raised in this Petition that the then-California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye made irrevocable concession as a matter of law when she deliberately avoided a response to Petitioner's Request for Recusal duly filed on 7/7/2021 in S269711, which generated a legal effect that the entire Request for Recusal filed in S269711 became truth. See, e.g., *Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County,* 2 Cal.App.5th 10, 39, and 40 (2016).

Tani Cantil-Sakauye admitted to her special relationship with James McManis and seven conspiracies with James McMcmanis and retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy to influence the US Supreme Court Justices in hurting Petitioner including but not limited to using summary denial to block Petitioner's access to the courts in causing permanent parental deprival of SHAO, robberies

through fraudulent "imputed income tax" in conspiracies with California State Bar and California Franchise Tax Board, robberies through 5/3/2013's conspired child support order and six times of suspension of Petitioner's bar license as a harassment and retaliation against Petitioner for suing James McManis.

The Petition was delayed docketing until 12/14/2021, when Petitioner filed a Request for Recusal for Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Stephen Breyer, Justice Samuel Alito, Justice Elena Kagan, Justice Sonia Sotomayer, Justice Neil Gorsuch and Justice Bret Kavanaugh.

All of the above Justices (Ginsburg had passed away) except Gorsuch and Kavanaugh were at default since 10/16/2018 in the first case of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (Petition No.20-524 and No.22-350) and had impliedly recused themselves in 20-524 in not participating in voting and later expressly recused themselves in 22-350. Yet, **they conspired in each not deciding recusal in 21-881.**

Justice Breyer was retired in June 2022.

Yet, months after 20-524, in 21-881, the Justices each conspired in not deciding his/her recusal in order to retain their rights to vote, and they voted summary denial of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari on 2/22/2022.

On 2/22/2022, Petitioner filed a second case of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. with the District Court of

Eastern California (22-00325) with a Motion for Temporary Injunctive Order regarding this Petition 21-881. It was not decided before the case was dismissed with a bribe to Judge John A. Mendez from then Vice President Kamala Harris.

On 4/18/2022, in conspiracy, Harris certified Senior Judge Status of Judge John A. Mendez and he signed off dismissal upon receipt of the certificate on 4/19/2022. Non-coincidentally, **on the same day, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. recused himself.** The law mandates 2/22/2022 order to be vacated; yet, all other seven Justices conspired in each not recusing himself/herself and voted summary denial of Petition for Rehearing in order to close the case.

Chief Justice Roberts then conspired in blocking this case from being reopened seven (7) times by concealing and returning Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Mandamus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§1651(a).

B. Ten courts:

Please see 55 cases, plus three proceedings that the courts refused to file/docket, as of January 5, 2024, shown in ECF 75 (Ninth Circuit, No.22-15857; http://1drv.ms/b/c/0e631fd091ed30a4/EaQw7ZHQH2MggA5qAgAAAAABHVnvXG62LUyiIZhsnRPGfg?e=N97o88), pp.451-457 (Ninth Circuit's Appeal 22-15857 was on p.452). In addition, there were about **12 new proceedings** in 2023-5 that are **not included** in pp.451- 457:

In violation of Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1], D.C. Circuit had three judge members of American Inns of Court to **summarily denied motion to change venue,** and affirm District Court's felonious dismissal on 3/18/2025, sua sponte, beyond the scope of the motions of Petitioner and without jurisdiction.

Petition for Rehearing with subsequent Supplement were filed on April 10 and 11, 2025, which was summarily denied on 5/12/2025, without an opinion illegally

(3) **California Supreme Court**:

1. **Petition for Writ of Mandamus S283308,** regarding the lower courts' joint blocking Petitioner's access to the courts for nearly 3 years on Shao v. McManis Faulkner, LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy, Catherine Bethtel (Santa Clara County Court 2012-1-cv-220571; appeal No.H048651 at California Sixth District Court of Appeal) regarding the motion to vacate dismissal and all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan (Question No.1 presented above)

California Chief Justice illegally required Vexatious Litigant Request for New Litigation to be filed, held it for 4 months, then summarily denied the Request such that there is **no decision on the merits**.

2. **S280063**was created by California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero on 5/18/2023 to deter Petitioner from getting her bar license back in case

of Petitioner's being able to reach a lump sum settlement with Santa Clara County D.C.S.S.

(4) **California Superior Court of Alameda County: Shao Law Firm, PC v. Huang and Hsia, HG20065475**--- James McManis influenced Alameda County Court in blocking a Clerk's default judgment from being issued since September 2020, illegally instructing Judge Dennis Hayashi to copy his proposed order (became 2/23/2021 order, in addition to 2/4/2021 order) in vacating default against Huang when the law does not allow vacating default, bribing Plaintiff's counsel Ron Lunski to betray Plaintiff by silently taking off from calendar reserved Motion for Default Judgment on 7/17/2023, conspired in **forging efiling stamp** to antedate Huang's Separate Statement from 1/4/2024 to be 12/19/2023 as an excuse to deny Plaintiff's motion for summary adjudication, then had his buddy Judge Victoria Kolakowski **purge all court files and obstruct justice**, blocking trial, and attempting dismissal.

Kolakowski issued an order change venue on 7/18/2024 upon seeing Petitioner's exposure of her perjury, yet James McManis blocked Petitioner from getting a copy of the order and influenced Kolakowski to purge the 7/18/2024 order 13 days later, then later pending judicial disqualification, Kolakowski issued 10 orders to cover up her purging 7/18/2024 "Order Change Venue" where she forged an "Order re Motion to

Change Venue" in substitute, when there is no such motion in existence other than the one that is ancillary to Motion to Vacate 2/8/2024 order denying motion for summary adjudication which she and the court conspired to take off from calendar fraudulently in June 2024 when Huang failed to file an opposition.

After the above exposure of Kolakowski's altering her own Order Change Venue dated 7/18/2024, James McManis sponsored another member Mark Fickes to substitute Kolakowski on 1/1/2025, who implemented McManis's plan of dismissal by issuing an Order to Show Cause on 2/11/2025 when he had **predetermined the issue on Petitioner's bar license suspension** and used that as the only ground to deny all five UNCONTESTED motions filed by Plaintiff, and used that as the ground to dismiss the case on 3/19/2025, in disregard of Fickes' and the Alameda County Court's conflicts of interest.

Disregard of direct conflicts of interest, Finkes continued presiding on Petitioner's Motion to Vacate Dismissal Order of 3/19/2025 and 2/11/2025 orders and denied with the same ground that was under attacked by the very same motion and denied the motion. See the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in App.133-164).

Petitioner's right to access the court is thus blocked by a corruptive judge.

(5) **California First District Court of Appeal** A169444-- an interlocutory appeal from

2/8/2024's order of Judge Victoria Kolakowski in denying Motion for Summary Adjudication, **despite the motion was uncontested**, when the court, Huang, her attorney Richard Wilson, Petitioner's then counsel Ron Lunski, **forged efiling stamp** for Wilson/Huang's incompetent Separate Statement to antedate its filing from 1/4/2025 to 12/18/2024 in order to use that to forge a false justification to deny the motion, with full knowledge of the perjury of Huang that is containe.

Presiding Justice Allison M. Tucher who is an officer of McManis's club, **deliberately dismissed appeal sua sponte on Day 1 of docketing appeal**, after blocking appeal from being docketed to no avail, and blocking Petitioner from paying appeal fees to no avail.

(6) **California Department of Child Support Services** failed to respond to Petitioner's request for settlement as required by 1/24/2022 order in order to make sure Petitioner's bar license was suspended, and has refused to respond to Petitioner's repeated requests for lump sum settlement since April 2023, and refused to allow judicial review since February 2022, refused to provide accounting with months' delay except on 8/24/2023 (ECF 75, p.524-28, see footnote 1) and on 1/22/2025.

Recently, **it failed to refund to Petitioner the $1,400** that it laundered from US Department of Treasury, in disregard of Petitioner's demand. (112-115)

Moreover, they conspired to use the retired judge, who is a member of McManis's club, trying to cease the church's funds in 2025. After exposure of such conspiracies, the court recently issued an order on child support in arrears, in violation of the prevailing Code. California Child Support Services was fully aware that the court had no jurisdiction, that the court was required to set the child support in arrears to be zero when Petitioner proves her poverty out of the proactive and systematic robberies directed by James Mcmanis's gangsters through the American Inns of Court..

(7) **American Institute in Taiwan**: plotting denying issuance of Emergency Passport, with intent to block Petitioner's return to Maryland, on 6/6/2024, and 10/1/2024 respectively, where it demanded Petitioner to cancel air tickets, and illegally required overpayment for each emergency passport when **the statute did not allow additional fees for an emergency passport** that was issued within 12 months of last issuance.

(8) **Israel Border Control**: 1/24/2025 at about 7:00 a.m., it pre-determined denial of entry at the Tel Aviv Airport, who concealed from disclosure to Petitioner that, in fact, at a time 45 minutes before plane arrival, at 11:14 p.m. on 1/23/2025, Israel

Border Control **had secretly altered its permit of entry for Petitioner to be "Denied" based on an unidentified ground** of "Change of Circumstances." Petitioner had filed her appeal, yet, Israel Border Control did not issue an appeal number.

Fraudulent interview note of Israel border control officer was docketed where the issues raised by that interviewing officer were all for issues of this Petition that had no relevancy of border control, **stressing Petitioner's bar license suspension and no personal bank accounts which served as a harassment, a predicate act of a series of violent crimes led by James McManis in the past 10+ years.**

(9) **US Embassy in Berlin, German**: charged $165 again on 1/27/2025 without statutory basis for an emergency passport and limited to only 2 days to allow Petitioner to fly back to the US. It failed to give a letter to account for why not giving 10 years' regular US Passport.

(10) **U.S. Department of the Treasury Bureau of the Fiscal Service**

On 12/30/2024, it issued a Notice of transfer $1,400 from I.R.S. to California Department of Child Support Services for the purported child support debt (App.111).

Petitioner made a timely objection based on Fair Debt Collection Practice Act. Department of Treasury made a response with 53 days' delay by attaching a spoliated notice of its own notice dated

12/30/2024 denying any account in existence for Petitioner, laundering $1,400 to California Department of Child Support Services, while California Department of Child Support Services failed to respond, and continued kept Petitioner's $1400 illegally up to present.

(1) **US Supreme Court**:
Petition No.23-6140 and Application 23A617--the court **concealed and blocked** Petitioner's Petitions for Rehearing and **"closed" the cases with a historical anonymous "docket" "order"**, **without a decision** on 2/20/2024 in disregard the prevailing law which requires Supreme Court to certify appeal to an impartial Senior Judge at a Court of appeal as articulated by Congress's specific designed procedure in "The Act of June 9, 1944, c.239, 58 Stat.272 (Supp.V.1946), 15 U.S.C. §29 passed to meet the contingency of "the lack of a quorum" when the Supreme Court is sued, as stated by the Supreme Court in United States v. *Southern District Court of N.Y.*, 334U.S.258 (1948). See the quoted Congress-designed procedure on the US Supreme Court's website in Appendix, App.8-10 for Petition No.22-350.

Petitioner's 18th Application to Justice Barrett was eventually docketed as 23A617 on 1/8/2024, but it was docketed as a summary denied application by a different Justice, Justice Neil Gorsuch, in disregard of pending judicial disqualification. Gorsuch eventually **failed to decide his recusal** when he has direct conflicts of interest **in violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i)**. The Supreme Court refused to certify appeal, concealed the motion to change venue, blocked and concealed filing of Petition for Rehearing, ***in disregard of Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-***

6[1], 28 U.S.C.§1651(b) and Rule 22 of Supreme Court Rules, concealed the Amendment to Application and its supplement from being posted on the docket, and **blocked Justice Barrett from deciding 23A617 and 23-6140**.

The proceedings are regarding the court crimes of Ninth Circuit (22-15857) and the District Court of E. Cal. on the bribed dismissal of Case #2 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al., emergency release freedom to Lydia, illegal enforcement of child support orders, illegal bar license suspension, and illegal restricting international travels.

Thus far, Supreme Court has blocked Petitioner from seeking grievances in front of Justice Barrett 30+ times.

(2) **District Court and D.C. Circuit in D.C.: Case#3 of Shao v. Roberts, et al., which is a RICO complaint**, filed with the District Court for the D.C. with case no. 24-2814 and Appeal No.25-7004 with the D.C. Circuit, where both proceedings were illegally dismissed sua sponte, beyond jurisdiction, and the D.C. Circuit summarily denied rehearing without an opinion (App.91-111). **D.C. Circuit endorsed the District Court's crimes in concealing from being shown on the docket of all 200+ defendants, which marked the infamous history of the federal court that a civil case has no defendant**, showing the obvious court crimes of 18 U.S.C.§§241, 242, 1506, 1512(b)&(c), 2071 and 1962.

Moreover, D.C. Circuit further **quietly purged from pacer.gov two dockets for related Appeal Nos. 19-5014 and 21-5210** re Case No.#1 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al., until January 2025 after Petitioner made objections.

District Court trespassed into Petitioner's CM/ECF account to block Petitioner from being able to e-file the RICO complaint, such that they were able to delay docketing by 11 days and conceal all defendants' names. Then, it posted a wrong complaint as ECF 1; within three hours after correcting ECF 1 with ECF 4 (Errata on Complaint), Judge Jia M. Cobb, an officer of defendant American Inns of Court, concededly with ex parte communications with the American Inns of Court, dismissed the case sua sponte on **the very same day of case docketing,** that marks the history of the courts. Chief Judge James Boasberg, a defendant in the same case, Clerk's Office, and Judge Jia M. Cobb, deliberately refused to make any correction.

On 12/5/2024, Judge Jia M. Cobb stated that the case was closed retroactively on 10/21/2024, without any legal basis, as an excuse **not to decide** Petitioner's Application for Order to Show Cause and 4-in-1 motion even including the Rule 60b motion, that were duly filed on 11/5/2024. Contrary to Cobb's self-created "case closure date," the D.C. Circuit considered case closure to be in December 2024.

California Department of Child Support Services failed to respond.

PARTIES FOR THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Shao, is representing herself, with contacting address at P.O. Box 300; Big Pool, MD 21711; phone number of (408) 873-3888 and email of AttorneyShao@aol.com

Interested parties

Lydia Deborah Wang, 3769 Rigor Drive, San Jose, CA 95148

Israel Embassy consulat@washington.mfa.gov.il, beitdinararimjer@justice.gov.il

Tz@piba.gov.il, zukermanex@state.gov

consular@washington.mfa.gov.il, consular-feedback@mfa.gov.il

(202) 364-5500

Parties requested to be joined by an Order to Show Cause

(1) **John Sauer, Solicitor General**, Room 5616 Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530-0001 Supremecourtbriefs@usdoj.gov

(2) **Pam Bondi, US Attorney General** 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., #2242, Washington, DC 20530-0001 Oag@dc.gov

(3) **Brian Schwalb**, U.S.Attorney General for the D.C., 400 6th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001 USADC.serviceCivil@usdoj.gov

(4) **Michell Beckwith** the acting U.S. Attorney General for the Eastern California, 501 I Street, suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814

(5) **Patrick D. Robins**, U.S. Attorney General for the Northern California, 450 Golden

being confined to illegal child custody of her father who was discovered to have dangerous mental disorder which corroborated with Lydia's complaint of cruel abuse over her. They conspired in altering Application for Emergency Relief to be Application for Stay in the dockets of 14-7244 and 14A677.

