

No.25-1345

In re Yi Tai Shao

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

**REQUEST FOR RECUSAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G.
ROBERTS, JR., AND ASSOCIATE JUDGES CLARENCE
THOMAS, SAMUEL ALITO, ELENA KAGAN, SONIA
SOTOMAYOR, NEIL GORSUCH, BRET KAVANAUGH
AND KATANJI BROWN JACKSON PURSUANT TO 28
U.S.C.§455(b)(5)(I) AND §455(a)**

Yi Tai Shao, Esq. aka Linda Shao

PO Box 300

Big Pool, MD 21711

Tel: (408) 873-3888

attorneyshao@aol.com



10M25159429

United States Supreme Court

Recipient:

Clerks Office

Sender:

Shao, Linda

Processed:

6/14/2026 9:50:03 PM | 562



RECEIVED

JUN 17 2026

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

Table of Contents

I. All Justices named here must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) as they are opposing parties in Applicant's RICO complaint which is at issue for this Petition.....	1
A. All named Justices have done illegal voting in many Petitions filed by Applicant/Petitioner	2
II. Chief Justice Roberts and all named associate Justices committed about 470+ incidents of crimes of 18 U.S.C. §§241, 242, 1001, 1506, 1512(b) and (c), 2071(b), and 1962, when he was personally involved in judicial child kidnapping and permanent parental deprivation by altering the name of Application for Emergency Relief (14A617 and Petition No.14-7244) to be Application for Stay, in deliberate disregard how Lydia suffered in having to live in horror with her father that is a dangerous psychotic who may kill himself and her any time, when Dr. Jeffery Kline's affidavit was submitted along with the professional supervisor's affidavit was submitted about how terrible a child had suffered, when the law mandates immediate child custody change to Petitioner/Applicant.....	4
III. Associate Justice Neil Gorsuch expressed violated Due Process, Rule 15.5 and Guidance on Scheduling and 28 U.S.C.455 by usurping Justice Amy Coney Barrett's judicial post to block her from deciding 23A617	15
IV. The June 9, 2026 setting of June 25, 2026 Conference appears to be another predicate act of the Justices' attempt illegal voting again, after this Court had forged misleading orders in Petition Nos. 20-524, 21-881, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617 in refusing to decide on the merits joining James McManis in hurting Applicant/Petitioner all rights a human may have.	15
A. "Distribution for conference" of Petition No.25-1345 that was set within 6 days following docketing must be vacated for violation of Due Process, 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) and Rule 15.5.....	16
<i>V. Five of them had been at default</i> <i>p. 18</i>	
<i>VI. The named Justices are officers of American Inns of Court Cases and conspired in concealing name of Jam McManis & his partner</i>	
Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal 1941; Hall v. Superior Court, 198 Cal. 373 (1926).....	<i>p. 19</i> 3
Aetna Life Ins. Co. 106 S Ct. 1580, 89.	3
Berger.....	14
Berger v. U.S., 255 US 22 (1921).....	2
Bradley v School Bd. Of City of Richmond, 324 F. Supp.439 (E.D. Virginia 1971))	3

<i>Exxon Mobil Corporation v. Ford</i> , 204 Md.App. 274 (2012).....	3
<i>Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County</i> , 2 Ca.App.5th 10, 39 and 40 (2016).....	7
<i>In re Grand Jury Proceedings</i> , C.A.10 2010, 616 F.3d 1186	15
<i>Morse v. Lewis</i> , 54 F.2d 1027.....	2
Order of 12/15/2020.....	7
<i>United States v. District Court for Southern District of New York</i> , 334 U.S. 258 (1948)	13
<i>United States v. Will</i> (449 US 200, 101 S. Ct. 471 (1980),	2
<i>Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.</i> (1991) 234, Cal.App.3d 415.....	7
<i>Will</i>	14
Statutes	
18 U.S.C. §§242, 241, 1506, 1512(b) and (c), 2071(b), 1001, 1962	16
18 U.S.C. §242.....	15
28 U.S.C. §455.....	2, 3
28 U.S.C. §455(a) and §455(b)(5)(i)	11
Rules Enabling Act	15
Other Authorities	
Constitutional Due Process	11
Rules	
FRAP 35.....	3, 16
Rule 15.5	15
Rule 22	11
Rules of the Supreme Court Rule 15.5	16
Supreme Court's Guidance on Scheduling	16

I.

