


25-5335

No: USCA7 24-1803

ORIGINAL




In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States Supreme Court

Case 24-1803

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

**Xena Ames – Pro Se
10090 Eagle Eye Way
Indianapolis, Indiana 46234**



Question Presented

- 1.) Whether the issuance of a writ of mandamus is the proper procedure to correct a clear abuse of discretion by the trial court, due to erroneous issues with ineffective counsel.
- 2.) Whether the lower courts erred in fact and law and abused their discretion.

Parties to the proceeding

Xena Ames was an employee of The Department of Veteran Affairs, FedEx and Commonwealth who rightfully used the EEOC equal employment opportunity commission and even in doing so was fired from her job while protected by the EEOC.

Respondents:

FedEx: Employees Barbara Hutchinson, David Murtland, Chris Pipes, Josh (Managers)

Commonwealth Hotels: Kim (HR), Sarah (Manager) and Linda (employee)

Lodge Members: Jornette Holmes, Jocelyn Miller, Tamika Dickerson, Rodney Jackson and Xenisha Hawkins, Mildred Craig. (Family & Lodge members).

Attorney Office: Paul Cummings & Ana Sifuentes (Attorney & Assistant)

The Department of Veteran Affairs: Non-VA CARE Mitchell Metcalf (Lodge member & employee). The United States Military Unit: Cpt. Vargas and Sgt. Ferguson

Witnesses: Will be subpoenaed

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

In the Marion County Superior Court 6-24-24

DENIED ATTORNEY WITHDRAWAL.

- 1:21: cv-02652-MPB-KMB State of Indiana Summons 49D11-2106CT-o18457 Jocelyn Miller & Tamika Dickerson, Appearance of Attorney in Civil Case Attorney Cummings Hennsworth Cummings and Page. Appearance of Attorney in Civil Case on behalf of Jocelyn Miller,

Final Judgement As all issues have been finally resolved. (Court Errored) 4-24 24
Appeal Court 24-1804

- 1:21: cv-02652-MPB-KMB Public Docket U. S District Court Southern District Of Indiana Civil Docket For Case # 1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB. Filed 10-15-21 Terminated: 04/24/24
Xena Ames – Plaintiff – Represented by Paul Cummings
Federal Express Corporation- Defendant- Represented by Brandon D. Pettes

Notice of Appeal Xena Ames V. Barbara Hutchinson Cause No: 1:19 -cv 04282-JRS-MPB (Court erred this case was against FedEx) Appeal Court 24-1803

- Notice of Appeal Xena Ames V. Barbara Hutchinson
Cause No: 1:19 -cv 04282-JRS-MPB
Xena Ames – Plaintiff – Represented by Paul Cummings
Federal Express Corporation- Defendant- Represented by Pamela A. Paige
- ON THE SAME DAY THE CASE WAS DENIED May 9th

Protective Order David Murtland – Police Officer, no attorney appearance 1:21-cv-02652-JPH-DML- Denied 06-07-22

Xena Ames v. Commonwealth EEOC Charging No. 470-2025-00145

Other Related Cases:

- Department Of Veteran Affairs case 200J-0583-2012101769 6-7- 2012, Jay Meisenholder, Notice of acceptance of EEO Complaint- subjected to a hostile
- Xena Ames v. Department Of Veteran Affairs case
EEOC No. 470-2013-00090X
agency number 200J-0583-2012101769 May 11, 2012, Rosemary Dettling
EEOC No. 470-2013- 00080X
Agency number 200J-0326- 2012101769 First set of discovery
- U. S Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Eric Shinseki
Secretary, United States Department of Veteran Affairs Docket No. 470-
2013-00080X 11-12-13
Rosemary Dettling, ESQ Complainants Attorney. Chadwick C. Duran Staff
Attorney for Department Veteran Affairs
- U. S Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Eric Shinseki
Secretary, United States Department of Veteran Affairs Docket No. 470-
2013-00080X 11-12-13
Prehearing Order 11-5-6-2013. Location: Richard L. Roudebush V.A Medical
Center 1481 West 10th St. Room C-1051 (first floor C-Wing) Indianapolis,
Indiana. (This was not a real trial and that's part of the reason the
harassment is still happening today). Michelle Metcalfe, lodge member,
was ordered to testify. Signed by Judge Johanna Philhower Maple.
- Digitization of Complaint File ORM Investigation Manager 12-31-2012
- Xena Ames v. Federal Express Corporation EEOC Charge No: 470-2021-
01104 FEDEX File: 255661 6-18-21
- Morgan Stanley Representative Brian David Blanker STE 1200 101 W. Big
Beaver Rd. Troy Mi 48084 -5295

