

Table of Contents of Appendix

I. CA SCT S2833308: Motion to vacate 5/16/2024 order in S283308 which Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero CONCEALED the motion from being shown on the docket and avoided a decision with full knowledge of the frauds that had been involved by the lower court, which is a predicate act of the racketeering activities of the American Inns of Court Enterprise when Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero is an officer of the Enterprise when its leader James McManis is the defendant to the underlying case to S283308, Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al. 1

EXHIBIT A TO THE MOTION TO VACATE
5/16/2024 ORDER: 5/16/2024 ORDER 4

EXHIBIT B TO THE MOTION TO VACATE
5/16/2024 ORDER: Truefiling’s record showing ALL FILINGS IN S283308 WERE PURGED to become zero, which constituted multiple counts of California Government Code Sections 6200-01..... 5

EXHIBIT C TO THE MOTION TO VACATE
5/16/2024 ORDER: emails showing Simon Voltz’s admission that Cal. Supreme Court did delay unreasonably in failing to decide on the vexatious litigant prefiling application, which supports the fact that 5/16/2024 Order is a felonious act of 18 U.S.C.§242. 6

I.A. Petitioner’s “Request to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant” filed in S283308 on 1/8/2024, which was fraudulently denied by Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero on 5/16/2024 (App.4) with four (4) months’ delay where she misused summary denial of the Request as an excuse to avoid decision on Petition for Writ of Mandamus; this is a fraud as this Request was redundant (see App.2, John v. Superior Court), but CA Supreme Court required it in order to

falsify an excuse to block a decision on the merits, blocking Petitioner from seeking grievances. Such malice is confirmed by Jorge Navarrete's 8/28/2024 letter (see below in I.E.)..... 8

For all of the documents filed in S283308, when SHAO tried to click them open, the screen showed "An error occurred while retrieving filing details for filing" for each document; in fact, the court records were all purged. As shown above, the number of "Filings" had become "0"..... 11

I.B. On August 23, 2024, California Supreme Court blocked Petitioner's access to the court regarding the aforementioned motion to vacate 5/16/2024 order by creating false notices of "payment rejection," when in fact, payment was successful and the motion was posted on the truefiling as successfully processed. . 12

I.C proof of successful processing filing by truefiling on August 21, 2024 13

I.D Re-filed (the third time of filing) the motion on August 28, 2024 which showed "Submission successful"; Petitioner immediately emailed the proof to Simone Voltz, supervising deputy clerk at California Supreme Court to avoid later alteration 14

I.E. When the trick of payment rejection failed, Cal. Supreme Court Clerk Jorge E. Navarrete issued August 28, 2024 letter of returning filing; afterwards, Cal. Supreme Court *purged* the motion to vacate 5/16/2024 order from the docket and truefiling; Simone Voltz concealed this letter; the letter proved that the motion was indeed filed but the Court purged the court record, and that the Court deliberately avoided a decision on the Petition with 4 months' delay by denying VL application and that VL orders procured by James McManis from his attorney Judge Maureen A. Folan was misused again

to block Petitioner's access to the court. See
5/16/2024 Order shown in App.4..... 15

I.F. California Supreme Court failed to respond to
Petitioner's Requests based on Public Record
Information Act which is, in fact, a predicate act of
the American Inns of Court Enterprise. 16

II. CONSPIRED DISMISSAL of the second
complaint of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. at U.S.D.C. for
E.C. and 9th Cir. —evidence was produced by Rob
Bonta on 10/5/2023 which proves that on 4/8/2022, 11
days prior to dismissal, Rob Bonta and his client,
Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero on behalf of
California Commission on Judicial Conduct, had
conspired in case dismissal with California Dept. of
Child Support Services and other defendants,
including Merrick Garland as US Attorney who is
supposed to be representing all federal defendants,
and Kamala Harris as Vice President. Evidence
shows that per their conspiracy that Kamala Harris
would expeditiously approve Judge John A. Mendez's
Application for Senior Judge Status in exchange of
his dismissal; Judge Mendez received certification of
Senior Judge status from Kamala Harris dated
4/18/2022 at the night of 4/19/2022 and immediately
signed off dismissal orders; evidence shows they
were discussing whether Cal. A.G. would represent
D.C.S.S. about the foreseeable appeal (which is 22-
15857 at the Ninth Circuit) that Plaintiff would file
(See ECF 75, filed in Appeal No.22-15857, 9th Cir.,
p.470) 17