In 21-881 (appeal from S269711, Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al), when Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. eventually recused himself on 4/18/2022 by "took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition," which caused the same legal effect of the underlying order of 8/25/2021 of Tani Cantil-Sakauye- concession to all facts stated in the verified recusal.

When the 2/22/2022 order denying certiorari should have been automatically reversed because of Roberts' later recusal, the other Justices conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal in order to be able to vote "denial" on Petition for Rehearing. Then, **Chief Justice Roberts blocked 7 times of filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus to reopen 21-881 for illegal case closure on 4/18/2021 under 28 U.S.C.§1651**.

They conspired in blocking 23A617 from being decided by Justice Barrett. In addition, Chief Justice Roberts has blocked 29 Applications to Justice Amy Coney Barrett and concealed the filings since 2021. Address: 1 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20543. Email: etorrey@supremecourt.gov

Served of the US Supreme Court Respondents upon

(1) **John Sauer, Solicitor General**, Room 5616 Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530-0001 Supremecourtbriefs@usdoj.gov

Gate Avenue, PO Box 36055, San Francisco, CA 94102

(6) **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**) 200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20201 1-877-696-6775 OCRmail@hhs.gov

Parties for Application for Order to Show Cause in Shao v. Roberts, et. al. 24-2814, at U.S.D.C. for the D.C.

House Speaker Mike Johnson Capitol, Washington, DC through email of contact@campaigns.rnchq.com **Hon. Jim Jordan** as Chair of House Judiciary Committee at 2056 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC, was served as a party to the Application on 10/31/2024 and 11/6/2024. Jared.Dilley@mail.house.gov **Hon. Chuck Grassley** as Chair of Republican Senate Judiciary Committee Tianna_Torrejon @grassley.senate.gov 135 Hart Senate Building, Washington DC 20510 (202) 224-6522

Respondents involved for 10 Questions are below:

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION NO.1:

ALL Justices of US Supreme Court Justices except Justice Amy Coney Barrett, had conspired in keeping their voting rights to implement the common goals of James McManis by each not deciding his/her own recusals by about 17 times and deliberately suppressed these issues for Question No.1 that were repeatedly at issue in Petition Nos. 11-11119, 14-7244, 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617. At least five of the Justices joined the conspiracy of judiciary child abduction of Lydia by deliberately ignored the imminent risk of harm because of Lydia's

(2) **Pam Bondi, US Attorney General** 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., #2242, Washington, DC 20530-0001 Oag@dc.gov

(3) **Brian Schwalb**, U.S.Attorney General for the D.C., 400 6th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001 USADC.serviceCivil@usdoj.gov

(4) **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**) 200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20201 1-877-696-6775 OCRmail@hhs.gov

California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero[9] and Clerk Jorge Navarre, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102.

---

[9] As stated in Pages 41-42 of ECF 4 filed in the RICO complaint with the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (24-2814),
"Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero, who conspired with the American Inns of Court Enterprise in
(1) creating false orders framing 12 false docket entries in S263527 in 2023 and 2024 even though S263527 was closed long ago on 8/14/2021, with knowledge that Tani Cantil-Sakauye's Order creating the case was fraudulent as the docket alleged basis being a purported 7/27/2021 State Bar's Board of Supervisors' resolution which actually did not exist.
(2) S280063: quietly created a fraudulent this case in order to suspend Plaintiff's bar license in June 2023, which was again, based on the purported State Bar Board of Supervisors for S280063 that did not exist. It has the same style as S263527. Guerrero affirmed suspension of Plaintiff's bar license despite knowing that Plaintiff was not served with any notice of warning of suspension of bar license, to ensure Plaintiff's bar license would not be recovered through settlement with the D.C.S.S. on Tani Cantil-Sakauye's suspension in 2022 when she was made known that Tani's suspension was void for lack of jurisdiction.
(3) Shao v. Roberts, et. al.: Guerrero conspired with Judge John A. Mendez's dismissal and 9th Circuit's appeal dismissal, with California Attorney General Rob Bonta, on behalf of

Service upon their attorney, **California Attorney General Rob Bonta**: Angela.Atwal@doj.ca.gov
Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood of California Sixth District Court of Appeals, 111 W. Santa Clara Street, 10 F, San Jose, CA 95113
Service upon **Supervising Clerk, Felex Castuera** via felix.castuera@jud.ca.gov
Judge Maureen A. Folan who issued the vexatious litigant orders with direct conflicts of interest
Judge Christopher Rudy who dismissed the civil case of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al with direct conflicts of interest
Ex-Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner, who directed blockage of setting for hearing of the motion to vacate dismissal and all orders of Folan.
Ex-Presiding Judge Patricia Lucas, who committed frauds on court, in conspiracy with James McManis and Michael Reedy, to let their law firm McManis Faulkner draft her permanent parental

---

California Commission on Judicial Conducts where she is the head;

(4) S283308: Guerrero knew California lower courts have perverted justice for nearly 3 years in refusing to decide Plaintiff's motion to vacate dismissal and all orders (including Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order) of Judge Maureen A. Folan, but after delaying more than 100 days, Chief Justice Guerrero deliberately purged all court records in S283308, and decided to block the Petition for Writ of Mandamus from being decided on its merits with summary denial of Vexatious Litigant request to file new litigation when such requirement is false under prevailing California laws as the very issue of vacating Prefiling Vexatious litigant order is an issue for the proceeding; *John v. Superior Court* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 347. Plaintiff filed a motion to vacate the denial of application on 8/28/2024, again, California Supreme Court failed to respond.

deprival order dated 11/4/2013 and persisted on refusing to set aside.
present Presiding Judge Beth McGowan of Santa Clara County who blocked a hearing being set for Petitioner's motion to set aside dismissal and all orders of Folan for 3+years since 11/3/2021
191 N. First Street, San Jose, CA 95113
Civil Clerk **Alex Rodriguez**, who conspired with the above in not setting for a hearing the motion to vacate dismissal and vacate all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan for 3+ years.
Service upon **Lisa Herrick** via email of lherrick@scscourt.gov per written stipulation
James McManis, Michael Reedy, McManis Faulkner law firm,
Service upon **William Faulkner**, general counsel for the McManis Faulkner law firm via email of wfaulkner@mcmanislaw.com
50 W. San Fernando Street, Ste. 1000, San Jose, CA 95113
RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION NO.2:
Chief Judge James Boasberg and **Judge Chia M. Cobb** at the U.S.D.C. for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20001
DCD_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov (202) 354-3120
Chief Judge **Padmanabhan Srikanth "Sri" Srinivasan**, Judge **J. Michelle Childs**, Judge **Florence Y. Pan**, and Judge **Bradly N. Garcia** at the US D.C. Circuit Court Appeal, 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20001
Chief Justice **John G. Roberts, Jr.** who had blocked four filings of an Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett from 11/26/2024 through 1/8/2025 with false ground of returning notice.

1 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20543,
Served upon
(a) John Sauer, Solicitor General,
(b) Pam Bondi, US Attorney General
(c) Brian Schwalb,
(d) Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**)
With contacting address shown above

In addition, Respondents for the Application for Order to Show Cause filed on 11/5/2024 which was spoliated by Judge Jia M. Cobb:
US Attorney General Pam Bondi and Brian Schwalb
House Speaker Mike Johnson
Capitol, Washington, DC
through email of contact@campaigns.rnchq.com
Hon. Jim Jordan as Chair of House Judiciary Committee at 2056 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC, was served as a party to the Application on 10/31/2024 and 11/6/2024.
Jared.Dilley@mail.house.gov
Hon. Chuck Grassley as Chair of Republican Senate Judiciary Committee Tianna_Torrejon @grassley.senate.gov 135 Hart Senate Building, Washington DC 20510 (202) 224-6522
RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION NO.3:
(1) Chief Justice **John G. Roberts**, Clerk **Scott Harris**, Justice **Neil Gorsuch**, Justice **Kantaji Jackson** at US Supreme Court in blocking 23A617 to be decided by Justice Barrett:
Address: 1 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20543.
(2) **Ninth Circuit Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia, Judge Barry Silverman, Judge Ryan D. Nelson and Judge Patrick J. Bumatay, Clerk Molly Dwyer, Judge Anthony D. Johnston, Judge Andrew D. Hurwitz and Chief Judge**

Brian M. Morris at U.S.D.C. for Montana, 95 Seventh Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, who refused to change venue despite the motion was uncontested, rushed a summary denial in conspiracy without a memorandum regarding Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing and Mandate on 6/26/2024 when the Mandate contained no attached judgment and the Order denying Rehearing was fraudulently antedated to 6/18/2024 without an opinion, discriminatively, in an apparent effort to satisfy James McManis's command in conspiracies with the Alameda County Court to "close" the appeal case (causing the license suspension issue being not in a status of "pending appeal"), and failed to decide ECF 121 that was pending for 3+ months.

On 11/10/2024, Petitioner filed a motion to decide ECF 121 ("ECF 122"), the panel responded by a notice of case closure on 11/12/2024 and "Petitioner **shall not file any documents**." On 11/26/2024, Petitioner discovered that the Ninth Circuit trespassed into her CM/ECF account again and blocked the mechanism for any efiling. Motions@ca9.uscourts.gov

(3) **ex Vice President Kamala Harris** for provide the bribe for Judge John A. Mendez to sua sponte dismiss Case #2 of Shao v. Roberts, et.al (2:22-cv-00325; Ex-Vice President Kamala Harris who conspired with John A. Mendez's dismissal order to use her post as the Vice President to provide a bribe for Mendez's dismissal on Shao v. Roberts, et al, (U.S.D.C. for E. Cal., 2:22-cv-00325), and conspired with the American Inns of Court enterprise to support affirm the void child support order of 5/3/2013 in violation of the AG Guidelines and

California Family Code §17407[10] and covering up judiciary child abduction of Lydia; with last known address at: Number One Observatory Circle in northwestern Washington,
D.C. (202) 456-1414
(4) **Judge John A. Mendez** conspired in blindly dismissing Case #2 for a bribe and failed to decide 4 injunctive motions which constituted restrains on Petitioner's life, liberty and property interests.
Served upon

- **(a) John Sauer, Solicitor General,**
- **(b) Pam Bondi, US Attorney General**
- **(c) Brian Schwalb**, Attorney General for the D.C.
- **(d) Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**)
- **(e) Michell Beckwith** the acting U.S. Attorney General for the Eastern California, 501 I Street, suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814

---

[10] See ECF 75/72-5 filed with the Ninth Circuit in Appeal NO.22- 15857, p.420 where Rob Bonta concealed the public record disclosure of the AG Guidelines about implementation of California Family Code §17407, which only required Kamala Harris and Xavier Becerro to support Petitioner's appeal, not for them to support the fraudulent and void order of 5/3/2013. 9Rob Bonta and his legal team had already tacitly admitted to the accusation that Rob Bonta and his client, California Chief Judge Patricia Guerrero as head for California Judicial Council, conspired with Judge John A. Mendez's dismissal of the Complaint No.2 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. based on the documentary evidence produced by Rob Bonta's office as shown in ECF 75/72-5, p.470 --- 11 days before Judge Mendez's execution of dismissal, on 4/8/2022, Department of Child Support Services inquired Rob Bonta's office whether they would represent the agency on the anticipatory appeal--- the appeal later docketed as 22-15857.
See footnote 1 re ECF 75 and ECF 72-5.

(f) Patrick D. Robins, U.S. Attorney General for the Northern California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, PO Box 36055, San Francisco, CA 94102

With contacting address shown above

(4) California Chief Justice **Patricia Guerrero** as Head of California Commission on Judicial Conduct and Clerk **Jorge Navarrete**, California Supreme Court, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94120

Service upon Rob Bonta as shown above.

(3) **Leah Wilson, Executive Director at State Bar of California**, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105 who knowingly ignored Petitioner's motion to vacate Tani Cantil-Sakauye's 1/25/2022 order in conspiracy of causing Petitioner permanent bar license suspension, and conspired in using McManis's attorney members with using California government fund to blocking appeal No.22-15857:

Service upon **Attorney Anik Banerjee**
anikbanerjee@calbar.ca.gov

(4) **David Kilgore** at California Department of Child Support Services (PO Box 419064, 11150 International Dr., Rancho Cordova CA95741- 9064), **Noel Murrey, Narjeet Randhawa** at Department of Child Support Services in Santa Clara County located at 880 Ridder Park Drive, San Jose, CA 95131who conspired with California A.G. to dismiss the underlying District Court case No.24-2814 and Appeal No.22-15857 and conspired in issuing fraudulent garnish notices to assist robbery by James McManis.

Service upon Noel Murray, Esq.
noel.murray@css.sccgov.org

(8) **Rob Bonta**, California Attorney General who conspired in Judge John A. Mendez's dismissal as shown by ECF 75/72.5, p.470, and appeal dismissal and knowingly ignoring Petitioner's bar license issue. Rob Bonta is located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
Angela.Atwal@doj.ca.gov

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION NO.4:

(1) Judge **Victoria Kolakowski**, Judge **Mark Fickes**, C.E.O. **Chad Finke,** Chief Judge **Thomas Nixon** at Administrative Office located at 1221 Oak Street, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA 94612 [department 518 is located at 24405 Amador Street, Hayward, CA 94544; Presiding Judge Thomas Nixon is located at 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612.
Dept518@alameda.courts.ca.gov
Dept1@alameda.courts.ca.gov

(2) California Chief Justice **Patricia Guerrera** on behalf of California Judicial Council, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 who conspired in dismissing this case by deliberately assigning the disqualification of Judge Victoria Kolakowski to interested judge to decide for 5 months planning to delay the case beyond the 5 years' statute of limitation to bring a case to trial, when Guerrera had a good record of destroying all court records of S283308 in early 2024, forging 12 orders in S263527, forging S28003 and obstructed justice in unambiguously helping the frauds of James McManis.
Service upon **Rob Bonta** as stated above

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION NO.5:

(1) **Tsan-Kuen Wang**, 3769 Rigor Drive, San Jose, CA 95148.

(2) **Mary J. Greenwood**, Presiding Justice for California Sixth District Court of Appeal (H039823)

Service upon Felix Castuera via
felix.castuera@jud.ca.gov
Sixth District Court of Appeals, 111 W. Santa Clara Street, 10 F, San Jose, CA 95113

(3) **Kamala Harris and Xavier Becerra** fraudulently in deliberate violation of AG Guideline and Cal.Family Code §17407, conspiring in judicial child abduction and robberies, in conspiring in representing California Department of Child Support Services to help affirm the void 5/3/2013 child support order.