I. All Justices named here must be recused pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) as they are opposing parties in Applicant's RICO complaint which is at issue for this Petition.

All justices named above are defendants of Applicant's RICO complaint which is directly at issue as Question Presented No. 3 for this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (25-1345), i.e., for the RICO Complaint shown in ECF 4 of Shao v. Roberts, et.al. with U.S.D.C. for the D.C. in case no.24-2814 which was dismissed crazily by Judge Jia M. Cobb within 4 hours of case docketing.

The eight named Justices (other than Justice Barrett) were sued for having conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal 17 times in order to retain illegally their voting rights to block Petitioner/Applicant's grievances seeking.

Malice for such conspiracies was shown when many of them knew to recuse themselves in Petition No.20-524 but failed to decide each of their recusal in Petition No.21-881 and No.22-28 such that there is a reasonable appearance to the public that the named Justices had malice to use illegal voting to block Applicant's civil right to access this courts on the key common goals of the American Inns of Court Enterprise manipulated by James McManis in the two Petitions. Petition No.21-881 is regarding corruptive Prefiling Vexatious Litigant Order and conspired dismissal of Shao v. McManis Faulkner, James McManis, Michael Reedy, and Catherine Bechtel (Santa Clara County Superior Court 2012-1-cv-220751)) and Petition No.22-28, as the final efforts of Petitioner to seek child custody back.

Therefore, all eight justices reasonably appeared to have been

participating the racketeering activities of the American Inns of Court Enterprise for accomplishing the common goals of permanent parental deprivation, judicial child custody, permanent robbery of all assets, including all bank accounts and bar license, permanent restriction of liberty to cause complete destruction of the life, liberty and property of Applicant/Petitioner that they must be disqualified under 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) as both the parties against Applicant/Petitioner, as well as an officer of American Inns of Court that is a defendant/respondent for QUESTION PRESENTED NOS. 2 and 3.

In addition, all named Justices have direct conflicts of interest in this Petition and Application as they defendants in the new RICO complaint filed as the First Amended Complaint (separated by the clerk into four documents: ECF 11, ECF 11-1, ECF 12 and ECF 12-1) with the U.S.D.C. for Maryland in No.26-1556

There were about 17 conspiracies among almost all justices named here that each would retain illegal voting power by not deciding on recusal.

A. All named Justices knew or should have known that they were casting illegal votes in the Petitions filed by Applicant/Petitioner.

Each of them have done many recusals. They should have been very familiar with judicial disqualification laws.

The US Supreme Court held in *Berger v. U.S.*, 255 US 22 (1921) that the judge shall proceed no further after a party files an affidavit for judicial recusal/disqualification asserting bias and prejudice. See also, in *United States v. Will* (449 US 200, 101 S. Ct. 471 (1980), the Supreme Court held that “In federal courts generally, when an individual judge is disqualified from a

particular case by reason of 28 U.S.C. §455, the disqualified judge simply steps aside.

The judge **must retire from trial, if affidavit is sufficient on its face.** *Morse v. Lewis*, 54 F.2d 1027 (4th Cir. 1932). If affidavits have met standards of statute governing disqualification of judge on ground of personal bias or prejudice, then the judge **must recuse himself even if the allegations are known by the judge to be false.** See, e.g., *Bradley v School Bd. Of City of Richmond*, 324 F. Supp.439 (E.D. Virginia 1971))

Furthermore, **all eight justices** have the history of conspired in each not deciding recusal for 17 occasions in about 10 cases in order to retain their purported voting right, which violated prevailing laws. They had each violated Constitutional Due Process and 28 U.S.C. §455 by casting votes pending judicial disqualification and avoided deciding the grievances of the Petitioner/Applicant.