II.A. The 9th Circuit was actively involved with
blocking the appeal (Appeal No.22-15857) from
Mendez's dismissal of the 2nd Shao v. Roberts, et al.,
when all three courts at the D.C. were doing the
same: Screenshot dated 11/25/2024 shows Ninth

Circuit Court of Appeal had quietly trespassed
Petitioner's CM/ECF account again in disallowing
Petitioner from doing any e-filing [*** previously, *for
more than 13 months* until August 2023, both 9th
Circuit and US Supreme Court were concealing the
dockets of Petitioner's appeals: Petition No.22-350
and Appeal No.22-15857. 22-350 is for Case #1 of
Shao v. Roberts, et.al. and 22-15857, the 2nd Shao v.
Roberts, et. al.)***] 19

II.B. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeal SPOLIATED
the 633 indisputable and admitted documentary
evidence for judiciary conspiracies by replacing ECF
75 with ECF 72-5, making many pages illegible and
enlarging the file size of the ECF 75 by 7 times from
21.3mb to 154 mb to deter download. This is
consistent with the Ninth Circuit's patterns of
racketeering activities in blocking Petitioner's right
to access the court—concealing the docket from
WestLaw for 13 months, trespassing into Petitioner's
CM/ECF account to block Petitioner from receiving
case activities for 13 months, then on 11/25/2024
blocking e-filing (see App.18)..... 20

II.C. ECF 75 or ECF 72-5, while uncontested, is used
to support two motions (ECF 72 and ECF 88 in
Appeal No.22-15857, Ninth Circuit) that were NOT
CONTESTED, but both were illegally denied by a
panel that is composed of the Enterprise's own
members in deliberate violation of 28
U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(i) with direct conflicts of interest,
without stating any reason of denial; the Ninth
Circuit further altered ECF 88's docket entry to
conceal the name of the motion..... 22

II.D. 11/12/2024's Notice of Docket Activity for
Appeal 22-15857—REFUSED TO DECIDE on the
merits of the First Petition for Rehearing which its

Clerk/Executive Officer who is NOT a judge issued an order of summary denial without jurisdiction, with alteration of the docket entry, with months' delay, by American Inns of Court's judge members, with direct conflicts of interest in deliberate violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i), in order to sustain the illegal Clerk's order and eventually blocked Petitioner's physical access on 11/25/2024 (see App. 18)..... 23

II.E. THE MOTION FILED ON 11/10/2024 (ECF 122; asking to decide 121 and change venue); in response, THE 9TH CIRCUIT ORDERED CASE CLOSURE ON 11/12/2024 (II.D, ABOVE, in App.22). 24

II.F. The US Supreme Court had fraudulently refused to decide Petition No.20-524 (Complaint #1 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al.) with false order/judgment that were taken off from 20-524 docket three times between 1/12/2021 and 1/17/2021, and refused to decide Petition No. 22-350 with an anonymous docket order with misleading statement of law after blocking 6 filings including blocking an Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett. And, US Supreme Court blocked filings of a Petition for Rehearing which cited authorities disputing the misleading statement of laws and request transfer to Second Circuit for a meaningful appellate review..... 37

The Evidence for the Supreme Court's illegal taking off three times its order/judgment off the docket of 20-524 was presented in ECF 161 (ECF 161-1 and ECF 161-6) Rule 60 motion and motion to change venue filed in the Case #1 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (U.S.D.C. for the D.C., 1:18-cv-01233RC), including evidence of a conspiracy between D.C. Circuit and US Supreme Court to

block Petition for Rehearing (See ECF 161-6 first two pages, where the US Supreme Court used what was supplied by D. C. Circuit in returning filings to Petitioner); the US Supreme Court even committed mail hijacking to delay mail arrival, refusing to pick up the mail of Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing for 20-524 from 1/8/2021 through 1/17/2021..... 37