(4) **Leah Wilson**, Executive Director at State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105 who knowingly blocked and ignored Petitioner's motion to vacate Tani Cantil-Sakauye's 1/25/2022 order and conspired with Tani Cantil-Sakauye in suspending 5 times Petitioner's bar license with the fraudulent enforcement of 5/3/2013 child support order
Service upon Attorney Anik Banerjee
anikbanerjee@calbar.ca.gov

(5) **David Kilgore** at California Department of Child Support Services (PO Box 419064, 11150 International Dr., Rancho Cordova CA95741- 9064), **Noel Murrey, Narjeet Randhawa** at Department of Child Support Services in Santa Clara County (County Council also conspired in ignoring Petitioner's request to meet or confer) located at 880 Ridder Park Drive, San Jose, CA 95131who knowing blocked a Petition for Review, blocked Petitioner's request for judicial review, but fraudulently conspired a second child support order days in 2023 after Lydia had became 18 in egregiously forcing Noel Murray, on behalf of California D.C.S.S. for San Jose.

(6) **Selvi Stanislau,** Chief Executive Officer/CEO of California Franchise Tax Board, 5306 Lawnview Way, Elk Grove, CA 95758 or PO Box 115, Rancho Cordova, CA 95741-0115 (916) 845-4543 taxnews@ftb.ca.gov

(7) **Scott Bessent**, the present Secretary of Treasury, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20220 FOIA@treasury.gov;SBLFinstitutions@treasury.g ov

(8) **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services when the predecessor Xavier Becerro illegally enforced 5/3/2013 child support order causing blocking passport renewal after Petitioner paid more than $1,300.
200 Independence Avenue,S.W., Washington, DC 20201 1-877-696-6775 OCRmail@hhs.gov

Federal officials are served by delivering to

(a) John Sauer, Solicitor General,

(b) Pam Bondi, US Attorney General

With contacts stated above.

RESPONDENT FOR QUESTION No.6:

California Chief Justice **Patricia Guerrero, and Clerk Jorge Navarrete**, California Supreme Court, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94120. Service upon California Attorney General **Rob Bonta**, as stated above

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION No.7:

California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero, and Clerk Jorge Navarrete, California Supreme Court, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94120. Service upon California Attorney General **Rob Bonta**, as stated above

Leah Wilson, Executive Director at State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

Service upon Attorney **Anik Banerjee**;
anikbanerjee@calbar.ca.gov

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION No.8:

All Justice at the US Supreme Court except Justice Amy Coney Barrett, who had participated in Petition Nos. 11-11119, 14-7244, 18-569, 20-524, 22-28, 23-6140 and 23A617, whether failed to decide recusal or failed to disclose conflicts of interest.

Served upon

(a) **John Sauer, Solicitor General,**
(b) **Pam Bondi, US Attorney General**
(c) **Brian Schwalb**, Attorney General for the D.C.
(d) **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**)
(e) **Patrick D. Robins**, U.S. Attorney General for the Northern California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, PO Box 36055, San Francisco, CA 94102

Tsan-Kuen Wang, 3769 Rigor Drive, San Jose, CA 95148 (408) 823-1482.

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION No.9:

Tsan-Kuen Wang, 3769 Rigor Drive, San Jose, CA 95148 (408) 823-1482.

David Kilgore at California Department of Child Support Services (PO Box 419064, 11150 International Dr., Rancho Cordova CA95741- 9064), Noel Murrey, Narjeet Randhawa at Department of Child Support Services in Santa Clara County, 880 Ridder Park Drive, San Jose,
CA noel.murray@css.sccgov.org

Marc Rubio, in the capacity as the present Secretary of the State, 2201 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20451 1-877-487-2778
NPIC@state.gov

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services when James McManis's officer Xavier Becerro set up nationwide enforcement of the void child support order of 5/3/2013 causing passport issue
200 Independence Avenue,S.W., Washington, DC 20201 1-877-696-6775 OCRmail@hhs.gov
Served upon

(a) **John Sauer, Solicitor General,**
(b) **Pam Bondi, US Attorney General**
(c) **Brian Schwalb**, Attorney General for the D.C.
(d) **Patrick D. Robins**, U.S. Attorney General for the Northern California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, PO Box 36055, San Francisco, CA 94102

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION No.10:
James McManis, jmcmanis@mcmanislaw.com 50 W. San Fernando Street, Ste. 1000, San Jose, CA 95113
Marc Rubio, in the capacity as the present Secretary of the State, 2201 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20451 1-877-487-2778, who has the authority to handle US citizen's being barred entry into Israel NPIC@state.gov
Served upon

(a) **John Sauer, Solicitor General,**
(b) **Pam Bondi, US Attorney General**
(c) **Brian Schwalb**, Attorney General for the D.C.
(d) **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** in the capacity as the present Head of Department of Health and Human Services (**Civil Right Office**)
(e) **Patrick D. Robins**, U.S. Attorney General for the Northern California, 450 Golden

Gate Avenue, PO Box 36055, San Francisco, CA 94102

RESPONDENTS FOR QUESTION No.11:

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
Scott Harris, Clerk
Supreme Court

Served upon

(a) John Sauer, Solicitor General,
(b) Pam Bondi, US Attorney General
(c) Brian Schwalb, Attorney General for the D.C.

Table of Contents

11 QUESTIONS PRESENTED i
RELEVANT PROCEEDINGS xxi
PARTIES FOR THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS xxvii
Petitioner Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Shao xxvii
Parties requested to be joined by an Order to Show Cause xxvii
Parties for Application for Order to Show Cause in Shao v. Roberts, et. al. 24-2814, at U.S.D.C. for the D.C. xxviii
PETITION OR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO Hon. Justice Barrett pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§2241(a) and §2254(a) [also precedent Petition No.12- 8660] who is the ONLY qualified Justice when all others must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) as being defendants of the RICO complaint (Question No.2.) 1
Many Supreme Court dockets in Petitioner's cases showed prima facie evidence of crimes of 18 USC §241, §242, §1506, §1512(b) & (c), §2071(b): 5
JURISDICTION: 9
I. Extraordinary circumstances 9
A. No other courts are available as all courts that have jurisdiction should change their venues pursuant to the Guide to Judiciary Policy§3.3-6[1] or California Code of Civil Procedure §397(b) 14
B. All Justices other than Justice Barrett must be recused 15
C. Justice Barrett has an indispensable duty to decide as being the only qualified Justice at this court 15

II. Reasons for not making applications to the district court of the district in which the application is held 16
ORDERS REQUESTED, Statement of the Case and Why a writ should be issued. 18
A. Re QUESTION NO.1 regarding Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. and S283308: 18
Vexatious litigant order was created to block child custody return to Petitioner when evidence shows Wang has dangerous mental disorder ... 27
Repeated usage of this void Prefiling Vexatious Litigant to block Petitioner's fundamental civil right to access the court (crimes of 18 U.S.C.§241 and §242) 28
A "BR" directed the illegal return notices blocking Petitioner's 7 applications to Justice Barrett in Petition NO.22-28 29
B. QUESTION NO.2 RE NINTH CIRCUIT'S BLOCKING APPEAL IN APPEAL NO.22- 15857 32
C. Re QUESTION NO.3 on RICO Complaint case and its appeal: 35
D. Re QUESTION NO.4 regarding HG20065475 at Alameda County Court, California): 41
E. Re QUESTION NO.5: vacate 5/3/2013 child support order and later 4/24/2023 order (after Lydia became an adult) 44
E. Re QUESTION No.6: 47
F. Re QUESTION No.7: 48
G. Re QUESTION No.8: Lydia's migration 50
H Re QUESTION No.9: 51
J. Re QUESTION No.10: 52
K. Re QUESTION No.11: 53
STATUTES INVOLVED 54
Verification 55

Cases

28 U.S.C. §1651(b) ..... v, 3
Ayestas v. Davis, 584 U.S. 28, 138 S.Ct. 1080, 200 L.Ed.2d 376 (2018), ... 14
Brady v. Superior Court (1962) 200 Cal.PP.2D 69.. 49
Comer v.Murphy Oil USA, 607 F.2d 1049,1057 (5thCir.2010) 16
Fortenbury v. Superior Court (1940) 16Cal.2d 405 . 49
Gray v. Superior Court, 123 Cal.App4th 949 (2004), ... 48
Guffey v. 14
Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County, 2 Cal.App.5th 10, 30, 40 (2016)..... 12
Holcomb v. U.S. Bank National Association, et al. 120 Cal.App.4th 1494 (2005), ... 20
Iddir v. INS, 301 F.3d 492, 498 (7th Cir. 2002)..... 16
In re Nashiri, 921 F.3d 224 (D.C. Cir. 2019) 14
John 30
John v. Superior Court (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 347 xxxii
John v. Superior Court (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 347, 179 Cal.Rptr.3d 856 18
John, supra 26
Judge Peter Kirwan's 12/15/2017 order..... 19
Mardikian v.Commissions on Judicial Performance (1985)40 Cal.3d 473,477..... 15
Mitchell..... 51
Mitchell v...... 48
Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 963..... 20
National Education Assoc. v. Lee County Board of Public Instruction,467 F.2d 477 (5thCir.1972) 16
Petition No.12-8660 .....passim
Ringgold Lockhert v. County of L.A., 781 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2014) 18
Shalant v. Girardi, 51 Cal.4th 116 (2011)..... 28

U.S. V. Konrad, 730 F.3d 343, 347 (3rd Cir. 2013). 14
U.S.v. Southern District Court of N.Y., 334U.S.258 (1948) 15, 32, 35
United States v. Roque-Espinoza, 338 F.3d 724, 728-29 (7th Cir.2003) 16
United States v. Will, 449 U.S. 200 (1980)..... 15

Statutes

18 U.S.C. §241 and §242..... 28
18 U.S.C. §242..... 54
18 U.S.C.§§241, 242, 1506, 1512(b)&(c), 2071 and 1962..... xxii
18 U.S.C.§241 and §242..... 28
18 U.S.C.§241 and §242..... 21
18 U.S.C.§241, §242, §1506, §1512(b) & (c), §1962, §2071(b) vii
18 U.S.C.§242..... 39
18 U.S.C.§242, §1962..... 35
18 U.S.C.§242, 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(b) and (c) and §2071(b), ... 18
28 U.S.C. 15
28 U.S.C. §1651(b),§2241(a),§2251, §2254 (a) iii
28 U.S.C. §2254(a..... iv
28 U.S.C. §2254(a) vi
28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and (a)..... vii
28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i): 54
28 U.S.C.§144..... 38
28 U.S.C.§1651..... xxix
28 U.S.C.§1651(b xxi
28 U.S.C.§2241(a) .....passim
28 U.S.C.§2241(a), §2254(a) and §2251 16
28 U.S.C.§2251..... vii
28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) 32
28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i) 40
28 USC §2241(a) 55
28 USC §2251..... 55
28 USC §2254..... 54

Cal.C.C.P.§397(b) 15
Cal.Family Code §17407 xiii
Cal.Gov.Code §6200 18
California Code of Civil Procedure §397(b) 14
California Code of Civil Procedure§397(b): 54
California Family Code §17407 xxxv
California Penal Code §278.5 iv
California Penal Code §278.5. 22
California Penal Code §278.5: 55
Code of Civil Procedure §391.7 20
Freedom of Information Act 22, 29
Other Authorities
13th Amendment iv
Equal Protection Clause 31
Expert witness Attorney Meera Fox 24
First Amendment ..... iv, 31
Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] ..... passim
Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1], ... 10
Guide to Judiciary Policy, §3.3-6[1] 35
Guide to Judiciary Policy§3.3-6[1] 14
Seventh Amendment 40
the Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] 32
Thirteenth Amendment ..... viii, 31, 49
Rules
AG Guideline xiii
California Rules of Court, Rule 3.650(d) 19
Canon 3B(2)(d)(i) (party to the proceeding) 15
Civil Local Rule 8(c) 24
Code of Conduct for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States 15
Rule 22. 55
Rules of Evidence 801(d)(2) 3
Supreme Court Rule 22.1 29

PETITION OR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO Hon. Justice pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§2241(a) and §2254(a) [also precedent Petition No.12- 8660] who is the ONLY qualified Justice when all others must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) as being defendants of the RICO complaint (Question No.2.)

For 14 years, Petitioner has been systematically deprived of her fundamental civil rights, liberty and properties and blocked from seeking grievances by extraordinary racketeering activities in 10 courts, Attorney Generals of California and federal, and many government agencies even to Israel recently, through a secret legal society of American Inns of Court that has corrupted the judiciary and top prosecutors throughout the U.S.A. since 1986 as led by its leading attorney/founder, James McManis, a harlot/Master of FreeMason/Satanist, a defendant in the breach of fiduciary duty and legal malpractice lawsuit of Shao v. McManis Fulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel (2012-1-cv-220571, Santa Clara County Court, CA).

Such extraordinary racketeering activities at the courts, top prosecutors and government agencies in harming Petitioner's civil rights were **firstly** exposed by California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye on 8/25/2021 in California Supreme Court at Petition for Review No.269711, 11 years following judicial child abduction of Petitioner's daughter, who conceded to seven (7) conspiracies with James McManis and retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, as a matter of law, which was further tacitly admitted by all defendants of Shao v. Roberts, et.al. 20+ times at the Appeal No.21-5210 proceeding at the D.C. Circuit.

The **second exposure** was by McManis's attorney James Lassart on 10/13/2021 in the same proceeding of Appeal No.21-5210 about he and his clients' conspired dismissal of Appeal No.19-5014 with the D.C. Circuit "Court" on 7/31/2019 when Merrick Garland was the Chief Judge, when the panel lead Judge Patricia Millett DID issue a sua sponte Order to Show Cause that day to reflect the conspiracy—an order to Petitioner to show cause why not adopt the ENTIRE order of dismissal of Judge Rudolph Contreras at the District Court.

The **third exposure** was by American Inns of Court itself which tacitly admitted in the same Appeal No.21-5210 proceeding that it bribed then-Chief Judge Merrick Garland and panel lead Judge Patricia Millett in dismissing AIC from Appeal No.19-5014.

The **fourth exposure** was also in 21-5210 proceeding by McManis defendants who tacitly admitted that McManis Faulkner law firm was the one who drafted Judge Patricia Lucas's permanent child custody deprival order of 11/4/2013 when Lucas delayed 3.5 months in issuing the order, with five pages of recital of facts that were not presented at the child custody trial.

The **fifth exposure** was also in 21-5210 proceeding when Tani Cantil-Sakauye and McManis admitted tacitly to have conspired with Judge Rudolph Contreras in issuing the sua sponte dismissal order of 1/17/2019 in Shao v. Roberts, et. al. where all present 5 Justices (Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Kagan, Sotomayor) as well as Contreras himself are all at default.