Reports:

- Memorandum 2-9-2012 Fired due to defendants reading medical records
and picking fights- signed by Paul Pessagno (Department of Veteran
Affairs).
- Witness Statement- Sandra Stroy 10-12-12
- Patient Advocate Office Intake Form- filed against Barbara Hutchinson
Filed on 12/07/18.
- Another Medical Record Breach filed a medical record concern with the
Department of Veterans Affairs 9/7/22. Tara Ducoli Privacy Officer

- Office of the Indiana Attorney General Xena Ames v. Department of Veteran of Affairs File No. 12-CP-56969. DENIED. Send me back to the Department of Veteran Affairs.
- In 2017 the Lodge wrote a letter stating that they did not want this issue brought up again signed by Grand Master. However, this issue continues to be a problem. If I brought this up again I would be suspended. Letter attached.
- Indiana Department of Labor was notified for cheating Plaintiff out of wages they were notified on 12/17/24. Company has until 1/27/25.

Tortuous Behavior throughout this case:

- Blood Work changed to indicate that Plaintiff has Herpes.
- Endometrial Biopsy was done removing my ability to have children and causing a growth in my stomach on top of issues in colonoscopy.
- Harassing my son since elementary school, trying to prime kids to be gay.
- Burning out the plaintiffs natural hair. (pictures).
- Causing injury to plaintiff's eyes and sending her to hospital resulted in missing work.
- Hacking into my email accounts and sharing information "USB STICK"
- Causing injury to my 2 boys children's hair and causing permanent injuries to kids.
- Using nearby neighbors to watch and torture plaintiff, putting rats in home.
- Intruding upon my medical records and using my medical prescribed deodorant as a tactic to cause harm. (picture submitted).

Money Stolen from banks and home.

- MetLife, Morgan Stanley and USAA these accounts are missing
- Hendricks County Sheriff Department ORI IN 0320000 Fraudulent charges on checking accounts and credit cards. Potential harassment also.
- Detective Tyree reported money being stolen out of my account (317) 745-4270
- Theft case report HP210002643-001 Nathan Hibschiman
- Stealing Mortgage payments in the amount of \$29,000 now a report is coming to the home with \$0 balance.

- Hendricks County Communications Center Call # 172501299
- Hendricks Police Case number HP230002952-001 Burglary
- Forum Credit Union monthly withdrawals from veteran benefits

Overall, you can't get justice if the police and government workers cover-up everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion Below.....	Pg. 11
Jurisdiction	Pg. 11
Constitutional and Statutory provisions involved.....	Pg. 12
Statement of the Case.....	Pg. 12
Reasons for granting the Writ of Mandamus.....	Pg. 44
Conclusion.....	Pg. 44

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendices A United States District Southern District of Indiana Pages.....	(139)
Appendices B United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit Pages...	(15)
Appendices C Marion County Superior Court.....	(23)
Appendices D Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Pages.....	(24)
Appendices E Department of Veteran Pages.....	Proof of the Case (CD)
Appendices F Hendrick County Sheriff Department Pages.....	(13)