A. 20-524 anonymous 12/14/2020 order and 1/15/2021 judgment signed by Clerk Scott S. Harris: 37

B. 22-350 anonymous docket "order" of 12/12/2022: 38

II.G. In response to the frauds of the 9th Circuit in suppressing Appeal No.22-15857, which was to suppress the conspired dismissal of Case #2 of Shao v. Roberts, et. al., Petitioner filed Petition for Writ of Mandamus No.23-6140 and Application 23A617; however, in repeating their frauds in using the identical "anonymous docket order" in 22-350 (App.34) to close Petition No.23-6140 and 23A617 on 2/20/2024 in REFUSING TO DECIDE, BLOCKED AND CONCEALED THE FILED PETITIONS FOR REHEARING; when 23A617 was filed as the 18th Application to Justice Barrett, Justice Barrett was blocked from deciding 23A617 and 23-6140. Note: All concealed filings in 23A617 and 23-6140, are court records duly filed with the Ninth Circuit Appeal No.22-15857 as notices to the respondents at the Ninth Circuit..... 39

III. 10/18/2024 docket print out for the 3RD SHAO V. ROBERTS, et al. (U.S.D.C. for the D.C. with case no. of 24-2814): The District Court created the most infamous docket in 236 years history of federal courts in that A CIVIL CASE SHOWS NO

DEFENDANTS with all names of 200+ defendants being concealed, with a misrepresentation that there is only a defendant of “John G. Roberts, Jr.” with misspelling of Petitioner’s name—when they delayed 11 days in create a docket with several *discriminatory excuses*, and in that it was the FIRST case in the history that was involuntarily dismissed ON THE SAME DATE OF DOCKET CREATION.. 40

III.A. Email showing Judge Jia M. Cobb’s Crazy Dismissal at 5:11 p.m. of October 8, 2024, within hours of docketing the case. 43

III.B. The docket of this RICO complaint after 10/18/2024 (Clerk’s office corrected Petitioner’s name and added “et. al.” after John G. Roberts, Jr.)..... 44

III.C. ECF 12 THAT JUDGE JIA M. COBB CONCEALED FROM THE DOCKET in III.B. is a service copy for the EMERGENCY APPLICATION TO JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT WHERE COBB IS A RESPONDENT where she has direct conflicts of interest..... 49

III.D. CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR. CONSPIRED WITH DISTRICT COURT IN SUPPRESSING THE RICO Complaint (Complaint #3) of SHAO V. ROBERTS, ET. AL. [See III.B. above] WHERE ROBERTS WAS NAMED AS THE FIRST DEFENDANT, by blocking four(4) submissions of Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett that were duly filed on 11/26/2024, 12/2/2024, 12/20/2024 and 2/12/2025, which are the 26th through 29th Applications seeking grievances in front of Justice Barrett; CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS HAD DELIBERATELY BLOCKED PETITIONER’S ACCESS TO JUSTICE AMY CONEY BARRETT totally 29 times since 2022, with direct conflicts of interest. 52

(1) On 1/8/2025, simultaneously with Jia Cobb's filing the Notice of Appeal (after holding 18 days), Chief Justice also had a "Kyle R. Ratlin" with unknown job title nor phone number to handle another false return notice to block the 28th Application to Justice Barrett:..... 52

(2) The letter in (1) was in response to Petitioner's cover letter to Chief Justice Roberts, Clerk Scott S. Harris and Emily Walker dated 12/19/2024 as the 28rd Application to Justice Barrett since 2021:.... 53

(3) In response to (1), on 2/12/2025 6:59 a.m., Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and re-filed the identical Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett. Chief Justice Roberts had Robert Meek returned Application on 2/13/2025, pretending there was NO Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, and had Emily Walker returned the Petition with technical ground after meditating for 12 days on 2/24/2025. 58