The **sixth exposure** was by Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. who effectively "conceded" on **4/18/2022 for the first time in Petition No.21-**

881, just like California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, to all severe criminal accusations against Supreme Court being done by him under the manipulation of James McManis.

The **seventh exposure** was the fact that **all defendants for Shao v. Roberts, et.al.** tacitly **admitted to all** severe criminal accusations contained in **Petition For Writ of Mandamus No.22-350** pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 801(d)(2) by deliberately and expressly waiving an opposition. In 22-350, all Justices respondents of the Supreme Court except Justices Gorsuch and Jackson, recused themselves, concealed Petitioner's Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, blocking her from rendering a decision under 28 U.S.C. §1651(b) and posted an illegal, misleading minute order ***anonymously*** stating that the Supreme Court was unable to decide for lack of quorum in contempt of 28 U.S.C. §1651(b) where no quorum is needed for an application, and the precedent of Petition No.12-8660 presented that a justice (Elena Kagan) could even decide alone on a Petition for Writ of Certiorari when all Justices recused themselves. The predicate act of using anonymous minute order to avoid a decision re-played in Petition for Writ of Mandamus No.23-6140 and Application 23A617.

Chief Justice Roberts in fact had blocked **29 Applications to Justice Amy Coney Barrett**, including unreasonably refusing to decide the emergent issues of Petitioner's bar license suspension and international travel blockade for three years, which were derived from illegal enforcement of 5/3/2013 child support order despite having no jurisdiction, as directed by James McManis.

The **eighth exposure** was the 633 pages of documentary evidence in the ECF 75 at the Ninth Circuit Appeal No.22-15857 proceeding as stated in Footnote 1, it includes selective evidence of these judicial conspiracies as of 1/14/2024. Notably p.471 that was produced by California Attorney General Rob Bonta proved the defendants' conspiracies on 4/8/2022 that whether Rob Bonta would appear as the attorney when the case #2 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al would be on appeal, which means, 11 days before case being sua sponte dismissed, they had conspired the case dismissal. All defendants, and attorneys from California Attorney General Office and State Bar of California did not dispute and tacitly admitted that the dismissal done by Judge John A. Mendez was bribed by Vice President Kamala Harris – a condition of Mendez's dismissing the case being Harris's expeditious approval of Mendez's Senior Judge Status application and Mendez did sign off dismissal upon receipt of the mail for Senior Judge Status.

The entire ECF 75/72-5 is undisputed and was admitted tacitly by all respondents twice in Appeal No.22-15857 proceeding, including James McManis's attorney members at California Attorney General and California State Bar (who conspired in using California government funds to appear in 22-15857 proceeding for the benefit of all Respondents including all federal defendants and even their club, Appellee American Inns of Court.

The Ninth Circuit tried to conceal the evidence in ECF 75/72-5 by blurring some pages and even augmented the file size to be 7 times larger in converting ECF 75 to ECF 72-5 (see footnote 1) to deter file download. Therefore, besides tacit admission by all appellees, the doctrine of spoliation

of evidence applies to further provide legal presumptions that all facts contained therein are true.

Many Supreme Court dockets in Petitioner's cases showed prima facie evidence of crimes of 18 USC §241, §242, §1506, §1512(b) & (c), §2071(b):

(1) Petitioner's Application for Emergency Relief filed in Petition 14-7244 and 14A677 to immediately release Lydia to Petitioner based on indisputable evidence that Tsan-Kuen Wang has had dangerous mental disorder that posed imminent risk of harm to Lydia, was altered record to be "Application for a stay."

(2) Mothers of Lost Children's Amicus Curiae Motion duly filed on 11/8/2018 in Petition No.18-569 (Petitioner's child custody appeal from Judge Patricia Lucas's permanent parental deprival order of 11/4/2013 that was drafted by McManis Faulkner law firm), **was purged** when the appearance of Amicus Curiae's attorney Christopher W. Katzenbach is at the bottom of the docket.

(3) Supreme Court concealed the names of James McManis and his partners from all Petitions arising from Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel, *in conspiracies with California Supreme Court and California Sixth District Court of Appeals*, including Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, 21-881 as directed by James McManis on or about 10/25/2017.

(4) The fact as shown on the dockets[11] of Petition Nos. 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881, 22-28, 23-6140 that not a Justice decided the Request for Recusal and that all documentary evidence supporting the Requests for Recusal has been consistently concealed and not posted, with a note of its existence or some even being completely wiped out, e.g., 20-524, proves the conspiracies among the justices asked to be recused as it is legally and factually impossible that not a justice not decided his/her recusal but for an agreement that each would not decide.

(5) Pp.14, 15, 20-22 in the Request for Recusal filed in Petition No.21-881 showed the undisputed screenshots that Supreme Court crazily took off its Order/Judgment in 20-524 three times, which indicate the order/judgment that was not signed by a justice was a fraud on court.

(6) The court deliberatively refused to decide in Petition Nos. 22-350, 23-6140 by anonymous minute orders that stated misleading laws that the court was unable to decide for lack of quorum, which conflicts with the All Writs Act in 28 U.S.C.§1651(b) (a justice may decide) and Petition No.12-8660.

(7) 23A617 shows the application was for Justice Barrett but it became a summary denial by Justice Gorsuch when he failed to decide a Request for Recusal against him (filed in Petition No.23-6140.

---

[11] Several R.R.s were concealed from posting, such as 17-82, 22-28 (filed in 11/15/2022), 22-350 and the amended one in 23-6140.

(8) Chief Justice Roberts recused himself on 4/18/2022 in Petition 21-881 but the case was closed on 4/18/2022 instead of automatic reversing the 2/22/2022 order denying certiorari which he participated with conflicts of interest.

21-881 was right after 20-524; why that the justices would recuse themselves in 20-524 and 22-350 but would not recuse themselves in 21-881 nor in 22-28? 21-881 is the source of all evils, James McManis's case, and 22-28 was to get Lydia released to Petitioner before she reached 18. They would not recuse as both cases were so important to James McManis that they must keep their voting rights in order to manipulate the orders to the satisfaction of James McManis, their gang head.

The same predicate acts of altering court records, blocking filings and forging orders, refusing to change venue despite direct conflicts of interest existed in all ten (10) courts. The American Inns of Court used government money to fund all these criminal acts, even doing money laundering among agencies.

Obviously, James McManis issued a directive on 1/8/2025 such that four courts took immediate actions:

1. After holding 20 days, US Supreme Court returned the third Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, It was done by a "Kyle R. Ratlin" without job title nor phone number who vaguely stated the Application cannot be filed alone without a Petition.
2. After holding it for 20 days, Judge Jia M. Cobb at the District Court for D.C. filed Petitioner's Notice of Appeal regarding her orders in the RICO case (24-2814),.

3. D.C. Circuit delayed creating a docket for the RICO appeal until 1/10/2025 and predetermined dismissal of the appeal, when Petitioner also discovered that the dockets for Appeal Nos.19-5014 and 21-5210 were concealed from pacer.gov for an unknown period of time. (put back in late January 2025 after objected by Petitioner)
4. The Alameda County Court issued orders in Shao Law Firm, PC v. Huang and Hsia (RG20065475) to set Plaintiff's 5 motions on hearing on 2/11/2025, plotting to abort the motions on 2/11/2025 despite they were UNCONTESTED and dismissed the case on 3/19/2025 with the ground that Petitioner was suspended bar license despite pending appeal.

On 3/18/2025, D.C. Circuit issued a "sua sponte" dismissal order of Appeal on the RICO complaint watering Petitioner's prayers for damages which is more than $1 billion beyond the scope of Petitioner's motions. On 3/19/2025, Alameda County Court's new judge Mark Fickes that was sponsored by James McManis as a judge to substitute Victoria Kolakowski[12] dismissed the civil case prejudicing Petitioner's secured debt of attorneys' fees of more than $700k.

The damages on 3/18/2025 and 3/19/2025 were the subject of Petitioner's Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett which was blocked four times Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. since 11/26/2024 that he had deliberately anticipated the damages of $700k secured interest and $1 billion

[12] On November 7, 2024, Judge Kolakowski slipped out the reason why she continued presiding for five months pending judicial disqualification was because "There is no other judge" who could do this type of court crimes she did--- purged all court records and altered court records.

damages of Petitioner to be watered by way of his delaying tactic, after having refused to decide the issues of Petitioner's bar license suspension for three years.

Petitioner respectfully requests an "emergent" writ of habeas corpus regarding eleven QUESTIONS PRESENTED to scrutinize, investigate and remove the extremely unreasonable executive and judicial restraints on her life, liberty and properties.

JURISDICTION:

I. Extraordinary circumstances

As shown above in pages 1 through 8 of this Petition, it is without any doubt that the racketeering activities done by the courts, executives at government agencies, Attorney Generals in California and U.S. through a secret legal society manipulated by Petitioner's enemy James McManis to harm Petitoner's **life, liberty and property interest** and block all ways seeking grievances for 14 years presents exceptional extraordinary circumstances as the organized crimes were shockingly done by the judicial system at 66 cases (see, footnote 1, ECF 75/72-5, pp.451-457) that even included the Supreme Court Justices, especially Chief Justice, who **deliberately violated Constitution and judicial disqualification laws.**

With the severe harm visibly done, and with the undisputed eight exposures and 8 prima facie evidence shown on the dockets of the US Supreme Court, no reasonable person could mock that judiciary conspiracies were imaginary.

In doing corruptions, the biggest issue is all these judges/justices members are officers of the American Inns of Court and refused to change venue when some were specifically assigned to suppress the cases such that **NO courts ever decided the merits of**

the cases in the past 14 years, except in conspiracies in creating the fraudulent permanent parental deprival order of Judge Patricia Lucas (drafted by McManis Faulkner law firm) on 11/4/2013, creating the void and fraudulent child support orders and affirming the void child support order of 2013 outside the bounds of all laws, in using Kamala Harris and Xavier Becerra. James McManis has manipulated all ten(10) courts to deliberately violate judicial disqualification laws and not to change venue. "refused to decide" or denied summarily, blocking and concealing filings, purging court records, altering records, and forging orders, including even the 12/15/2020 order and 1/15/2021 judgment in 20-524 by the Supreme Court as stated above in p.4!

Six of the ten courts concealed names of James McManis and his partners and material co-conspiring judges, and the two lower courts in the D.C. concealed ALL defendants for the RICO case!

When all federal courts having jurisdiction are required to change venue pursuant to Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1], not only all of them refused to change venue but further conspired to conceal §3.3-6[1] from being able to be searchable on the internet.

Eleven(11) Questions presented are intertwined with each other with the source of all evils being derived from Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel (Santa Clara County Court, 2012-1-cv-220571) where James McManis used permanent parental deprival of Petitioner to assert his defense (ECF 75/72.5, p.115, Declaration of Meera Fox, ¶4), and later used his attorney Judge Maureen A. Folan to forge prefiling vexatious litigant order to block Petitioner from filing any motion at her divorce case in order to

ensure Petitioner would not regain child custody when the law Petitioner should have, especially when in September 2014 that Petitioner obtained indisputable evidence of Wang's dangerous mental disorder (ECF 75/72.5, p)

Page 208 of ECF 75 is James McManis's admission during his deposition on 7/20/2015 that McManis is an attorney for the Santa Clara County Superior Court as an institute, an attorney for many judges, Clerk, courtroom clerk, bailiffs on their "private affairs", from Santa Clara County to California Supreme Court.

In addition, James McManise is a long term Master for the Courts as a quasi employee.

Above all, has has about 30 judge/justice-members and 70 attorney members at William A. Ingram American Inn of Court where Michael Reedy his partner is the registered founder, when the 70 attorney members provided gifts/meals/expenses of the judge members and monthly meals in exchange for judge members' providing ex parte communications on their clients' cases through their mentorship program, and superhighway to judicial seats-- attorney members who donate most may get judicial seat sponsorship by James McManis through this secret club, in addition to the tax credits. For example, Justice Anthony M. Kennedy.

In Shao v. McManis Faulkner et al., Judge Peter Kirwan at Santa Clara County Court, explicitly recused himself on 12/15/2017 with a finding that "there is a public view of bias and prejudice for a judge's membership with a defendant in the American Inns of Court". Two years before Kirwan, Judge Socrates Manoukian also recused himself on the same ground in the same case. In the appeal from dismissal of the case (S269711) California Chief

Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye recused herself on 8/25/2021, and Chief Justice John G. Roberts, on 4/18/2021 in Petition No.21-881(appeal from S269711).

Years later, Petitioner discovered Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, and all present Justices except Justice Barrett are officers at McManis's American Inns of Court and were sponsored their judicial seats through the same. Moreover, recently, Petitioner discovered that her "Application for Emergency Relief" to save her daughter from imminent risk of harm from Wang's dangerous mental disorder that was filed with the Supreme Court in Petition No.14-7244 and 14A677 was altered to be "Application for Stay" such as to conceal the Supreme Court justice-members' conspired judiciary child abduction of Lydia.

The first exposure of judiciary conspiracies by California Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye (p.1 in S269711) included her concession[13] that James McManis was her attorney and they committed 7 conspiracies in harming Petitioner, including involving Justice Anthony M. Kennedy when Tani was sponsored to be Chief Justice after serving as President of Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court:
(1) misusing her judicial seat to issue summary denials to block Petitioner from access to California Supreme Court,
(2) influencing the US Supreme Court Justice-Members to use their judicial posts to vote summary

---

[13] See, Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye's using "not participated in voting" to avert detailed response to Petitioner's Verified Statement of Disqualification entailed a legal effect of "concession" to all facts stated there in and all facts stated therein became "truth." E.g., *Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County*, 2 Cal.App.5th 10, 30, 40 (2016)

denials to block Petitioner from accessing the US Supreme court,
(3) conspiring with California State Bar and Department of Child Support Services in taking Petitioner's money, suspending Petitioner's bar license and driver's license five times with excuse of enforcement of the fraudulent child support order of May 3, 2013, and even blocking passport renewal,
(4) conspiring in creating S263527 on 7/27/2020 to suspend Petitioner's bar license based on ***non-existent*** State Bar's Board of Trustees' resolution, in retaliation to Santa Clara County Presiding Judge's filing of Petitioner's appeal from dismissal and vexatious litigant orders of Shao v.McManis Faulkner, et al, and
(5) conspiring with California Franchise Tax Board and California State Bar to garnish all money from Petitioner's financial accounts by creating an "imputed income tax" since 2017 (Question No.5)[14], after Petitioner moved out of Santa Clara County such that they could not take money by enforcing the 5/3/2013 child support order. This conspiracy further extended to the IRS with unknown thousands of dollars that were laundered into California Department of Child Support Services. (Question No.11: Department of Treasury laundered tax refund of $1400 from IRS into California Department of Child Support Services on 12/30/2024 (App.111) then spoliated its own notice pretending non-existent of Petitioner's account in conflict with its own 12/30/2024 notice).

---

[14] CFTB further conspired in committing money laundering to "refund" the money taken from Petitioner through the imputed income tax, into Department of Child Support Services.