A disqualified judge's vote is mere surplusage. *Aetna Life Ins. Co.* 106 S Ct. 1580, 89. FRAP 35 was amended that a disqualified judge was not included in determining the number of judge required to order a case to be heard.

A disqualified judge may not decide; see *Exxon Mobil Corporation v. Ford*, 204 Md.App. 274 (2012). See, also, *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal*, 17 Cal.2d 280(1941); *Hall v. Superior Court*, 198 Cal. 373 (1926).

B. Each of Justices conspired to misrepresenting laws on lack of quorum in the November 2023 Code of Judicial Conduct.

The court has blocked all filings from Petitioner in all these Petitions since 20-524 that contained the correct laws on lack of quorum as designed by the Congress. The only pleading that skipped and allowed on the docket was the discussion in Petition for Rehearing filed in Petition No.21-881. That is the

Supreme Court discussion in *United States v. District Court for Southern District of New York*, 334 U.S. 258 (1948). The Supreme Court stated the Congress-designed procedure in lack of quorum as below:

“it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, **the case shall be immediately certified by the Supreme Court to the circuit court of appeals** of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought which court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to hear and determine the appeal in such case, and it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge of said circuit court of appeals, **qualified** to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, to designate immediately three circuit judges of said court, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the court, so comprised, to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to hear and determine the same, and the decision of the three circuit judges so designated, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.”

Moreover, for Petition for Writ of Mandate or Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, especially for the later that is in Article 2, §9 of the US Constitution, a justice may decide under Rule 22. See 28 U.S.C. §§2241, 2242, 2243, 2254(a). Rules Enabling Act disallows US Supreme court to create rules in conflict of these Statute and Constitution.

All Justices under the leadership of Chief Justice Roberts conspired in misleading the public the correct laws on lack of quorum, appearing for the purpose to cover up the illegal orders misstating the laws on lack of quorum in Petition Nos. 20-524, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617.

II. Chief Justice Roberts and all named associate Justices

committed about 470+ incidents of crimes of 18 U.S.C. §§241, 242, 1001, 1506, 1512(b) and (c), 2071(b), and 1962, when he was personally involved in judicial child kidnapping and permanent parental deprivation by altering the name of Application for Emergency Relief (14A617 and Petition No.14-7244) to be Application for Stay, in deliberate disregard how Lydia suffered in having to live in horror with her father that is a dangerous psychotic who may kill himself and her any time, when Dr. Jeffery Kline's affidavit was submitted along with the professional supervisor's affidavit was submitted about how terrible a child had suffered, when the law mandates immediate child custody change to Petitioner/Applicant.

Chief Justice Roberts is supervising the Clerk's Office and many named Associate Justices conspired in

- (1) As conceded by ex-California Chief Justice Tani Cantial-Sakauye, she and James McManis and retired Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, Roberts conspired in continuous judicial child kidnapping and permanent parental deprivation by influencing Supreme Court Justices to use "summary denial" to block Applicant's civil rights to seek grievances (access to the courts). Roberts conspired in summarily denial orders for Petition No.11-11119, 14-1724, 14A617,17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613 and 22-28.
- (2) **Chief Justice Roberts is personally involved with judicial child kidnapping and permanent parental deprivation in 2014 and 2015 by forging court record in altering the name of "Application for Emergency Relief" in Petition No.14-7244 and 14A677 to be "Application to Stay", which based made based on CIGNA Health Insurance's indisputable subpoenaed production of 275 pages of Wang's**

psychological insurance claim records where it showed that Wang has concealed his dangerous mental disorder that may kill himself and his surroundings any time.

- (3) Chief Justice conspired with California Supreme Court and Court of Appeal Sixth District in concealing the names of James McManis and his partners from being shown on the dockets as being Respondents. These cases include Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, 20-524, 21-881 and 22-350. All the corresponding cases at California Supreme Court and California Sixth District Court of Appeal also concealed the names of James Mcmanis and his partners.
- (4) Roberts further conspired with the Associate Justices Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Elena Kagan, Sonia Sotamayer, Neil Gorsuch and Kevin Kavanaugh in each not deciding on his/her recusal, in order to retain his/her voting rights to vote summary denial in Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800, 19-613. As of December 2020, there were nine (9) conspiracies among all Justices in each not deciding his/her recusal in order to illegally retain voting rights. As of present, there were 17 incidents of such conspiracies among all justices except Justice Barrett.