III.E. Judge Jia M. Cobb's clerk Dwight Patterson sent an email on 11/8/2024 disclosing the fact that Judge Cobb is actively manipulating filing, that is beyond her jurisdiction as a judge, a crime of 18 U.S.C. §371, ¶1. 60

III.F. First page of the Notice of Appeal (ECF 14, USDC for the D.C. No.24-2814) that was concealed by Judge Jia M. Cobb by 18 days; filed on 1/8/2025, the same day when Supreme Court's return of the 28rd Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett, which is also the same date when Judge Victoria Kolakowski issued many orders--- not-coincidentally on the same day of 1/8/2025 under the command of James McManis! 61

Page 2 of Notice of Appeal: Cover page for “FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT” filed on 10/20/2024— Judge Jia M. Cobb concealed it from the docket, which, but for Cobb’s concealment, would have automatically vitiated her dismissal order of 10/8/2024..... 62

Page 3 of the Notice of Appeal: Judge Jia M. Cobb failed to decide Rule 60(b) motion that was filed on 11/5/2024..... 64

Page 7 of the Notice of Appeal: Evidence that Judge Jia M. Cobb deliberately spoiled the 4-in-1 motion and application by commingling both actions into ECF 9 and messed up the pages such that the Request for Judicial Notice was found to be from Page 20 of ECF 9-2, instead of the first page of a record; one of the 4-in-1 motion was Rule 60(b) motion which was NOT decided. [Note: this filing on 11/13/2024 was in response to Petitioner’s ECF 122 Motion to decide ECF 121 that was filed on 11/11/2024 where Petitioner criticized Jia M.Cobb’s lengthy concealment of both Application and the motion since 11/5/2024; Cobb deliberately messed up sequence of pages for the two pleadings chaotically by ECF 9.] 65

Page 8 of Notice of Appeal: Judge Jia M. Cobb issued the first illegal Notice of Case Closure on 12/3/2024 with an antedated self-created date of “case closure” being on 10/21/2024, in violation of Due Process and 18 U.S.C.§241, §242, §1506(b)&(c), §1512, §2071(b) 67

Page 10 of Notice of Appeal: direct evidence of Judge Jia M. Cobb’s disruption of the normal function of the Clerk’s Office in violation of 18 U.S.C. §241, §242, §371, ¶1, §1506, §1312(b) &(c) and §2071(b) and interfered with filing—on

12/3/2024, Judge Cobb stated on the top right cover of Application to Order to Show Cause after she concealed it by 28 days, which was concealed in chaotic paper in ECF 9, that she denied filing, despite of her direct conflicts of interest and there is no legal authority supporting the case closure being on 10/21/2024.No reasonable judge would issue such an order but for conspiracy. 68

Page 17 of the Notice of Appeal: Judge Jia M. Cobb’s 10/8/2024 order dismissing the RICO Complaint (on the date of docketing the case) 70

Page 18 of the Notice of Appeal: Memorandum of 10/8/2024 “dismissing” the RICO complaint--Her “res judicata ground stated in App.63 exposed the extrajudicial conspiracy of her sua sponte dismissal. 71

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 71

III.G. October 21, 2024 Minute order 76

III.H. Table showing that six courts systematically concealed names of respondents/defendants as a pattern racketeering activities of the American Inns of Court and that Judge Jia M. Cobb’s concealing defendants’ names in 24-2814 is the 21th predicate act, and the D.C. Circuit did the same crime for the appeal No.25-7004 as the 22th predicate act, and all conspired courts, including Supreme Court, refused to change venue; these facts prove circumstantially that Judge Jia M. Cobb’s hidden/secret order of 10/3/2024 not to enter into the docket any defendants’ name is a conspiracy among the six courts in the American Inns of Court Enterprise. See also, ECF 1-5 filed in 24-1814 (ECF 88-2 filed in 22-15857 at Ninth Circuit), pp.68-69 78