In view of the eight exposures and eight prima facie evidence stated in pages 1 through 8 of this Petition, the three cases of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. are full of frauds on court, bribed dismissal in conspiracies led by James McManis. The third case, RICO complaint, even marked the history that there is not one defendant being docketed and a judge could dismiss a case sua sponte on Day One of docket creation.

A. No other courts are available as all courts that have jurisdiction should change their venues pursuant to the Guide to Judiciary Policy§3.3-6[1] or California Code of Civil Procedure §397(b)

The Guide to Judiciary Policy, which was issued by Administrative Offices (Judicial Conferences) of the United States Courts as **policy directives**, has the authority of "instructing the courts". E.g., *U.S. V. Konrad*, 730 F.3d 343, 347 (3rd Cir. 2013). The Guide to Judiciary Policy has been widely cited by all courts in the United States, e.g., *Ayestas v. Davis*, 584 U.S. 28, 138 S.Ct. 1080, 200 L.Ed.2d 376 (2018), *In re Nashiri*, 921 F.3d 224 (D.C. Cir. 2019); *Guffey v. Mauskopf*, 45 F.4th 442 (D.C. Cir. 2022).

On June 25, 2014, in Shao v. Wang, et.al (3:14-cv-01912WBS, U.S.D.C. Northern Cal), Judge Jon Tigar issued an "Order of Recusal, and Denying Motion to Disqualify Judge as Moot" recommending the Administration of the District Court to change venue, as Judge Edward Davila was named as a defendant. Judge Jon Tigar quoted the Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1]:

"When a judge or judicial nominee is named as a defendant and his credibility or personal or financial interest are at issue, all judges of the same district should recuse, unless the litigation is patently

frivolous or judicial immunity is clearly applicable." See, also, ECF 75, p.121, the Declaration of Meera Fox.

McManis's club has purged this law from the internet, including concealing it from being posted at the Judicial Council of U.S. Courts (uscourts.gov). The U.S.D.C. for N. Cal later even **blurred Judge Tigar's quoted policy** until discovery by Petitioner.

All courts sued herein deliberately violated this Judiciary Policy (Cal.C.C.P.§397(b) is a similar statute in California to change venue).

B. All Justices other than Justice Barrett must be recused

On 12/22/2023, being posted in 23A617, Justice Elena Kagan recused herself and ordered: "Justice Kagan is excused. See 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and Code of Conduct for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, Canon 3B(2)(d)(i) (party to the proceeding)".

Now that all Justices except Justice Barrett are parties to the RICO complaint which is a subject for this Petition in Question Presented No.3, and also issues of conspiring in covering up 9th Circuit's crimes in Question No.2, the law cited in the above paragraph require all Justices except Barrett to be excused.

C. Justice Barrett has an indispensable duty to decide as being the only qualified Justice at this court

The Court has a paramount duty to decide (*U.S.v. Southern District Court of N.Y.*, 334U.S.258 (1948) and *United States v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200 (1980)); **refusal to rule is a clear violation of judicial duty**, *Mardikian v.Commissions on Judicial Performance* (1985)40 Cal.3d 473,477; **the court's duty to decide is "absolute"** (Comer v.Murphy Oil

USA, 607 F.2d 1049,1057 (5thCir.2010)) and **is Constitutionally-imposed** (*National Education Assoc. v. Lee County Board of Public Instruction*,467 F.2d 477 (5thCir.1972)). Therefore, as Justice Barrett is the only one Justice who may decide and the statutes 28 U.S.C.§2241(a), §2254(a) and §2251 authorize explicitly one justice to decide a writ of habeas corpus, and it is a duty imposed by the Constitution, Justice Barrett has an indispensable duty to decide this Petition. Petition No.12-8660 proceeding also confirmed that a justice may even decide on a Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

II. Reasons for not making applications to the district court of the district in which the application is held

All these courts that have jurisdiction are manipulated by James McManis and predetermined issues, which resulted in futility. Futility will exempt the exhaustion requirement. *United States v. Roque-Espinoza,* 338 F.3d 724, 728-29 (7th Cir.2003); *Iddir v. INS,* 301 F.3d 492, 498 (7th Cir. 2002) In fact, all requested orders except Question Nos.10,and 11, were presented to a District Court and **no courts ever decided** on Question Nos.1 through 7 and 9; the court failed to decide on the merits for Question No.8:

1	Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. (Santa Clara County Court, 6th District Court of Appeals, Cal. Sup. Court)	U.S.D.C. for E.Cal. (2:22-cv-00325) U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (1:18-cv-01233RC) 9th Cir. (Appeal No.22-15857) D.C. Cir. (Appeal No.21-5210) Sup.Ct. Petition Nos. 22-28, 23-350,23-6140

2		U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (24-2814); D.C. Cir. 25-7004; 4 applications with a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed with S.Ct.
3		9th Cir.(22-15857), S.Ct. (23-6140 &23A617)
4	Cal.1st Dist. Court of Appeal (A169994)	9th Cir.(22-15857), S.Ct. (23-6140 &23A617)
5	Cal.6th Dist. Court of Appeals (H039823)	U.S.D.C. for N.Cal. (3:14-cv-01912); U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (1:18-cv-01233);U.S.D.C. for E.Cal. (1:22-cv-00325)
6		U.S.D.C. for E.Cal. (1:22-cv-00325); 9th Cir. (22-15857); S.Ct. (23-6140;23A617)
7	Cal.State Bar and Sup. Ct.(blocked filing)	U.S.D.C. for E.Cal. (1:22-cv-00325); 9th Cir. (22-15857); S.Ct. (23-6140;23A617)
8	Ca courts from 2010-2024 30+ cases	U.S.D.C. for the N.Cal.(3:14-cv-01912), for the D.C. (1:18-cv-01233), for the E.Cal.(2:22-cv-00325), 9th Cir. (Appeal Nos.14-17499, 15-18617 &22-15857), D.C. Cir. (Appeal Nos.19-5014, 21-5210), Sup.Ct.(Nos. 11-11119, 14-7244, 14A677,17-82, 17-613, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613, 20-524, 21-881, 22-28, 22-350, 23-6140, 23A617)

9		U.S.D.C. for the E.Cal. (2:22-cv-00325); 9th Cir.(22-15857); Sup.Ct. (23-6140,23A617)

Question No.10 should be in the original jurisdiction of this Court. Question No.11 is only applicable to Supreme Court that no District Court could decide.

ORDERS REQUESTED, Statement of the Case and Why a writ should be issued.

A.`Re QUESTION NO.1 regarding Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. and S283308:

Requested Order:

(1) A writ to reverse California Supreme Court's S283308 order of 5/12/2024 order as it is void for acting beyond the jurisdiction of the court by requiring a Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Application for New Proceeding which should have been exempt as Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order is at issue, pursuant to *John v. Superior Court* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 347, 179 Cal.Rptr.3d 856 when such act constituted illegal interfering with Petitioner's First Amendment privilege to access the court according to *Ringgold Lockhert v. County of L.A.*, 781 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2014).

Malice of such misuse the Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order to block Petitioner's access to the court is shown in 8/28/2024 letter (App.15) in rejecting filing of the motion to vacate 5/12/2024 order (App.1-6), when the Supreme Court's supervising clerk attempted to conceal the 8/28/2024 letter, with the malice corroborated by their purging all filings/court records in S283308; therefore, California Supreme Court's misconducts in S283308 constituted violations of 18 U.S.C.§242, 18 U.S.C. §1506, §1512(b) and (c) and §2071(b), as well as Cal.Gov.Code §6200 (purging court records). The

8/28/2024 letter written by Clerk Jose Navarrete reads:

> "No action may be taken on your "motion to vacate May 16, 2024 order," received August 28, 2024. The order of this court filed May 16, 2024, denying the above-referenced petition, was final forthwith and may not be reconsidered or reinstated. Please rest assured, however, that the **entire court considered the petition for writ of mandate, and the contentions made therein, and the denial expresses the court's decision in this matter.**"

(2) A writ to vacate the Santa Clara County Court's dismissal of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al.(2012-1-cv-220571) as it is undisputed that Judge Christopher Rudy who ordered dismissal is McManis's officer at the American Inns of Court such that his dismissal violated Due Process and is void when Judge Rudy knew or should have known Judge Peter Kirwan's 12/15/2017 order has set a rule to disqualify a judge for appearance of bias and prejudice based the judge's being a member of the American Inns of Court with a defendant when Kirwan's order was the last order preceding the motion to dismiss at issue.

In addition, the dismissal order was improperly issued when the stay was not lifted by defendants who are the parties that requested a stay of trial on 12/10/2015 and the entire proceeding on 3/11/2015, as required by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.650(d).

(3) A writ to vacate all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan including her Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order against Petitioner dated 6/16/2015 based on the fact that Judge Folan failed to disclose her conflicts of interest as being an attorney of record

for two legal malpractice cases on behalf of Defendant James McManis and his law firm for 2.5 years and was sponsored by McManis to be a judge at Santa Clara County Court such that all of her orders should be vacated based on violation of structural Due Process.

The Prefiling Order should further be void as the purported statement of decision did not mention Code of Civil Procedure §391.7, based on which alone the prefiling order is void according to *Holcomb v. U.S. Bank National Association, et al.* 120 Cal.App.4th 1494 (2005), as that constitutes a prefiling order without a supporting statement of decision. See, also, *Morton v. Wagner* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 963.

(4) A writ to enter default as a sanction against Defendants in Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. and to change venue to Judge Michael Begert at San Francisco Superior Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section §397(b) to conduct a jury trial to determine the monetary damages that defendants should pay to Petitioner when the entire Santa Clara County Court is a client to James McManis and had a history of failing to conduct jury pool on the jury trial date of 12/9/2015.

(5) An order to show cause to U.S. Attorney General why not to investigate

(a) Santa Clara County's forging **efiling stamps** in September 2019 for McManis's motion to dismiss in violation of Cal.Gov.Code §6200-01,

(b) California State Bar's covering up these crimes of James McManis, Janet Everson,

Suzie Tagliere[15], including purging the complaint against James McManis,

(c) Judge Theodore Zayner's stealing court records Volume 5 and two original deposition transcripts of James McManis and Michael Reedy, and his leading change of Local Rule 8(c) to cover up the conspiracies between Santa Clara County Court and James McManis on dismissing the case in that McManis's motion to dismiss failed to follow the original Rule 8(c) in failing to obtain a reservation from the court's Law and Motion unit (to avoid a notice to Petitioner) but was able to file the motion, and the issue of blocking a hearing to be set at Santa Clara County Court on this motion, when California Attorney General Rob Bonta has direct conflicts of interest and US Attorney General has jurisdiction of handling these criminal issues for violating 18 U.S.C.§241 and §242.

(d) Judge Maureen A. Folan's forgery of Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order and how the Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order was applied to the

---

[15] The original e-filed Certificate of Service showing efiling date of 9/18/2019 at 10:39 a.m. with efiling envelop of 3406422, was inserted as p.103 of Declaration of Suzie Tagliere who perjured her declaration in Opposition to Petitioner's first Motion to Vacate Dismissal that the motion to dismissed was "filed on 9/12/2019". The Declaration was filed on 3/11/2020. After they altered the efiling stamps to be 9/12/2019, the court's deputy clerk put a note on the docket about the efiling envelop being 3408311. Such alteration occurred after 9/18/2019 as the sequence of the docket entries showed the purported 9/12/2019 filings were after the entry of 9/18/2019's entry of a remittitur. They filed a Notice of Non-Opposition signed by Janet Everson on 9/30/2019 when Petitioner was in Israel, with knowledge that being a fraud on the court.

divorce case to block Petitioner from being able to change child custody and child support

(e) Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero's interfering with Petitioner's civil right to access the courts in S283308 and whether S283308 is a conspiracy among all Justices of California according to 8/28/2024's letter.

(f) The racketeering activities of McManis Faulkner law firm in manipulation of the ten courts in interfering Petitioner's lawful child custody in California Penal Code §278.5.

(g) What happened to US Supreme Court in purging or concealing the names of James McManis and his partners from being shown in the dockets of Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256-18-344, 18-800, 21-881.

(h) What happened to US Supreme Court in failing to vacate 2/22/2022 order in 21-881 when Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. recused, and all other justices except Justice Barrett did not decide on recusal but voted, pending judicial disqualification, to deny rehearing on 4/18/2022, including concealing seven filings of Petitioner including two Applications to Justice Barrett filed in 21-881, and who decided in blocking 7 times of Petitioner's filing of Petition for Writ of Mandamus to reopen 21-881.

(i) What happened in Supreme Court's blocking Petitioner from seeking grievances in front of Justice Amy Coney Barrett by 29 times since January 2021 in Petition No.21-881?

(j) Why Ethan Torrey refused to respond to Petitioner's Request for Information based on Freedom of Information Act (ft.1, ECF 75, pp. 605-07)?

(k) What happened in Supreme Court's alteration of the court record of Application for Emergency Relief filed by Petitioner in Petition No.14-7244?

(6) A writ to vacate the order dismissing appeal of H042531 by the Sixth District Court of Appeals on account that the vexatious litigant orders should have been reversed based on missing critical records on appeal (Volume 5 was missing in the hands of Judge Zayner) when the deputy clerk R. Delgado filed a Certificate later about the truth that the Notice of Completion filed on 12/12/2017 did missed documents and a fraud.

(7) A writ to vacate orders in Petition Nos.18-800 and 21-881 as the Justices failed to decide recusal causing voting to be void, and reopen 18-800 and 21-881.

Statement of the case

The facts presumed to be in existence that were stated in the Requested Orders for Question No.1 are exactly what happened regarding Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al., where defendants **plotted permanent parental deprival of Petitioner as their only defense to this lawsuit** (footnote 1, ECF 75/72-5,p.116, Expert's Declaration of Meera Fox, ¶4) including using their attorney Judge Maureen A. Folan to forge Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order in June 2015 and using Presiding Judges to apply Folan's Prefiling Order with ridiculous order of 5/27/2016, without a motion, notice, or hearing, to block Petitioner from filing any motion with the family court in her pre-existing divorce case to regain child custody or change child support or change venue, and eventually conspired dismissal on 10/8/2019 by McManis's judge member Judge Christopher Rudy, including forging many

efiling stamps for his motion to dismiss to forge notice having been given and conspired with the court in being able to file the motion in violation of Civil Local Rule 8(c) without a reservation, when they failed to first lifting the stay they requested on 12/10/2015.

Expert witness Attorney Meera Fox declared (which was taken judicial notice of twice by California Supreme Court and had never been objected by any person since April 2017):

> "Since being sued by Ms. Shao for his malpractice, it has become important to Mr. Reedy and the law firm of McManis Faulkner, for whom Mr. Reedy works, to ensure that Ms. Shao not regain custody of her child, since as long as she does not get her child back, they can argue that their failure to advocate for her did not cause the damage that she suffered. Not coincidentally, the judges who have denied Ms. Shao the return of her child ever since have been very close bedfellows with Michael Reedy and are two top executive members of his social "club," the William A. Ingram American Inn of Court."