In 21-881, except Chief Justice Roberts, all other seven Justices except Barrett conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal.

In 22-28, all Justices except Barrett also did the same conspiracy.

In 23-6140 and 23A617, Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kantaji Brown Jackson continued the legacy of not deciding recusal.

- (5) Regarding the crimes of 18 U.S.C. §242 in (2) where each of the Justices conspired in each not deciding recusal in order to do illegal voting,

Applicant filed her first Shao v. Roberts, et. al. with the U.S.D.C. for the D.C. (1:18-cv-01233RC) where all 8 Justices were at default, in the hands of God. They are present five Justices, Roberts, Alito, Clarence, Kagan, and Sotomayor, and two retired Justice—Anthony M. Kennedy and Stephen Breyer and a deceased Justice – Ruth Bader Ginsberg.

- (6) In 20-524, which is an appeal from the conspired dismissal of Appeal No.19-5014 by the D.C. Circuit, an appeal from Judge Rudolph Contreras's conspired sua sponte dismissal in 1:18-cv-01233, Chief Justice Roberts **forged 12/14/2020 Order, played a mail hijacking on 1/8/2021 in blocking Applicant's mail** from San Francisco that contained Petition for Rehearing from 12/14/2020 Order and Second Request for Recusal of Justice Neil Gorsuch and Justice Bret Kavanaugh, **which was the first time that they conspired to forbear Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding the Petition.** This is the first time of mail fraud.

- (7) Learning from James McManis's stalker that Applicant was writing a letter to each member of the Congress, from 1/12/2021 to 1/17/2021, the order or mandate in 20-524 was taken off three times and put back three times, with six(6) alterations of the docket of 20-524. Please see the uncontested or admitted evidence in Request for Recusal that was filed in Petition No.21-881. See also undisputed ECF 161, 161-1 and 161-5 in Shao v. Roberts, et. al. (1:18-cv-01233RC at the U.S.D.C. for the D.C.)

The hijacked mail resumed tracking record on 1/16/2021 after they rushed a mandate on 1/15/2021, despite the Court was fully appraised of the fact that mailing postage date constitutes filing date and that the two pleadings had been in mail.

- (8) Regarding child custody order appeal, i.e., Petition No.18-569, the justices conspired in each not deciding his/her recusal in order to illegally retain their voting rights to vote for summary denial such as to satisfy James McManis's common goals of **judicial child kidnapping** and Permanent parental deprival. The justices further conspired in not deciding Amicus Curiae Motion of Mothers of Lost Children. Chief Justice Roberts demonstrated his personal involvement by purging the court record of the Amicus Curiae motion that was duly filed on November 8, 2018. Such fraud is shown on the face of the docket 18-569 in that there was an attorney's appearance of Christopher Katzenbach for Amicus Curiae Mother of Lost Children but no paper. The court record purging date is after May 2019.
- (9) The justices conspired the 12/15/2020 order by falsifying lack of quorum being the ground of not deciding the Petition, which was actually wrong and a misleading statement of law, and thus conspired in each "took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition." In fact, such "took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition" caused a legal effect of concession to all verified statements for recusal filed in 12/15/2020 to become truth or facts. See, e.g., *Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.* (1991) 234, Cal.App.3d 415 and *Hayward v. Superior Court of Napa County*, 2 Ca..App.5th 10, 39 and 40 (2016)

The conspired Order of 12/15/2020 in Petition No.20-524 reads:

"Because the Court lacks a quorum, 28 U. S. C. §1, and since the qualified Justices are of the opinion that the case cannot be heard and determined at the next Term of the Court, the judgment is affirmed under 28 U. S. C. §2109, which provides that under these circumstances "the court shall enter its order affirming the

judgment of the court from which the case was brought for review with the same effect as upon affirmance by an equally divided court." **The Chief Justice, Justice Thomas, Justice Breyer, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor, and Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.**" [emphasis added]

See ECF 161-5 for the Petition for Rehearing and Motion to File Petition for Rehearing, Shao v. Roberts, et.al.1:18-cv-01233RC. Please also see the correct legal authority in case of lack of quorum that was presented in "PETITION FOR REHEARING [REQUEST TO GRANT PETITIONER'S MOTION TO TRANSFER COURT TO SECOND CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL SUBMITTED ON 12/10/2022" that was filed in Petition No.21-881.