Appendices B United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit Pages...	(15)
Appendices C Marion County Superior Court.....	(23)
Appendices D Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Pages.....	(24)
Appendices E Department of Veteran Pages.....Proof of the Case (CD)	
Appendices F Hendrick County Sheriff Department Pages.....	(13)
Appendices G Miscellaneous Documents Pages.....	(32)
Appendices H Family Court Documents Pages.....	(29)
Appendices I Life Insurance Documents Pages.....	(1)
Appendices J Injury to petitioners Pages	(21)
Appendices K Commonwealth Pages.....	(37)
Appendices L Cease and Desist Letters.....	(5)
Appendices M Blackmail Letter from FEDEX.....	(2)
Appendices N Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or disability.....	(6)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Act of 1990 (ADA), Pub L. No. 101-336 Stat. 327 (42 U.S.C, 12101 et. Seq.....Pg. 2	
42 U.S.C 12111 (b) (1).....	Pg. 2

ADAAA Pub L. No 110-325, 122 Stat. 3553.....	Pg. 3
ADAAA & 2 (a) (4) -7 and (b) (2)- (5), 122 Stat 3553-3554.....	Pg. 3
42 U.S.C 12112 (a).....	Pg. 3
42 U.S.C 12112 (b).....	Pg. 3
42 U.S.C 12111 (2).....	Pg. 3
42 U.S.C 12111 (8)	Pg. 3
42 U.S.C 12102 (3).....	Pg. 4
42 U.S.C 12102 (1)	Pg. 4
42 U.S.C 2000e-5(b).....	Pg. 4
42 U.S.C 2000e-5 (e) (1).....	Pg.4
42 U.S.C 2000e-5 (f) (1)	Pg. 4
29 CFR 1601.28 (a) (1)	Pg. 4
42 U.S.C 2000e-5 (f) (1) (3).....	Pg. 4
Ledbetter Fair Pay Act Pub L. No. 111-2, & 3, 123 Stat. 5-6 amended section 2000e-5	Pg. 4
42 U.S.C 2000e-5 (e) (3) (A)	Pg. 5
Title I of the ADA Fair Pay Act & 5 (a), 123 Stat 6.....	Pg. 5

Kerr v. United States District Court 426 U.S 394,403,96 S.Ct.2119, 2114,48 L .Ed 2d 725(1976).....	Pg. 5
Allied Chemical Corp v. Daiflon, Inc 449 U.S 33,35, 101, S. Ct 188 190, 66, L. Ed 2d. 193 (1980).....	Pg. 5
28 U.S.C & 2674	Pg. 6
28 U.S.C & 5001.....	Pg. 6
28 U.S.C & 2254.....	Pg. 6
18 U.S.C & 1341.....	Pg. 8
42 U.S. Code &132od-6.....	Pg. 8
Health Insurance Portability and accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).....	Pg. 9
28 U.S.C & 4101.....	Pg. 9
19 U.S.C & 482	Pg. 9
18 U.S.C & 641.....	Pg. 10
18 U.S.C & 371 conspiring to violate & 17 and 24.....	Pg. 11
18 U.S.C & 134.....	Pg.11
Pinkerton v. United States 328 U.S 64, 66 S Ct. 1180, 90 L Ed, 1489 (1946).....	Pg. 11
18 U.S.C & 2245.....	Pg. 11
18 U.S.C & 3509.....	Pg. 11

50 U.S.C & 1803.....	Pg. 12
18 U.S.C & 2255.....	Pg.12
10 U.S.C & 917.....	Pg. 12
18 U.S.C & 241.....	Pg. 12
18 U.S.C & 2511.....	Pg.12
18 U.S.C & 2422.....	Pg. 12
28 U.S.C & 1357.....	Pg. 13
18 U.S.C & 2.....	Pg. 15
18 U.S.C & 3286.....	Pg. 15
18 U.S.C 3283.....	Pg.16
18 U.S.C 657.....	Pg.17
15 U.S.C 57 (b).....	Pg.17
18 U.S.C &1111.....	Pg. 18
18 U.S.C 1956 and 1957.....	Pg. 28
18 U.S.C 1956 and 1957.....	Pg.29
18 U.S.C. 371.....	Pg.29
18 U.S.C &1111.....	Pg. 18