In November 2019, immediately after Petitioner returned from Israel and learned the dismissal, Petitioner made an application for leave to allow deposition of Attorney Janet Everson and Suzie Tagliere regarding how they could be able to schedule the motion to dismiss without a reservation under Civil Local Rule 8(c) when Law and Motion Unit had strictly enforced such rule since 2009 that McManis's attorneys must meet or confer with Petitioner first on the date of hearing on their intended motion, then reserve the motion, then being able to be accepted for filing. Judge Sunil Kulkarni stipulated on the record that in filing the motion to

dismiss, Defendants did not make a reservation as required by Civil Local Rule 8(c) but denied and blocked Petitioner from deposing Janet Everson and Suzie Tagliere to conceal their conspiracies with the court. Kulkarni mentioned that he was on vacation on 10/8/2019 when Judge Rudy came in to dismiss the case.

In late July 2019, immediately after Petitioner discovered that Folan was an attorney to James McManis, Petitioner immediately sent to Presiding Judge Theodore Zayner a Vexatious Litigant Request for filing with the family court a motion to vacate Presiding Judge Rise Pichon's sua sponte Order of 5/27/2016 that required Petitioner to seek Presiding Judge's preapproval in filing a motion in her divorce case, pursuant to Folan's Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order.

Zayner transferred the Application to Judge Folan who denied the application, and thus blocked filing with the family court a motion to vacate Pichon's 5/27/2016 Order.

Petitioner then filed a motion to vacate Judge Christopher Rudy's dismissal as well as all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan with the civil case (2012-1-cv-220571)and its appeal (H048651) based on violation of structural Due Process for their undisclosed conflicts of interest. Two lower courts refused to set a hearing nor decide for three(3) years on Petitioner's motion.

During the three years, Petitioner diligently sought grievances through 4 Petitions (Nos. 21-881, 22-28, 22-350, 23-6140) with the Supreme Court and the second Shao v. Roberts, et.al. (District Court of E.Cal., 2:22-cv-00325 and its appeal No.22-15857 with the 9th Circuit), to no avail.

On 1/8/2024, Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate (No.S283308) with California Supreme Court regarding two lower courts' blocking access to the court. Yet, California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero, McManis's officer at the American Inns of Court also blocked Petitioner's access to the court by:
1. requiring a Vexatious Litigant Request to File A New Action to be filed for S283308 (App.8) in violation of *John, supra*, then **delayed deciding the Request by 4 months**, and eventually *denied summarily* such that there was no decision on the merits of the Petition for Writ of Mandate;
2. **blocked filing** Petitioner's motion to vacate the 5/12/2024 order (App.1-6),
3. **PURGED ALL court records** in S283308 (App.5-6) and concealed the 8/28/2024 letter returning filing of Petitioner's motion to vacate 5/12/2024 order.

The Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order was signed by Judge Maureen Folan on or about 6/24/2015 but antedated to be 6/16/2015, without being supported by a statement of decision.

No deputy clerk would enter it into the case docket for 2 years. On 8/15/2017, Judge Theodore Zayner arranged a non-clerk, a "contractor" who is likely McManis' hacker, Kevin L. Warnock, to enter it into the docket with a false entry date of 6/16/2015.

On 12/10/2015, McManis defendants *orally* moved to stay the jury trial, then let the judge sign their order on 3/11/2015 to stay *the entire proceeding*. In June 2017, Petitioner discovered the fact that **Judge Theodore Zayner took the original records of this civil case from the trial court, stole the original deposition transcripts of James McManis and Michael Reedy, and caused Volume 5 court record to be "lost".**

Volume 5 contains material court records for appeal H042531, including Notice of Appeal from Judge Folan's vexatious litigant orders, and motions to vacate her orders such that losing Volume 5 causing incomplete records on appeal that **should have justified reversal of the vexatious litigant orders (H042531)**.

H042531 was appealed to this Court in Petition No.18-800, but was *summarily denied* when the Justices conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal, in order to retain their voting rights to close the Petition to **block Petitioner's challenge of the vexatious litigant orders**.

Vexatious litigant order was created to block child custody return to Petitioner when evidence shows Wang has dangerous mental disorder.

On 9/15/2024, Petitioner obtained indisputable evidence from CIGNA health insurance that Tsan-Kuen Wang has had 6-7 mental illness including a very dangerous mental disorder that may harm any time his own life and his surroundings. (Ft. 1, ECF 75, p.41) The laws mandate immediate child custody change to Petitioner in view of imminent risk of danger to the minor. Thus, James McManis caused the court to change pretrial judge to be his sponsored judge Maureen A. Folan who issued a Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order on or about 6/24/2015 but antendated it to be 6/16/2015. No deputy clerk would enter into the case docket of this order until 8/15/2017 then it was docketed by a "contractor."

On 5/27/2016, *without a notice, hearing or motion*, McManis caused then-Presiding Judge Rise Pichon to issue sua sponte an order requiring Petitioner to submit any intended motion in her divorce case to Presiding Judge for preapproval such as to block

change of child custody when Lydia was 11 years old, in violation of *Shalant v. Girardi*, 51 Cal.4th 116 (2011). *Ironically Petitioner could file motions freely in the civil case where the Prefiling order was issued.* This constituted many felonies of 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242 and California Penal Code §278.5 (interference with lawful custodian right to child custody).

James McManis used "permanent parental deprival" as the only ground for 13 motions in limine—trying to break the causation of his undisputed breach of fiduciary duty in failing to do his job on Petitioner's child custody and Petitioner's unable to get back her child custody. See expert opinion in ECF 75, p.116, supra.

Throughout the past 10 years, these judges/justices who are defendants for RICO complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (USDC for the D.C., 24-2814) as well ex-California Attorney General Kamala Harris and Xavier Becerra, **all conspired in child endangerment and permanent parental deprival** (Ca. Penal Code §278.5) when all had been ***bribed*** by Jams McManis through AIC and **the courts have consistently refused to decide on the merits of these issues**. Petitioner was barred from access to Family Court by way of Judge Maureen A. Folan's Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order.

Repeated usage of this void Prefiling Vexatious Litigant to block Petitioner's fundamental civil right to access the court (crimes of 18 U.S.C.§241 and §242)

California Supreme Court's using Prefiling Vexatious Litigant status to block Petitioner's access to court in S283308 is NOT the first instance. Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero did the same on Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (No.S273215),

which was to release Lydia from 12 years' confinement of illegal child custody. Gurrero withheld Petitioner's Request of Prefiling Vexatious Litigant for New Litigation for S273215 Petition for **92 days** then used a summary denial of the request to block the Petition. This was appealed to the US Supreme Court in Petition No.22-28.

McManis' Justices officers/members conspired in each not to decide his/her recusal in order to retain their voting rights to accomplish James McManis's crucial common goal of permanent parental deprival of Petitioner when Chief Justice John G. Roberts blocked seven(7) applications to Justice Barrett filed in that Petition (in violation of Supreme Court Rule 22.1).

A "BR" directed the illegal return notices blocking Petitioner's 7 applications to Justice Barrett in Petition NO.22-28

> In its 7th desparate blocking of an Application to Justice Barrett in Petition 22-28, Chief Justice Roberts, specifically antedated the date of denial of Petition for Rehearing from 11/22/2022 to be 11/21/2022 in order to create a false excuse for returning the 7th Application to Justice Barrett; the emergency application clerk Robert Meek disclosed a "BR" who was ***dictating*** *Meek's return notice* ***by verbatim*** dated 11/22/2022, when was 4 months before Lydia's 18 years old's birthday. Ft.1, ECF 75, p.151.

And, the Supreme Court's General Counsel Ethan Torrey **deliberately ignored Petitioner's Request for information based on Freedom of Information Act.** ECF 75, pp. 605-07.

With such evil stronghold of the US Supreme Court Justices other than Barrett, all 9 other courts

have shamelessly violated Constitution and laws in hurting Plaintiff, in pleasing James McManis.

At least three appeals at California Sixth District Court of Appeal were blocked access with the excuse of Folan's fraudulent Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order. See ECF 75, pp.451-455.

In H042603, an appeal from Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order, the court dismissed appeal based on Prefiling Vexatious Litigant status; it was vacated as Petitioner raised the case law of *John, supra.* but later the court still
dismissed the appeal with another false ground by faking that the court did not receive the civil cover sheet for appeal when it was filed.

Another H043665 appeal was dismissed by summarily denying Request of Prefiling Vexatious Litigant for a New Litigation.

In H048651, the appeal from Rudy's felonious dismissal, Petitioner properly obtained preapproval of appeal from the Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County (has had early retirement) on 7/27/2020 who filed the Notice of Appeal, then, California Supreme Court immediately created a false case to suspend Petitioner's bar license (S263527[16]) alone, based on California State Bar's Board of Trustees' resolution dated 7/27/2020 which, in fact, **does not exist**.

Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood at California Sixth District Court of Appeals, wife of

---

[16] The case with only one defendant that is the Petitioner, was closed on 8/14/2021. Yet, after Feb. 2022, in purging this evidence that Tani Cantil-Sakauye conceded in S269711 and admitted 20+ times in Appeal NO.21-5210, Tani Cantil-Sakauye forged about 79 orders by stealing the identify of deceased California lawyers; Patricia Guerrero further copied Tani, after becoming the Chief Justice, in generating 12 orders after January 2023.

Judge Edward Davila (who was sponsored by James McManis to be District Court Judge immediately after he judicial abducted Lydia through a bribe by Wang) **concealed the Notice of Appeal by 111 days**, then, after the appeal docket of H048651 was created, attempted dismissal with all tricks they used before; after all tricks failed, Greenwood required a SECOND Request for Prefiling Vexatious Litigant, without any statutory basis, and **held it for another 155 days**, then used a straw Justice Allison Danner as "Acting" Presiding Justice to summarily deny the Request on 5/26/2021.

In God's almighty hands, in appealing to California Supreme Court with Petition No.S269711, Tani Cantil-Sakauye made the first exposure on her conspiracies with James McManis, Anthony M. Kennedy and US Supreme Court Justices and other government agencies in harming Petitioner 8/25/2021, which was re-affirmed 20+ times in Appeal No.21-5210 at D.C. Circuit (2nd appeal for Case #1 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al., 1:18-cv- 01233).

URGENCY and WHY WRIT IS JUSTIFIED:

Access to the Court is a fundamental civil right. The Thirteenth Amendment and First Amendment's Equal Protection Clause and Right to Access the Court would guarantee that Petitioner not be discriminated and not be forced into paying attorneys fees to assert her rights at the courts. There are two urgencies that justify emergent writ being issued:

1. James McManis's sponsored judge Victoria Kolakowski had sua sponte ordered to attack Petitioner based on Folan's Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order; on 3/19/2025, Petitioner's very strong collection case based on a valid secured lien was dismissed by Alameda County Court

(HG20065475) when the issue on vexatious litigant order must be resolved when motion to vacate dismissal is pending.

2. James McManis bribed Petitioner's law firm's attorney Ron Lunski to betray Petitioner, causing Petitioner to suffer substantial damages, yet with the vexatious litigant order, Petitioner was blocked from filing a complaint herself in violation of her 13th Amendment right to represent herself, which needs vacating the Prefiling Vexatious Litigant order..

B. QUESTION NO.2 RE NINTH CIRCUIT'S BLOCKING APPEAL IN APPEAL NO.22- 15857

ORDERS REQUESTED

(1) Vacate all orders of the Ninth Circuit in 22-15857 as they were made in deliberate violation of 28 U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) and the Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] and change venue to a senior judge who is not a member of the American Inns of Court to form a neutral panel at the Second Circuit Court of Appeal for a meaningful appellate review pursuant to the Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] (See the Congress-designed procedure in *U.S.v. Southern District Court of N.Y.*, 334U.S.258 (1948))

(3) Order to show cause why US Attorney General not to investigate

(a) the complained court crimes of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal in Appeal No.22-15857 about 30 incidents as presented in ECF 121 and 122 including but not limited to its trespassing Petitioner's CM/ECF twice, concealing releasing the docket to Westlaw together with the Supreme Court (22-350), altering ECF 75(ft.1), how two panels were formed, how to let the Clerk to summarily denied rehearing, the appearance of bribe for Judge Nelson's clerk receiving Temple Bar Scholarship from Appellee

American Inns of Court in 2023 pending this appeal of 22-15857,
(b) the parties' undisputed conspiracies in Judge John A. Mendez's bribed dismissal (2:22-cv-00325) (App.17-18; ECF 75, p.470),
(c) how California State Bar and California Attorney General conspired with other defendants in using California government funds to form a league of James McManis's attorney members at the AIC who jointly raised a new factual argument impermissibly first time on appeal that Appellee AIC is a professional bar.(ECF 72)

Summary Statement Of The Case And Why A Writ Should Be Issued

Petitioner filed the second case of Shao v.Roberts, et al. with the U.S.D.C. for the E.Cal. on 1/22/2022. Judge John A. Mendez, an officer of McManis's Club, deliberately assigned injunctive motions to Magistrate Judge Allison Claire without jurisdiction (specifically prohibited by the statute), then Claire sua sponte issued an order of dismissal, summarily denied three injunctive motion and completely failed to decide the fourth injunctive motion which was to release Lydia from dangerous child custody.
All of Magistrate Judge's summary denial of three injunctive motions were **not** verified Mendez, thus the result was **none of the 4 injunction motions were decided**. These issues on injunctive motions was appealed to the Ninth Circuit and were again undecided, which were appealed to Supreme Court which were **rejected to be decided by a misleading ANONYMOUS minute order** (23A617 and Petition 23-6140). These motions include the subject of this Petition.

All key leaders of the American Inns of Court, except James McManis and his law firm when the

due date for Answer to the complaint had not been due, **purposely caused themselves to become at default, who are retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and his Inn of Court, the first member sponsored by the AIC into the Supreme Court, James McManis's client Tani Cantil-Sakauye, California Chief Justice and their attorneys.**

On appeal, clear and convincing evidence of conspired dismissal of the District Court case was produced by California Attorney General Rob Bonta that the parties and Judge John A. Mendez conspired dismissal not later than April 8, 2022 (App.19), with actual dismissal prolonged to April 19, 2022 being because Judge Mendez required a bribe of expeditious approval of his application as a Senior Judge, which was received by him on April 19, 2022 from then Vice President Kamala Harris. The above was undisputed by any defendants/appellees.

In this Appeal proceeding, as stated in pages 1-8 of this Petition, 633 pages of selective documentary evidence filed by Appellant in ECF 75/72-5, became truth or at least having presumption of truth based on the spoliation of evidence doctrine. See ft.1.

Petitioner file a motion to disqualify government attorneys [ECF 72] who are James McManis's members, despite uncontested, the 9th Circuit **failed to decide but dismissed the appeal**. The Ninth Circuit allowed Clerk/CEO to deny rehearing, and blocked a motion to vacate the Clerk's decision, and refused to decide ECF 121 for 80 days; when Petitioner filed a motion to decide ECF 121 motion on 11/10/2024, the 9th Circuit responded with an order that the case is closed on 11/12/2024 and stated Petitioner shall not do any filing. Two weeks later, Petitioner discovered that the 9th Circuit trespassed

into her CM/ECF account again and blocked physical filing..