To sum up, 28 U. S. C. §2109 has two opposite paragraphs. The author of this order was very unprofessional and below the standard for misstating the law in the 12/15/2020 order for 20-524. Yet, all Justices conspired in using recusal in order to conspire no decision on the merits, and for the first time, recused themselves by "took no part in".

The correct law should be the Supreme Court certified appeal to a neutral senior judge at a Court of Appeal who forms a panel and conduct review, as already passed by the Congress, according to Supreme Court's holding and reasoning in *United States v. District Court for Southern District of New York*, 334 U.S. 258 (1948) and the Congressional public policy in must review an appeal in *United States v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200 (1980). See Petition for Rehearing filed in No,21-881, which mentioned a filing of Motion to Transfer Court which was concealed from being shown on the docket.

- (10) In Petition for Writ of Certiorari in No.21-881, an appeal from conspired dismissal order and vexatious litigant order in Shao v. Mcmanis Faulkner,

LLP, James McManis, Michael Reedy and Catherine Bechtel, for the first time, Chief Justice Roberts conceded to his relationship with James McManis and his conflicts of interest.

He delayed five months in recusing himself; yet the other six Associate Justices conspired in each not deciding on R.R. even though they knew they should do as what they did in 20-524, in an apparent purpose to retain their illegal voting right such as to “deny” and “close” the case.

On March 22, 2022, before the conspired case closure, the court **removed** from the docket **the Petition for Rehearing** which was duly filed on March 18, 2022. See the docket alteration evidence in <https://onedrive.live.com/?q=21881&searchScope=all&mkt=en-US&lc=1033&id=%2Fpersonal%2F0e631fd091ed30a4%2FDocuments%2F21881%2Fconcealed%20unfiled%20motions%2F21881%20docket%20removed%20from%20filing%20the%20rehearing%2Epdf&parentview=7>

The seven other Associate Justices who conspired in each not deciding recusal in order to case their votes to case closure instead of reversing the Certiorari denial order of 2/22/2022, knowing the laws require automatic setting aside of 2/22/2022 order denying certiorari where Roberts participated in voting, but chose to close the case. They are: Associate Justices Samuel Alito, Clarence Thomas, Elena Kagan, Sonia Sotomayor, Stephen Breyer, Neil Gorsuch and Bret Kavanaugh.

- (11) Regarding the illegal closure of 21-881, Chief Justice conspired in blocking the filing of 28 USC §1651 Petition for Writ of Mandate to reopen 21-881 for eight (8) times from 2022 through 2024.

The PWM to reopen 21-881 Petition, without appendix can be seen here:

<https://1drv.ms/b/c/0e631fd091ed30a4/IQckMO2R0B9jIIAO2AEAAAAAAWi5TuE3fbbkz4bX-I44Xmo?e=glbw0o>

(12) In conspiracy to robbery of Applicant's California bar license, Chief

Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. blocked four(4) years to disallow review. (a)

Roberts persisted on not filing at least eight (8) times of Applicant's

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in 2023:

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgwovuKDAVAJCRI80?e=A8Vpyk>,
and its Appendix:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgw1VM6CRnk6JpchG?e=h4Q4d7>

Supplement to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgxonPOBrBZ0E8zw8?e=G92U24>

Application for Emergency Stay, Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgwuLEvVsXqmqw6l0?e=PDPhzH>

Supplement to Application for Emergency Stay, Emergency Relief to Justice Amy Coney Barrett filed on March 18, 2023, re-filed on April 3, 2023 (Without knowing return of Petition for Writ of habeas Corpus)

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgxhh6wzHhXW3J96n?e=R2LcPR>

Second Supplement to Application

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOgxmg5cnwD6fsJ2n?e=WjM6Bg>

Third Supplement to Application Part 1:

<https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOg1XxzcMB6alkmAtw?e=961qPw>

Part 2: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!AqQw7ZHQH2MOg1XxzcMB6alkmAtw?e=Jyo9VY>

As Chief Justice Roberts kept returning the PWHC, the Application to Justice

Barrett was supplemented three times.