STATUTE AND RULES

Fed R. Civ. P Rule 38.....	Pg. 7
18 USC 3282.....	Pg. 7
Indiana Revised Code & 34-11-2-4 Statute of limitations.....	Pg.7
Fed R. Civ. P Rule 50	Pg. 7
Fed R. Civ. P Rule 56.....	Pg. 7
Fed. R. Civ. P, Rule 41 search and seizure.....	Pg. 9
Fed. R.. Civ. P. Rule 38.....	Pg. 10
Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule. 803 & 804.....	Pg. 14

OTHER

Title VIII rule 65 Provisional and final remedies.....	Pg. 17
N.H. Admin Code & Per 102.85.....	Pg.18
Money Laundering Control Act of 1986, Pub L. No. 99-570, 100 Stat. 3207.....	Pg.29
24 Del Admin code 8800-c 15.0 I- injuries.....	Pg. 32

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner respectfully petitions for a writ of mandamus to the U.S Supreme Court. Petitioners request this Court to reverse all decisions made by the lower

courts as their decisions are unfair and impartial to the respondents for a crime of conspiracy. The petitioner requests an interlocutory review of all decisions made by the district and appellate court.

OPINIONS BELOW

Motion for reconsideration and case reversal, all cases throughout the procedural history were denied. Due to lack of ineffective counsel and the errors of the court, the petitioner is respectfully requesting an interlocutory review of all cases in District and Appellate Court as the petitioner has exhausted all adequate remedies, a clear right to fiduciary performance has failed and the lower courts have arbitrarily failed or refused to perform their duties.

JURISDICTION

This court should issue a writ of mandamus because such issuance will be in aid of the court's appellate jurisdiction because exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and because adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court. The petitioner prays for relief over this case and my family that God grants us the needs and justice that we so rightfully deserve.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The sixth amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy public

trial, by an impartial jury". The harassed shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Attached are the docket sheets from the lower courts which all cases are denied and consist of "ONLY" telephonic conferences.

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The petitioner, Xena Ames respectfully prays that a ruling issued herein directed by the Justices of United States Supreme Court to request the returns of Life insurance policies designated to the petitioner that are being used in lieu of a conspiracy. The following altercations that have been happening is a distraction from the real matter of monies missing from life insurance policies. The respondents took this opportunity to train a new member by using the petitioner a second time so that they could practice their craft that they use in the lodge in the "workplace". The attacks are happening while the petitioner is employed, causing the petitioner issue with a consistent work history. Throughout my Writ of Mandamus, I will show the timeline in which this long, drawn-out process to retrieve the funds as a beneficiary is in correlation with lodge members and public officials who harass and get petitioners fired from their job as a form of revenge.

Mandamus is an appropriate remedy in extraordinary circumstances petitioner has tried every resource possible to obtain relief. Kerr v. United States

Dist. Ct. 426 U.S 394. 403, 96 S ct. 2119, 2114, 48 L. Ed 2d 725 (1976). A petitioner seeking the issuance of a writ of mandamus must have no other adequate means to obtain the desired relief and must show that the right issuance is clear and indisputable. Allied Chemical Corp v. Daiflon, Inc 449 U.S 33, 35, 101, S. Ct 188, 190, 66, L. Ed 2d. 193 (1980).; Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Holland 346, U.S. 379, 384, 74 S. Ct 145, 148-49. 98 L.ED, 106 (1953). In my petition for the writ of mandamus, I will show in procedural history from 2012 to current and beyond. How the respondents use power sources in the community to attack petitioners and cause irreparable harm, searching for information and contacting ex boyfriends and there current girlfriends and wives. Not every emergency application filed in the Supreme Court presents a true emergency, however this one does. I am asking for a favorable outcome on my writ of mandamus and asking that the rulings from the lower courts be reviewed. Here I will explain all the facts and sign as confirmation of the truth as I know it.