III.I. Appeal No. 25-7004 docket on 1/13/2025 proves that D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals continues its conspiracy with both the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. as well as US Supreme Court in concealing all court records, concealing all defendants, and misspelled Petitioner’s name, misrepresenting only a defendant of “John Roberts, Jr.” with almost the entire docket blank. 82

III.J. A table of all cases of “John Roberts” as of 1/13/2025 at D.C. Circuit, which exposed that the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal had concealed Appeal Nos. 19-5014 and 21-5210, two appeals arising from Case #1 of Shao v. Roberts, et al.; Cp.: II.A. (App.18) and II.B. (App.19) show similar predicate acts that for 13 months, the Ninth Circuit and US Supreme court conspired in concealing Appeal No.22-15857 and Petition No.22-350 from being posted on pacer.gov or reported to WestLaw. 84

III.K. D.C. Circuit Clerk’s Order for this new appeal of 25-7004 indicates the D.C. Circuit had predetermined “disposition” to rush dismissal in March 2025 without suppressing the right to appeal, after they had done irregular docketing of the appeal. 85

III.L. D.C. CIRCUIT’S SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL OF APPEAL ON MARCH 18, 2025 beyond the scopes of Petitioner’s motions as reasonably foreseen by Petitioner in her Applications to Supreme Court which Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. had blocked filings since 11/26/2024 (App.53)..... 87

III.M. PETITION FOR REHEARING (ECF 2110480) FILED IN APPEAL NO.25-7004 ON APRIL 10, 2025 91

I. The March 18, 2025 Order must be reversed as there is no legal authority supporting the

panel's sua sponte dismissal of an appeal when the panel failed to disclose their conflicts of interest but presented actual prejudice in failing to decide any issues raised in four motions and failed to hold a hearing for the motion for judicial notice as required by F.R.E.201, when in fact, the order constitutes a predicate act of the American Inns of Court Enterprise complained in the underlying RICO complaint and constitutes a crime of 18 U.S.C.§242. 91

II. The March 18, 2025 order should be reversed for patent and deliberate violation of Code of Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1]..... 94

The March 18, 2025 order failed to address the key issue in Petitioner's Motion to Change Venue, that is based on Code of Judiciary Policy §3.3-6[1] when one judge sued in the same action requires change of venue but there are 7 judges at the D.C. Circuit sued as defendants in the underlying RICO complaint. As stated by Petitioner's Motion, 94

III. The March 18, 2025 order justifies a writ of error that should be vacated as it failed to decide "Motion to Change Venue" (ECF 2103465), and failed to address any and all issues of the other three motions, but decided summary dismissal that is beyond the scope of four motions that should be void. 94

III.N ON FILING THE NOTICE OF ERRATA AND SUPPLEMENT FOR THE PETITION FOR REHEARING, THE D.C. CIRCUIT BLOCKED PETITIONER FROM RECEIVING AN ENDORSED COPY UNTIL DAYS LATER and altered the time stamp of filing time..... 100

III.O Notice of Errata and Supplement with new Grounds IV and V re: Petition for Rehearing (ECF #2110480) to reverse and vacate March 18, 2025 order filed on April 11, 2025..... 101

V. March 18, 2025 Order should be void for impermissible predetermination of dismissal. 109

IV. RECENT ROBBERY on 12/30/2024 BASED ON FRAUDULENT CHILD SUPPORT ORDER 12/30/2024---12/30/2024 Letter of US Treasury proves that IRS joined the racketeering activities of American Inns of Court Enterprise as plotted by James McManis by robbing \$1,400 from Petitioner without notice, nor a chance of objection [there was a history that Kamala Harris also had used the US Treasury funds in bribing Judge John A. Mendez to dismiss the second Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (U.S.D.C. for East Cal. 2:22-cv-00325) on 4/18/2022] as a series of illegal robbery based on the fraudulent child support order of May 3, 2013. 111