- (b) In **Petition No.22-28**, as the last effort to release Applicant's daughter back from judicial kidnapping, Chief Justice Roberts again conspired with **all** Associate Justices, except Justice Barrett, to **vehemently block Justice Barrett from being able to decide Applicant's application**, and concealed Applicant's filing for Amended Application to Justice Barrett, in order to accomplish James McManis's common goal of permanent judicial child kidnapping and permanent parental deprivation, as any neutral justice would have return child custody back to Applicant.

In creating a ground to return filing, Emergency Applicant clerk Robert Meek sent an email to Applicant on 11/22/2022 which showed an antedated denial of rehearing on 11/21/2022 as a ground to return unfiled the 8th Application to Justice Amy Coney Barrett for 22-28. Robert Meek disclosed his fraudulent return notice was coached by a "
", who is likely the name of Roberts.

- (c) When **Petition No. 22-350** also mentioned the bar license robbery issue, all Justices conspired in not deciding by an anonymous order of "lack of quorum" with misstatement of the laws. This time the court omitted stating 28 U.S.C. §2019, but stated:

"Because the Court lacks a quorum, 28 U. S. C. §1, it is unable to take action on this petition, and the case is considered closed. The Chief Justice, Justice Thomas, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor, Justice Kagan, and Justice Kavanaugh are recused."

- (d) The second round of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was amended to Petition for a Writ of Mandamus and filed on 11/20/2023 as Petition No.23-6140, including the issues of illegal bar license suspension and the attempted robbery by Alameda County Court. While Applicant filed her Request for Recusal of other Justices in 23-6140 proceeding, but the court concealed Justice Elena Kagan's recusal order to be in Application No.

23A617.

Pending judicial recusal, in disregard of 28 U.S.C. §455(a) and §455(b)(5)(i) and Constitutional Due Process, Justice Neil Gorsuch failed to decide his recusal but conspired with Chief Justice to summarily deny Applicant's Application for Emergency Relief to Justice Barrett, in violation of Rule 22 then the court conspired in barring Justice Barrett from deciding the Application by setting for conference, just like in 22-28, Justice Barrett.

(13) Chief Justice Roberts conspired in concealing filing of Petition for Rehearing in 23-6140, which was shown in ECF 101¹, in Ninth Circuit, Appeal No.22-15857, but not shown in the dockets for Petition No. 23-6140 and 23A617.

From 11/26/2024 until May 17, 2026, with fifteen (15) times's submission of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, the Court eventually docketed the Petition on June 3, 2026. Petitioner/Applicant was illegally barred from filing Applications to Justice Barrett on November 26, 2024 when it was properly made pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2242. Yet, this Court violated Rules Enabling Act by using unwritten Rules of Supreme Court to violate 28 U.S.C. §2242.

Nevertheless, while the Petition covers two appeals at the Ninth circuit (22-15857) and DC Circuit (25-7004) due to the long delay, **the Supreme Court only posted App.1 through 4 and omitted App.5 through 170.** Also, **for almost all Requests for Recusal, the Court conspired in concealing all Appendixes.** See the complete Appendix in Appendix

¹ See ECF 101 also in

<https://1drv.ms/b/c/0e631fd091ed30a4/IQckMO2R0B9jIIAOrwIAAAAAAXYb29fXc18wY0PFGtC24tU?e=0aHGfv>

<https://1drv.ms/b/c/0e631fd091ed30a4/IQC-HFpaXjaMRruUDvwuYedFAT-eya8MY8dI4MZBGJOB2Lg?e=qxtzr>