Why writ should be granted

Ninth Circuit is the headquarters of this secret legal society and their crimes in Appeal No.22-15857 proceeding are recurrent issues of corruptions by this secret legal society, with recurrent issues of obstruction to justice, obstruction to fundamental right to access the court, and obstruction to the right to have an impartial tribunal, and crossing boards to US Supreme Court respondents who deliberately covered up the 9th Circuit's crimes in 22-15857 in refusing to decide with an ANONYMOUS minute order in Petition for Writ of Mandate No.23-6140 and 23A617 and blocked Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding the. The anonymous minute order was copied the anonymous misleading order of 22-350.

The court has Constitutional-mandated duty to decide. Thus this blocking access to the court, crimes of 18 U.S.C.§242, §1962 with bribes from American Inns of Court that repeatedly occur must be corrected by a writ to stop continuous miscarriage of justice.

C. Re QUESTION NO.3 on RICO Complaint case and its appeal:

Requested Orders

(1) An writ of immediate stay of Appeal No.25-7004 pending rehearing at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal for Shao v. Roberts, et. al. with a writ to reverse dismissal of the District Court and remand to a neutral Senior Judge at Northern District of New York pursuant to Guide to Judiciary Policy, §3.3-6[1] and the procedure stated in *U.S.v. Southern District Court of N.Y.*, 334U.S.258 (1948) and let the new court issue Summons, to correct ECF 9 to file original 4-in-1 motion and Application separately, to enter into the docket all defendants.

(2) A writ to Chief Judge James Boasberg and the District Court's CM/ECF supervisor on producing all documents for phone/texts/email communications on trespassing into Petitioner's CM/ECF account to alter and block Petitioner from doing efiling

(3) A writ to Judge Jia M. Cobb to produce all records regarding communications with any persons regarding Case No.24-2814 that caused her

- to delay docketing the case and secretly order the Clerk's Office not to enter into the docket any of the 200+ defendants
- to have the power or authority to issue such an order interfering the ministerial duty of the Clerk's Office to maintain records
- All extrajudicial communications that caused for Judge Jia M. Cobb to state the ground of res judicata in her 10/8/2024 dismissal order.
- Allow Petitioner to depose Judge Jia M. Cobb and her clerk.

(5) A writ to D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal (Operation Manager Scott Atchue) to disclose who and when the Court concealed Appeal No.19-5014 and 21-5210 from the pacer.gov and who created the initial docket without any court record.

(6)An order to show cause to US Attorney General for the D.C. to investigate

(a) the crimes in the District Court and D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal in Appeal Nos. 19-5014, 21-5210, and at the D.C. District Court for Complaint No.1 (1:18-cv-01233RC) as shown by Petition for Writ of Mandamus No.22-350 in lieu of D.C. Circuit's concealing 19-5014 and 21-5210 dockets.

(b)the crimes of the D.C. Circuit (Appeal No.25-7004)and District Court (24- 2814) for Complaint No.3 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al., as presented by Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing and Supplement

that were filed on 4/10/2025 and 4/11/2025, and to investigate the U.S. Supreme Court's blockage of filings of an Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett since 11/26/2024.
(c) The 22 crimes of six courts who had concealed names of parties as shown in App.78-80.

Statement of the Case

On or about 9/26/2024, the District Court in D.C. had trespassed into Petitioner's CM/ECF account such that Petitioner was unable to efile her RICO Complaint, but was required to email to the Clerk's office to examine whether the complaint was allowed filing or not, then requiring Petitioner must travel from Taiwan to the D.C. to pay court fees by credit card in person, discriminatively when all others may pay by phone, which was done on 10/3/2024. Petitioner was given a case number but the deputy clerk would not create the docket as promised.

Pending the lengthy delay in filing the complaint with the false excuse of needing to docket 200+ defendants, the Clerk's Office allowed Petitioner to submit updated Complaint, thus Petitioner added Chief Judge Boasberg, McManis's officer at the American Inns of Court who knowingly disregarded these misconducts.

Unknown to Petitioner, Chief Judge James Boasberg, McManis's officer at American Inns of Court, assigned the case to Judge Jia M. Cobb, another McManis' officer, who secretly **ordered the Clerk's Office on 10/3/2024 NOT TO DOCKET 200+ defendants.**

When the case was eventually docketed on 10/8/2024, it was docketed with the outdated version complaint as ECF 1 (which does not have Judge James Boasberg as a defendant). Petitioner immediately discovered this, then the deputy clerk

corrected with ECF 4 by Errata on Complaint, but refused to replace ECF 1. Then about 3 hours later, Judge Jia M. Cobb dismissed the complaint sua sponte.(App.70-75) A ground of her dismissal was res judicata which is outside of the face of the complaint, and **admitted tacitly by Cobb to be based on extrajudicial resources**, regarding this which was in numbered on Argument of Petitioner's ECF 8 motion, Cobb deliberately avoided responding in her minute order of 10/27/2024.(App.67)

Rule 60 motion was filed on 11/5/2024 but **undecided** (App.62) when Judge Jia M. Cobb used her retroactive notice on 12/3/2024 the "case was closed on 10/21/2024" as an excuse not to decide the 4-in-1 motion that includes Rule 60 motion as well as Application for Order to Show Cause that were filed on 11/5/2024. Judge Cobb further messed up the two actions into one ECF 9 when eventually allowed filing a month later and refused to file the original motion that has a notarized certificate for 28 U.S.C.§144 motion.

With the same excuse of case closure, Cobb ordered "Leave to file DENIED" and blocked it from being posted in ECF 12.(App.49-51)

On 10/20/2024, Petitioner filed the **First Amended Complaint**, yet, Cobb **concealed** it (App.62) such as to maintain her 10/8/2024 dismissal order.

Delaying 20 days, on 1/8/2025, Petitioner's Notice of Appeal was filed.(App.61) Three courts took action on the same date of 1/8/2025, appearing like James McManis issued a directive: Supreme Court returned the Application for emergency relief to Justice Barret after delayed 20 days (App.52-53) in response to Petitioner's letter to Chief Justice (App.54-57), Alameda County Court issued orders to set

Petitioner's 5 motions on hearing on 2/12/2025 with predetermined denial based on Petitioner's bar license still was suspended.

The D.C. Circuit created a docket **without an appellee nor any court records** with a predetermination that the case is suitable for speedy "resolution"(App.85) and set a discriminatory extremely short one month due date for "court records" and "Opening Brief" to be on 3/2/2025. They further **concealed the dockets of Appeal Nos. 19-5014 and 21-5210 from pacer.gov.**

The DC Circuit Court of Appeal was recently discovered on 1/13/2025 that they had concealed Appeal Nos. 19-5014 and 21-5210 from pacer.gov. (App.84) (They were put back to pacer.gov after Petitioner complained.) Petitioner filed three dispositive motion. Outside the scope of the three motions, on 3/18/2025, the DC Circuit sua sponte dismissed the appeal with predetermined dismissal by a panel composed of McManis's officers at the American Inns of Court.(App.87)

URGENCY and Why Writ should be issued

Appeal was forcibly made in view of the facts that

(a) the US Supreme Court had repeatedly blocked three filings of Application for emergency relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett from November 26, 2024 until January 8, 2025, including the issue on the crimes of Cobb, Boasberg and Clerk's Office (App.49-52);

(b) Judge Jia M. Cobb was persistent in concealing Petitioner's First Amended Complaint duly filed on 10/20/2024 such as to perfect her dismissal, which caused miscarriage of justice but D.C. Circuit affirmed such crime of 18 U.S.C.§242.

(c) Multiple courts have blocked Petitioner's access to the court by unilaterally stating case closure and not

allowed filing. See, Judge Cobb issued an order of 12/3/2024 that the "case was closed on 10/21/2024 and no more filings are allowed"(App.67) when **Ninth Circuit also did the same predicate act** (see above in Question No.2)

(d) Cobb disrupted the ministerial duty of the Clerk's Office to file (App.60, 46-48, 68), and to enter docket all defendants' name which violated 18 U.S.C. §371, ¶1, when **all courts involved committed the same crime with hundreds of incidents,** as a racketeering activity of the American Inns of Court enterprise.

(e) six courts' concealing names of parties from being shown on the docket with 22 incidents as shown in App.78-80.

D.C. Circuit has shown actual prejudice on concealing two appeals (19-5014 and 21-5210), concealing the Notice of Appeal, and concealing all names of Appellees, had **predetermined** fast closure of the appeal, and actually dismissed the appeal sua sponte on 3/18/2025, which is outside the scope of Petitioner's motions and violated Petitioner's first right to appeal in the Seventh Amendment, which was the third sua sponte dismissal of an appeal by D.C. Circuit (19-5014, 21-5210 and 25-7004) that must be stopped.

Any reasonable person perceives that the appeal is futile even pending rehearing as Petitioner is impossible to have a fair appeal, such that **a writ is necessary**.

All 6 federal courts sued in the RICO complaint deliberated violated Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] and 28 U.S.C.455(b)(5)(i), and interfered with the Clerk's Office's normal function, which touched the core of judicial system that requires a writ.

D. Re QUESTION NO.4 regarding HG20065475 at Alameda County Court, California):

REQUESTED ORDERS

(1) A writ for emergent stay the case proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§2241(a) and §2251;

(2) A writ to Alameda County Court to recover all original court records, including the original "Order Change Venue" and "Minute Order" of July 18, 2024 that were before alteration by Judge Victoria Kolakowski, and transfer all original court records and **change venue to Judge Michael Begert at San Francisco Superior Court for decision on the merits of all five motions.**

(3) A writ (related to Question No. 8) to reactivate Petitioner's California Bar License and to vacate Judge Maureen A. Folan's conspired prefiling vexatious litigant order (related to Question No.1), as James McManis had conspired in letting his newly sponsored Judge Mark Fickes dismiss the case on 3/19/2025 based on Judge Victoria Kolakowski's predetermined issue on Petitioner's bar license suspension dated 11/15/2024 in striking Plaintiff's Second Verified Statement of Disqualification (App.167-170).

Petitioner's $700k damages for this secured debt are at stake, as even though Petitioner had filed a motion to set aside dismissal (ft.3), without Justice Barrett's intervention, it is unlikely for the Alameda county court to abandon its conspired predetermined dismissal.

(4)A writ to Judge Victoria Kolakowski

(a) to explain all facts about her comment on 11/7/2024 that she continued presiding pending disqualification because "there was no one else".

(b) to disclose and provide documentation on all of her conflicts of interest, all of her contacts with

Yushan Huang's attorney Richard Wilson, all her contacts with Petitioner's prior counsel Ron Lunski, all of her contacts with the Administration of Alameda County Court, all of her relationship with James McManis and all other contacts about the case.
(c) to provide the original, before alteration, 7/18/2024 Order Change Venue and Minute Order.

(5) A writ to Courtroom Clerk Ms. Cooper-Smith to provide:
(a) all information about original court records, whether having been destroyed, by whom and what time.
(b) "Order Change Venue" and "Minute Order" of 7/18/2024 which she failed to serve Petitioner.
(c) to disclose and provide documentation on all of her conflicts of interest, all of her contacts with Yushan Huang's attorney Richard Wilson, all her contacts with Petitioner's prior counsel Ron Lunski, all of her contacts with the Administration of Alameda County Court, all of her relationship with James McManis and all other contacts about the case.
(d) to explain the electronic proof of service attached to Judge Victoria Kolakowski's Answer dated 6/21/2024.

Statement of the Case; URGENCY AND WHY WRIT IS NEEDED

See the summary statement of facts contained in Petitioner's motion to vacate dismissal in footnote 3. James McManis used his judge officers at the American Inns of Court, Judge Dennis Hayashi, Judge Victoria Kolakowski then Judge Mark Fickesis used by James McManis to block Petitioner's access to the court where he directed Judge Hayashi to copy

his proposed Order vacating default against Defendant Huang, blocked and denied a Clerk's Default Judgment from being able to be entered since September 2020, bribed Plaintiff's attorney Ron Lunski causing him to abandon a reservation of Motion for Default Judgment on 7/17/2023, conspired with Administration, Judge Victoria Kolakowski and Lunski to forge efiling stamp of Huang's incompetent "Separate Statement" to advance the filing date from 1/4/2024 to 12/19/2023 and used that to deny Petitioner's very strong Motion for Summary Adjudication and blocked Petitioner from being able to file the real evidence of Huang's perjury where she pretended not knowing English such as to forge an excuse to invalidate the Lien Agreement.

In blocking a jury trial from being able to proceed, the court destroyed all original court records and all electronic court records crazily (ft.3, Request for Judicial Notice) until after dismissal of 3/19/2025.

This is a Petition for Foreclosure of a valid Lien based on undisputed debt with the court's final finding on 12/10/2019 in the underlying case, and stipulated attorney fees in enforcing the lien with the present value of $700,000+, which James McManis wanted to water the money after having robbed all money away from Petitioner.

Plaintiff's thirteenth Amendment right of Constitution is prejudiced as the court was coercing Petitioner to expend money to hire attorneys in order to prosecute the collection case at the court that had predetermined dismissal after James McManis had caused his members to rob all money away.

Petitioner should have obtained judgment for her earnings that were secured by Defendants' residence in San Jose, California before end of 2020 but for corruptions by James McManis. Like all other courts,

the fundamental issue is lack of an impartial tribunal, which badly needs this Court's writ.

E. Re QUESTION NO.5: vacate 5/3/2013 child support order and later 4/24/2023 order (after Lydia became an adult).

REQUESTED ORDERS

(1) A writ to vacate child support orders of May 3, 2013 and all orders made based on May 3, 2013 as May 3, 2013 child support order was made based on 8/4/2010's judicial abduction of Lydia and blindly disregarded the fact that the 8/4/2010 order was already vacated in 10/31/2011 order but McManis's officer Judge Theodore Zayner conspired with McManis's member BJ Fadem (child attorney) and Petitioner's ex to conspire not returning the child to Petitioner.

(2) A writ to Tsan-Kuen Wang to provide records of each amount of "support" received from California Department of Child Support Services from 2013 until present with the date and amount of receipts and refund all to Petitioner with legal interest based on California law.

(3) A writ to California Department of Child Support Services, Franchise Tax Board, and U.S. Department of Treasury to provide accounting for all money of Petitioner that were laundered into the child support account at California Department of Child Support Services at Santa Clara County and how the money was distributed and records of all such receipt and distribution but D.C.S.S. had refused to provide such information for 12 years.