 The purported “debt” is based on forged child support orders orchestrated by this American Inns of Court Enterprise under direction of James McManis where Kamala Harris was also involved in affirming the fraudulent child support order of May 3, 2013 and in covering up the crimes of bribery and judicial abduction of the minor, in violation of Attorney General Guidelines for California Family Code §17407 and Family Code §17407 with misappropriation of California government funds. 111

IV.A. Petitioner disputed this “debt” re \$1400 then received a notice from the IRS on January 20, 2025 that the \$1400 was tax refund for 2021, but both

government agencies ignored Petitioner’s objections.
..... 113

IV.B. California Child Support Services retained
\$1,400 despite of the statutory letter, and the US
Department of the Treasury, responded 53 days later
with a tardy letter dated 3/22/2025 that it “could not
find information” and blurred its 12/30/2024 Notice,
when the malice of conspired robbery and money
laundering is shown on the face of such
correspondence where the US Dept. of the Treasury
deliberately blurred its own notice dated 12/30/2024
(App.112-13)..... 116

Its own 12/30/2024 notice (App.112-113) was
attached with apparent spoliation to be illegible.. 116

IV.C. Similar to this \$1,400 incident (App.84),
when Petitioner had zero income, Cal. Franchise Tax
Board created fraudulent tax dues from year 2017 to
2021 and proceeded garnishment on all accounts
based on “imputed income tax” without notice,
hearing, and ignoring objections; 4 years later,
California ex-Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakaue
conceded on 8/25/2021 in Petition No.S269711 that
she, James McManis, State Bar of California and
California Franchise Tax Board conspired in creating
such imputed income tax to rob \$ from Petitioner
from 2017 through 2021 with the total sum
unknown..... 117

Example of Cal. FTB’s fraudulent creation of tax
liability of \$13,530 for 2018..... 117

IV.D. Similar to the \$1,400 incident, on 6/28/2022,
Cal. Franchise Tax Board delayed refund by five
months then laundered \$4685.16 tax refund for year
2018 to the D.C.S.S., in plotting a second robbery
when the initial robbery was based on illegal
imputation of income tax, without accounting, and

ignored objection (See ECF 75 in Appeal 22-15857, p.351) when tax refund should have been done in January 2022. The whereabouts of Cal. FTB's promised refund for money robbed for tax years 2019 through 2021 are still unknown..... 118

IV.E. With repeated requests for information, 20 months following the D.C.S.S.'s taking, on 9/29/2023, Santa Clara County D.C.S.S. eventually disclosed the source of \$6,055.37 shown on the account's auditing report, being from James McManis's burglary-- His burglar stole Petitioner's Fidelity Ross IRA statement and gave it to James McManis who caused David Kilgar at the DCSS headquarters to proceed garnishment on 1/13/2022 with the false excuse of child support enforcement despite there was NO enforcement in existence and has had no enforcement for 5 years since 2017 (due to Petitioner's moving away and so Santa Clara County lacks jurisdiction for enforcement); D.C.S.S. held the Fidelity's check without depositing for another two months until enforcement was put into system which was to COVER UP THIS PRE-ENFORCEMENT ROBBERY. In this 9/30/2023 letter, Noel Murray refused to respond to Petitioner's request for judicial review, refused to allow one time payment of the purported debt, when Wang is a millionaire who does not need support and all orders were forged for the sole purpose of harming Petitioner. Points #5 and #6 were coached by James McManis. 120

See ECF 75, p.508 about this belated disclosure made 20 months following robbery: 120

IV.F. THE BASIS OF THESE ROBBERIES IS FRAUDULENT-- This 9/1/2023 letter shows that Rob Bonta deliberately concealed from producing to Petitioner Attorney General's Guideline on Family

Code §17407 in covering up the crimes of Kamala Harris and Xavier Becerra who knowingly misappropriated Cal. government funds to affirm the void per se child support order of 5/3/2013 in violation of F.C.§17407 and the Guideline; in addition, under spoliation of evidence doctrine, their crimes in embezzlement and covering up crimes involved in 5/3/2013 child support order are presumed as a matter of law; see ECF 75, p.420-21