- (14) On June 9, 2026, merely 6 days following docketing this Petition, the court conspired in blocking Justice Barrett from deciding the Petition by discriminatively prematurely sending for conference, with at least 45 days' advancement, acting as it they were attorneys for all Respondents, which are 200+.
- (15) After making so many false anonymous orders in betraying their Constitutional duty to decide, Chief Justice presented misleading laws on lack of quorum in Supreme Court's Code of Judicial Conduct in November 2023 in omission of the Congress-made procedure of certifying appeal to a neutral senior judge at a Court of Appeal to allow an appellate review that was stated in *United States v. District Court for Southern District of New York*, 334 U.S. 258 (1948).
- (16) From almost 14 or 15 return notices for this last round of Petition, Chief Justice just wanted to block Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding in order to continue obstructing justice to ensure Applicant to have permanent parental deprivation and permanent robbery with numerous attempted murders. Chief Justice blocked Associate Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding Applicant's Application at least 45 times since 20-524.
- (17) There were about 6 to eight pleadings concealed from filing in each of 21-881, 22-28, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617. Almost all appendixes for each of the 17 Requests for Recusal were omitted from being shown on the docket.
- (18) After blocking 1.5 years' filing, within six days of this Petition's

docketing, on June 9, 2026, the docket showed the Petition is distributed for conference on June 25, 2026, which violated Due Process, Rule 15.5, when all Justices except Justice Barrett are parties in the proceedings of Shao v. Roberts, et.al that 28 U.S.C. §455(b)(5)(i) mandated to be disqualified, while the returning notices in the past 1.5 years clearly showed the reason of blocking filings was to block Justice Amy Coney Barrett from deciding the grievances.

III. Associate Justice Neil Gorsuch expressed violated Due Process, Rule 15.5 and Guidance on Scheduling and 28 U.S.C.455 by usurping Justice Amy Coney Barrett's judicial post to block her from deciding 23A617

Justice Gorsuch has a history of knowingly disregarding Constitutional Due Process and in contempt of 28 U.S.C.§455(a) and (b)(5)(i) in No.23A617 where he willfully refused to decide his own recusal and *pending judicial disqualification*, he not only did not stand aside as required by the Supreme Court holdings in *Berger, Will, supra*, but proactively, deliberately, denied Application No.23A617 summarily and prematurely in violation of Rule 15.5, to show his summary denial on the date of docketing, when that application was expressly designated for Justice Amy Coney Barrett.

As stated above, Justice Gorsuch also conspired in each not deciding recusal in Petition 21-881 and Petition 22-28 in order to vote closure of the key petitions to accomplish the most important common goals of the American Inns of Court enterprise as manipulated by James McManis.

IV. The June 9, 2026 setting of June 25, 2026 Conference appears

to be another predicate act of the Justices' attempt illegal voting again, after this Court had forged misleading orders in Petition Nos. 20-524, 21-881, 22-350, 23-6140 and 23A617 in refusing to decide on the merits joining James McManis in hurting Applicant/Petitioner all rights a human may have.

They continue perpetrate fraud in this case. After conspiring delaying 1.5 years in blocking Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2242 by violation of Rules Enabling Act, in asserting that Supreme Court Rules does NOT have an application for Writ of Habeas Corpus, then blocked filing of this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus until June 3, 2026. Yet, on June 9, 2026 at 11:11 a.m., knowing this Petition is not suitable for a conference as they all have direct conflicts of interest, they conspired quick dismissal to suppress this case by illegally distribute for conference, before the opposing parties had a chance to voice their opposition, in violation of Due Process and Rule 15.5 and Guidance on Scheduling.

They had conspired in violating Rule 15.5 as a predicate act to dismiss the cases early on almost each Petition for Rehearing for each of the Petitions filed by Petitioner. For example, for the Petition for Rehearing in Petition No. 17-256, the Conference was immediately set on the ensuing date of filing, when Rule 15.5 requires minimum 14 days after Opposition due dates, and Guidance on Scheduling is 14 days plus 14 days, 28 days.