(4) An Order to Show Cause directing US Attorney General to investigate the crimes involved in

(a) conspiracies involved in dismissing Petitioner's child support appeal in H039823 at California Sixth

District Court of Appeal, including California Attorney Generals' violation of California Family Code §17407,
(b) imputed income tax--- when Tani Cantil-Sakauye conceded on 8/25/2021 in Petition No.S269711 that she, James McManis, State Bar and California Franchise Tax Board conspired in creating imputed income tax as a ground to garnish money from Petitioner's accounts since 2017 when D.C.S.S. in Santa Clara County lost jurisdiction for enforcement as Petitioner migrated from Santa Clara County to Alameda County on 4/1/2017.
(c) California D.C.S.S.'s 1/13/2022 collection over Fidelity Investment, and the record for the time and date in putting into computerized enforcement in 2022 and all information on how D.C.S.S. garnished money from Fidelity ROSS-IRA account on 1/13/2022. Thus far, D.C.S.S. has averted in responding to its computerized record to start enforcement of 5/3/2013 child support order in 2022.
(5) **A writ requiring U.S. Department of Health and Human Services** to disclose records on what date that they started nationwide enforcement of the 5/3/2013 child support order in 2022.
(6) A writ requiring California D.C.S.S. and its Santa Clara County office to disclose all contacts with James McManis regarding the child support issue of Petitioner.
(7) A writ requiring California D.C.S.S. and its Santa Clara County Office to state all contacts and records causing them to forge 5/3/2013 child support order and 4/24/2023 child support order, with fraudulent child support guidelines and refused to change the 5/3/2013 order despite being informed of Wang's perjured income and expense declaration.

(8) A writ to California State Bar and California Supreme Court to produce all records on how to cause California Franchise Tax Board and IRS to impute income tax against Petitioner.

Statement of the Case; URGENCY AND WHY WRIT IS NEEDED

Please see footnote 3 presented in pp. ix through xiii, above. A writ is needed as **all nine government agencies including six courts had conspired to block Petitioner from seeking grievances for already three years** on Petitioner's illegal bar license suspension and passport renewal block made under the excuse of enforcement of 5/3/2013 child support order but without jurisdiction, when prior California Chief Justice Tani Cantil's 1/24/2022 order was simply to cover up the burglary and illegal taking happened in January 2022. (Footnote 3)

While an order made based on a void order is void, Alameda County Court had used this as an excuse to dismiss Petitioner's Complaint for Enforcement of Lien Agreement, that is a secured debt in the present value exceeding $700k, and Petitioner had been kept forced into paying $165 to get emergency passport to return to the US.

The courts have a duty to declare 5/3/2013 child support order to be void, but all courts intended to follow their gang head James McManis's directives to **abuse Petitioner by this everlasting debt, and by blocking Petitioner from seeking grievances,** in disregard of the First Amendment of the Constitution guarantee as fundamental civil rights.

Tani Cantil-Sakauye's 1/24/2022 order to enforce 5/3/2013 child support order is void *not only* because the child support order is void *but also* because there was simply **no nationwide enforcement being**

put into system such that **the order is merely a fraud**, while California had lost its jurisdiction for enforcement. Tsan- Kuen Wang is a millionaire who does not need child support and an accurate guideline would have required him to pay Petitioner child support based on simply 1 % time with the minor for supervised visits who should have paid the supervised visitation fees but due to conspiracies, Petitioner had to pay 100% of supervised visitation fees since 2010.

E. Re QUESTION No.6:

Orders requested, and why writ of habeas corpus should be issued:

1. A writ to vacate Order of S280063 as it was made without notice in violation of Due Process, further was based on non-existent Board of Trustee's resolution where California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero created other orders by stealing the identities of deceased lawyers, it is a predicate act the same as what her predecessor Tani Cantil-Sakauye did where she created S263527 to suspend Petitioner's bar license by forging being based on a State Bar's Board of Trustee's resolution of 7/27/2020, which in fact did not exist; after Petitioner challenged it with a motion to vacate, the S263527 was "close" on 8/14/2020; then after 20+ times' tacit admission in Appeal No.21-5210 proceeding about Tani Cantil-Sakauye's "concession" of 8/25/2021 in S269711, Tani quietly reopened the closed S263527 and stole identities of 79 deceased lawyers to "rebut" her previous concession that she and James McManis conspired to create S263527 to suspend Petitioner's bar license in retaliation of the appeal that was granted filing by Presiding Judge of Santa Clara County Court regarding the felonious dismissal of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. (2012-

1-cv-220571), and 6 stealing identifies were filed by Guerrero in S263527.

The timing was when Petitioner asked D.C.S.S. in Santa Clara County for one time settlement of child support issue such that she may recover her bar license, and thus this order appeared to be planned to create the second suspension in case settlement was reached.

2.An order to show cause for US Attorney General to investigate the crimes involved in forging government records and court records in S280063 and S263527 in order to fraudulently suspend Petitioner's bar license in case of one time settlement with DCSS.

F. Re QUESTION No.7:

Orders requested:

A writ to California Supreme Court and California State Bar to show cause why not immediately reactivate Petitioner's bar license with the only condition to pay 2025 bar dues proportionately when the basis for the initial suspension on 2/24/2022 was a void child support order of 5/3/2013, without notice nor hearing, and the second suspension through S280063 was made without notice nor hearing.

why writ of habeas corpus should be issued; statement of facts

As stated in Question No.3, Judge John A. Mendez failed to decide four injunctive motions and the first one among the four is this "motion for temporary injunctive order" to recover her bar license. According to *Gray v. Superior Court*, 123 Cal.App4th 949 (2004), a professional license cannot be suspended without a notice. Moreover, no one may enforce a defective order and an order based on a defective order is void. See, e.g., *Mitchell v.Superior Court*, 28 Cal.App.3d 759 (1972).

In *Mitchell*, the Court specifically quoted that "No one can be punished for disobedience of a void order (*Fortenbury v. Superior Court* (1940) 16Cal.2d 405...; *Brady v. Superior Court* (1962) 200 Cal.PP.2D 69...."
A professional license is a property right that is protected by Due Process.

See the facts stated in Question No.7.The first suspension was based on void child support order and the second, was undisputedly made without notice and also did not make sense for requiring Petitioner to pay bar dues pending bar license suspension when D.C.S.S. deliberately refused to do one-time settlement.

Petitioner was barred seeking grievances for already 3 years when the issue is becoming extremely emergent as on 3/19/2025, Alameda County Court had used the sole ground of Petitioner's bar license suspension to dismiss the strong civil case of a Petition for Foreclosure of a Lien (RG20065475) that was already with a final order finding that Defendants' were breach with the Lien Agreement with the amount of debt not disputed, which is pending a motion to vacate (App.163-170).
After systematic robberies done by James McManis through the American Inns of Court members, Petitioner has no money to hire other attorneys to prosecute the case when the judgement should have been entered to Petitioner's favor in 2020 but for the obstruction of justice by James McManis's members. The hearing is set on June 12, 2025.
To require Petitioner to retain new counsel violated the Thirteenth Amendment. With this ground of suspension, the Alameda County Court refused to decide change venue. Without changing venue,

without this Court's intervention, it is impossible for Alameda County to change its predetermined dismissal, which will result in more than $700k undisputed property rights.

G. Re QUESTION No.8: Lydia's migration

Orders requested:

(1) A writ requiring Tsan-Kuen Wang to immediately relocate Lydia D. Wang from California to Maryland, ensuring Lydia D. Wang be fully released her liberty with purchase of roundtrip air ticket from California to Washington D.C., with cash of $1,500 for travel without any surveillance by Tsan-Kuen Wang or James McManis, to return to her mother for healing from 14 years' inhumane judicial abduction and forcible separation, including all of her belongings being moved to Petitioner's home in Maryland at the costs of Tsan-Kuen Wang as well as roundtrip air-tickets and at least $1,500 cash;

(2) A writ for US Attorney General and/or U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to investigate the crimes of California Penal Code §278.5 (interference with lawful custodian parent's child custody) including the bribes involved that had harmed Lydia, her brother Louis and Plaintiff for 14 years on the 66 proceedings shown in ECF 75/72-5, pp.451-457 when all government agencies and 9 courts confined Lydia into such dangerous child custody since August 4, 2010.

(3) Petitioner be allowed to take deposition of Tsan-Kuen Wang with Wang to pay all deposition costs, including court reporter's fees, Petitioner's airplane ticket roundtrips and hotel fees for the deposition estimated $1,000, and all costs of three times of deposition cancellation due to no show, about $600 where the Santa Clara County Court had

illegally disallowed Petitioner to take his deposition in the past 14 years.

statement of facts and ground of needing a writ

Please see footnote 3 and the Question Presented for No.8. No courts allowed review of the child abduction issue since 2011 through 66 proceedings, as shown by ECF 75/72-5, pp.451-457 (ft.1), including the Supreme Court respondents who were blocking grievances and conspired in judicial abduction with malice. The evidence of Supreme Court's malice is clearly shown by their alteration of Petitioner's "Application for Emergency Relief" to be "Application for stay" in Petition No.14-7244, and Application No.14A677 and by their purging the Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children (see a copy filed in Petition No.20-524) in Petition 18-569.

H Re QUESTION No.9:

Requested Order and Statement of Fact and reason why writ should be granted

It has been through 9 agencies that avoided a decision, when the enforcement of a defective or void order is void (*Mitchell, supra)* and May 3, 2013 child support order is void per se and was enforced without jurisdiction. Therefore, Petitioner requests a writ 1. to Department of State to immediately issue a 10 years' US Passport with proper refund of $825 as Petitioner had been unreasonably required to pay $1,023 (App.99) plus $165 in Germany on 1/27/2025 and $165 in Taipei on 3/18/2025, totally $1,353 when such enforcement on Petitioner's passport was initialized by Respondent Xavier Becerra who certified the child support debt as a McManis's officer in his capacity as the Head of Department of Health Human Services, and further abused by Anthony J. Blinken, prior Secretary of State by being forced to overpay emergency passport by at least

$825 when Department of State directed American Institute in Taiwan as well as Berlin Embassy to charge in conflict with the statute.

J. Re QUESTION No.10:

Requested order, statement of facts and why not a writ being issued

Article III, Section 2 and Clause 2 empowered the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to include foreign consuls. Department of State also published its jurisdiction in handling citizens' being deported or disallowed entry to a foreign country. Please see facts stated in Question No.10 above. Petitioner paid the hotel and airtickets and travel to Israel to fulfil her assignment received from God to blow the shofar on Mount Zion in Israel to start the Day of the Lord, as prophesized in Joel 2:1, which was announced 16 times to the public and to 31 Messiah Congregations located in Jerusalem. That was 11th entry to Israel but was blocked.

Thus, it is within the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction to require Secretary of State to exercise its jurisdiction to protect the Citizens from unreasonable interference of freedom of international travel is a civil right:

(1) Order Secretary of State to immediately contact Israel Embassy to **remove the record of entry denial** based on the false predetermined ground of risk of immigration and **cancel its silent revocation** of entry permit that Petitioner duly paid $25 in January 2025 when such quiet revocation actually violated Israel's Explanations Law of 1959.

(2) a writ for US Attorney General to investigate James McManis's plausible contacts with Israel Border Control Officer's related government agency in causing Israel ETA to revoke permit for visa waiver passport holders for Petitioner to be "Denied"

at 11:14 p.m. on 1/23/2025 when was 45 minutes before landing without any notice, and caused the Israel border to **predetermine denial** Petitioner's entry into Israel with a false ground of risk of immigration.

K. Re QUESTION No.11:

Requested order

A writ be issued to vacate the booklet format requirement in Rule 33 for being discriminative constitutes an unreasonable requirement blocking the civil right to access to the court, when efiling has been put into system of this court and there is no 6.125" size available in the prevailing market.

Statement of facts and why not a writ being issued

In 2020, the Supreme Court abandoned the booklet format requirement but everyone provided to the court one original unbounded copy for filing. After Covid-19, the onerous requirement for 40 books resumed, and it was used by the clerk's office to reject filing on 2/24/2025 (App.58-59), when the market no longer has the size of 6.125" but only **about the size**.

When the court has switched to efiling, such strict booklet requirement is nothing but an unreasonable deterrence from accessing the court. When the Supreme Court had unreasonably denied four times of simultaneous filing of Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Barrett since 11/26/2024, such rejection of filing by 2/24/2025 letter (App.58) after the court examined 12 days, appearing trying to pick faults to block filing, has the **public view of unreasonable interference of Petitioner's civil right to access the court.**

Such appearance of using Rule 33's special booklet requirement to interfere with fundamental

right to access the court is re-enforced by Mr. Robert Meek's unreasonable return notice dated 2/12/2025 in App.58, when a Petition besides an Application was made simultaneously. The reasons why an Application to Justice Barrett should not be returned were stated in Petitioner's letter dated December 16, 2024 (App.54-57).

As a direct result of Supreme Court's repeated deterrence of accessing to the court, Petitioner has suffered damages in that D.C. Circuit sua sponte dismissed appeal the third time as anticipated in Appeal No.25-7004 on 3/18/2025, and Alameda County Court dismissed the case based on Petitioner's state bar license issue that the Supreme court refused to decide in conflict with the statute and precedent in Petition No.12-8660 on 3/19/2025.

STATUTES INVOLVED

18 U.S.C. §242 Whoever, under color of any law, statute...willfully subjects any person in any State,..or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges..or protected by Constitution or laws of the United States...

28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i): is a party to the proceeding, or an officer, director, or trustee of a party.

Guide to Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1]

"When a judge or judicial nominee is named as a defendant and his credibility or personal or financial interest are at issue, all judges of the same district should recuse, unless the litigation is patently frivolous or judicial immunity is clearly applicable."

California Code of Civil Procedure§397

The Court may, on motion, change the place of trial in the following cases:

(b): When there is reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had therein.

28 USC §2254 states: "(a) The Supreme Court, a Justice thereof, a circuit judge, or a district court shall entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus.."
28 USC §2241(a) states:"(a) Writs of habeas corpus may be granted by the Supreme Court, any justice thereof"
28 USC §2251 states: "A justice or judge of the United States before whom a habeas corpus proceeding is pending, may, before final judgment or after final judgment of discharge, or pending appeal, stay any proceeding against the person detained in any State court"
Rule 22. Applications to Individual Justices
(1) An application addressed to an individual Justice shall be fled with the Clerk, who will **transmit it promptly to the Justice concerned** if an individual Justice has authority to grant the sought relief....
3... When the Circuit Justice is unavailable for any reason,...; the turn of the Chief Justice follows that of the most junior Justice. California Rules of Court, Rule 3.650(d) When a stay is vacated, is no longer in effect, or is modified, the party who filed the notice of the stay must immediately serve and file a notice of termination or modification of stay....
California Penal Code §278.5:
• Every person who takes,..withholds..and maliciously deprives a lawful custodian of a right to custody...
(c)A custody order obtained after the taking,..of a child does not constitute a defense to a crime charged under this section
Verification
The undersigned declares under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the

foregoing are all true and accurate to the best of her knowledge.

Dated: April 25, 2025

/s/ Yi Tai Shao

Yi Tai Shao