124

- A. Substitution of Attorney from Kamala Harris with questionable dates in 2014 re Appeal No. H039823, an appeal from 5/3/2013 order that was signed by the Commissioner without affording a trial, which is void per se as there is no verification by a judge, and Kamala Harris knew it was based on judicial abduction of Petitioner's child Lydia on 8/4/2013. Yet, one year later, she resumed her representation in exchange of the Enterprise's support of her US Senate election, without even a need to file a substitution of attorney!..... 126
- B. Notice of ReAssignment to Attorney (no substitution of attorney was made!!) 128
- V. The enterprise used this fraudulent enforcement of 5/3/2013 child support order that started at unknown time, about 2/28/2022, to seize Petitioner's US Passport and required \$165 fees for each emergency passport already 7 times, and kept charging extra \$165 without any statutory basis for the common goal of robbery and harming Petitioner—despite being within a year of last Emergency Passport, Petitioner was discriminated against and needed to pay \$165 with the most recent one being on 1/27/2025 where Berlin's US Embassy

did not even issue a letter for denying renewal of passport..... 129

VI. In addition to many violent crimes such as 30+ attempted murder incidents, James McManis influenced Israel Border Control to conspire blocking Petitioner from entry into Israel for the very important mission to announce the Day of the Lord on 1/24/2025 at a time 45 minutes before landing of airplane from Berlin with a fraudulent predetermined denial notice..... 130

A. Evidence of conspiracy—quiet, unnoticed denial of entry noticed at 11:14 p.m. on 1/23/2025, when Petitioner was on the airplane with a ground of “change of circumstances” 130

B. Predetermined denial order, sitting on the desk of the supervising control officer before interview. 130

C. The Border Inspection’s interview was all about Petitioner’s bar license suspension that is irrelevant to the issue immigration intent, and appeared to come from James McManis. 132

VII. About the same time when D.C.Circuit illegally sua sponte dismissed the appeal as discussed above in III.M through III.P, on March 19, 2025, James McManis also influenced Alameda County Court and his three sponsored judge members of American Inns of Cour to dismiss Petitioner’s law firm’s straightforward collection case to enforced a secured lien for Petitioner’s attorneys fees in Shao Law Firm, PC v. Huang and Hsia (RG16804034), with the damages suffered of more than \$700k as a direct result of the ten government agencies’ conspiracies within the American Inns of Court including US Supreme Court in blocking Petitioner from seeking grievances on her bar license

suspension issue by 3 years and now used bar license suspension as a ground to dismiss the civil case for enforcement of a valid debt of undisputed owed attorneys fees by a secured lien. 133

VII.A Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate Dismissal Order of March 19, 2025 and all orders of February 11, 2025 that was filed with the Alameda County Court on April 18, 2025..... 133

VII.B. US Supreme Court Justices’ conspired blocking adjudication on the emergency issue on Petitioner’s being illegally suspended bar license for three years since 2022 (Petition Nos.22-28, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617) to implement the common goal of James McManis through the American Inns of Court Enterprise has caused Petitioner to suffer more than \$700k damages from an undisputed, secured debt, when the new judge sponsored by James McManis dismissed the case of Shao Law Firm, PC v.Huang and Hsia (RG20065475) on 3/19/2025 165

VII.C Judge Fickes’s impermissible predetermination of the dispositive issue was to follow the impermissible predetermination of Judge Victoria Kolakowski in her ORDER STRIKING CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE AGAINST her that was filed on 11/7/24. (CCP 170.1(c.) 167

I. CA SCT S2833308: Motion to vacate 5/16/2024 order in S283308 which Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero CONCEALED the motion from being shown on the docket and avoided a decision with full knowledge of the frauds that had been involved by the lower courts, which is a predicate act of the racketeering activities of the American Inns of Court Enterprise when Cal. Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero is an officer of the Enterprise when its leader James McManis is the defendant to the underlying case to S283308, Shao v. McManis Faulkner, et al.