- A. "Distribution for conference" of Petition No. 25-1345 that was set within 6 days following docketing must be vacated for violation of Due Process, 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(i) and Rule 15.5**

As mentioned in Section I.E. and I.F. above, under 28 U.S.C. § 2072, Rules Enabling act bars Supreme Court from any practice or any rules that are **inconsistent with statutes or Constitution** and shall not abridge, enlarge, or

modify any substantive right. *See, Sibbach, supra, Lawyers for Fair Reciprocal Admission, supra.* In the past 1.5 years of attempting to file the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Supreme court administration, Chief Justice and Clerk's Office, all were made known that Justice Barrett was the only Justice who had no conflicts of interest and the only one justice who is qualified to decide Applicant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Rules Enabling Act should invalidate their "Distributed for conference" on June 9, 2026 at 11:11 a.m. as this violated Rule 15.5 as Rule 15.5 prescribes the earliest time to distribute a Petition for conference being 14 days following due date to respond and calculation of time for allowing appeal, such as the time for allowing district court to extend the time for filing a notice of appeal, is included in Rules Enabling Act. *See, In re Grand Jury Proceedings, C.A.10 2010, 616 F.3d 1186*

Take Petition 17-256 as an example, the Petition for Rehearing was distributed for conference on the ensuing date of filing, in direct violation of Rule 15.5 and Guidance on Scheduling, for the apparent conspiracy of quick closing, a crime of 18 U.S.C. §242.

It indicates that Chief Justice Roberts was acting as if he were a lawyer for all Respondents and could not wait to dismiss the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus after he had committed federal crimes of 18 U.S.C. §§242, 241, 1506, 1512(b) and (c), 2071(b), 1001, 1962 for 14-15 times in the past 1.5 years on this Petition alone.

Rules of the Supreme Court Rule 15.5 states:

"5. The Clerk will distribute the petition to the Court for its consideration **upon receiving an express waiver of the right to file a brief in opposition**, or, if no waiver or brief in opposition is filed, **upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing**. If a brief in opposition is

timely filed, the Clerk will distribute the petition, brief in opposition, and any reply brief to the Court for its consideration no less than 14 days after the brief in opposition is filed, unless the petitioner expressly waives the 14-day waiting period.”

Supreme Court’s Guidance on Scheduling also shows that the earliest time for distribution for conference being 14 days following opposition due date or waiver filing date.

All respondents have not responded yet. Chief Justice Roberts’ own attorney, U.S. General Solicitor had not filed any waiver yet. Further, as discussed above in the section of “Jurisdiction” from pages 3 to 9 of this Application, Distribution for conference of this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is improper and ILLEGAL as all other Justices’ votes could not be counted in determining the required quorum. *Aetna Life Ins. Co., supra* (A disqualified judge’s vote is mere surplusage.); FRAP 35.

As the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus can be decided by a Justice, the Application No. 25A1382 that was filed on May 19, 2026 would not have the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus decided by a Conference when an Application is on file.

All the other justices may not decide. *Abelleira, supra*.

As all other justices are disqualified, Constitutional Due Process mandates that this Petition No.25-1345 can only be decided by Justice Amy Coney Barrett alone, without a conference.

V. Five of them had been at default in the first case of Shao v. Roberts, et. Al. where the court conspired in creating anonymous orders with misleading statement of laws on lack of quorum in Petition No.20-524 and 22-350.

VI. The named justices who are officers of American Inns of Court or were sponsored their judicial seats by the American Inns of court all conspired in concealing the names of James Mcmanis and his partners from the case dockets, including Petition Nos. 17-82, 17-256, 18-344, 18-800, 21-881.

Any reasonable persons knowing all the facts above will believe that
Petitioner/Applicant Yi Tai Shao is

impossible ~~to~~ ~~have~~ have an impartial decision at a conference, that a conference will never resolve the writ of habeas corpus, and that all these Justices must be recused. They knew the only qualified Justice to decide is Justice Amy Coney Barrett and have conspired in vehemently blocking her from deciding for 47 times causing severe suspension on Petitioner's Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Due to James McManis's hackers' intensive hacking, this page is finalized by handwriting.

Petitioner / Applicant swears under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the U.S.A that the foregoing is all true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: June 13, 2026

Yi Tai Shao 
Linda Yi Tai Shao