No. S283308

In Supreme Court of California
YI TAI SHAO aka LINDA SHAO v. Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood (Sixth District Court of Appeal) and Presiding Judge Beth McGowan (Santa Clara County Superior Court) Judge Christopher Rudy Judge Maureen A. Folan Judge Theodore Zayner

Petition for Writ of Mandamus Regarding motions to vacate dismissal by Judge Rudy and all orders of Judge Maureen A. Folan regarding Shao v. Mcmanis Faulkner, LLP, James Mcmanis, Michael Reedy, Catherine that the courts have failed to decide for more than 2 years 10 months

MOTION TO VACATE 5/16/2024 ORDER BASED ON VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

Yi Tai Shao PO Box 300 Big Pool, MD 21711 (408) 873-3888 attorneyshao@outlook.com

TO CHIEF JUSTICE PATRICIA GUERERRO
Petitioner moves to vacate your 5/16/2024 order as attached based on violation of Due Process and the 5/16/2024 order constitutes nothing less than a crime

of 18 U.S.C. §242 because the court should not have required a prefiling vexatious litigant order and delayed excessively 4 months to deny the unnecessary application as an excuse not to decide on Petition for Writ of Mandamus is to use the vexatious litigant prefiling order of Judge Maureen A. Folan to block Petitioner's reasonable access to the court, a situation . . . [****Note: the "is to use" was altered by James McManis's hackers; original sentence should be. May 16, 2024 Order in Exhibit A is to use the vexatious litigant prefiling...; clearly there was a phrase following "a situation" that was purged by the hackers.**]**]

A. The 5/16/2024 order in Exhibit A must be vacated because a vexatious litigant prefiling application should not be required and could never be an excuse not to rule on the Petition for Writ of Mandate.

In *John v. Superior Court* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 347, 179 Cal.Rptr.3d 856, the court held that the vexatious litigant statute does not apply where the litigant is appealing from a judgment of Prefiling Vexatious Litigant. Here, the subject of this Petition for Writ of Mandate is both lower courts' deliberate refusing to decide the motion to vacate vexatious litigant order of Judge Maureen A. Folan as well as motion to vacate dismissal of *Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel*. S283308 is an appellate proceeding to challenge Judge Maureen A. Folan's Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order; therefore, the vexatious litigant statute does not apply such that 5/16/2024 order denying application for vexatious litigant order to close the case should be vacated.

B. The court purged all filings of Petitioner at Truefiling.com and delayed excessively in this proceeding which supports the finding that the 5/16/2024 order is a crime of 18 U.S.C. §242, such that Due Process requires it be vacated.

Attached hereto in Exhibit B is a true copy of truefiling.com showing zero filings, which proves that California Supreme Court has purged all court records on Truefiling.com, which is the only platform for a party to retrieve court records.

Attached hereto in Exhibit C shows the Court's Senior supervising Deputy Clerk Simone admitted that the time was too long beyond reasonable time.

The above proves that the 5/16/2024 order is aimed at blocking Petitioner from reasonable access to the court, which is a civil right protected by 18 U.S.C. §242 and *Ringwood Lockhart v. County of L.A.*, 781 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2014).

WHEREFOR, Petitioner respectfully moves Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero to vacate her 5/16/2024 order as attached in Exhibit A be vacated, and Mandate be issued as there was NO OPPOSITION for 4 months. The undersigned swear under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and accurate.

Dated: August 21, 2024

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Yi Tai Shao

Yi Tai Shao

EXHIBIT A TO THE MOTION TO VACATE
5/16/2024 ORDER: 5/16/2024 ORDER

Filed May 16, 2024

S283308 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
CALIFORNIA

LINDA SHAO, Petitioner

v.

COURT OF APPEAL, Sixth District Court of
Appeal, et. al.

Respondents

McManis Faulkner, LLP, et. al., Real Parties in
Interest

The application of petitioner for leave to file a
petition for writ of mandate is hereby denied.

GUERRERO

Chief Judge

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