I am asking the Justices to review my Writ of Mandamus and the docket sheets and to reverse the lower court's decision by essentially nullifying there ruling. Due to the failure of ineffective Counsel throughout the petitioner's case, there wasn't an opportunity to adhere to the timely guidelines of a Certiorari.

Irreparable damages from 2017 to current, the lower courts errors from prothonotary not docketing correctly and Attorneys causing excessive wait times resulting in unresolved and significant issues.

The docketing sheets will show that this case had little intervention besides telephonic telephone calls, many motions for help were asked throughout this time span from 2017- to current, irreparable damage continues to happen throughout the years and recourse for alleviation. The petitioner believes in the legal system and knows with the right attorneys in place, that justice can be served. However, throughout the procedural history below you will find that legal counsels and prothonotary were ineffective and did more damage than good.

A.) Facts and Procedural History (Year 2012-2017) Related Cases

Xena Ames v. Department Of Veteran Affairs case EEOC No. 470-2013-00090X In 2012 petitioner filed an EEOC Complaint that is relevant to this case because it shows a pattern of abuse, and ineffective counseling, that the petitioner continues to endure throughout this timeline.

Petitioner began working as veteran representative at The Department of Veteran Affairs. The District Court erred in violation of FED R. CIV P. Rule 38 as this case was not real and was held on the grounds of The Department of Veteran Affairs, there is no docketing sheet to attach from a trial. Petitioner hired Attorney Rosemary Dettling, The Federal Employee Legal Services (FELSC). Employment and Labor Attorney in Washington D.C.

Due to this case not providing justice and replicating an alleged real trial, resulted in the petitioner being excessively harassed by the employees of the VA during this time period. I'm respectfully asking the court for a motion of judgement as a

matter of law. Fed. R. CIV, P, 50. And a motion for summary judgement Fed. R. Civ. O. 56. The petitioner was given a check for \$5,000 after a fake case, after the respondents violated HIPPA as proven through The Department of Veteran Affairs Privacy Officer. The petitioner incurred financial losses throughout the years that has affected her life tremendously. I am asking for restitution to compensate for financial losses, proven from the privacy officer at The Department of Veteran Affairs. 18 U.S.C code 1341.

The petitioner looked for jobs through the Disabled American Veterans and Hire Heroes computer systems. Where "Rodney Jackson" who are cousins with the workers at the VA and 'April' from compensation and pension both worked together at Work one. The petitioner was released from The Department of Veteran Affairs because of lodge members escalating fights that resulted in altercations, and the petitioner/veteran was fired, and the other employee remained in their positions. The procedural History will show the harassment that the petitioner has endured from lodge members and affiliates. The petitioner felt that she was wrongfully discharged and so she filed an EEO complaint that resulted in a lawsuit In 2012. Department Of Veteran Affairs case 200J-0583-2012101769 6-7- 2012, Jay Meisenholder, Notice of acceptance of EEO Complaint.

The Department Of Veteran Affairs case 200J-0583-2012101769 on 6-7-2012 was portrayed as a real courtroom setting, with an attorney in attendance. The employees in the Non-VA-Care area were not reprimanded for their violations

of the petitioner's medical file, however they continued to keep their eyes on the petitioner in hopes that she would not report them for their wrongdoings.

Petitioner is respectfully requesting and mandating the court to alert The Department of Veteran Affairs and to stop employees, lodge members from violating HIPPA and harassing the petitioner. 42 U.S. Code &132od-6. Wrongful disclosure of individually identifiable health information.

Many of the employees of The Department of Veteran Affairs are members of the local lodges and during the time the petitioner was an employee, the petitioner's co-workers would harass her repeatedly with information obtained from the petitioner's medical file, like medical deodorant in the pharmacy. No one can have access to records unless they have a need to know, all of the individuals are co-workers whose names came up on the list of individuals who violated HIPAA through the privacy officer. Health Insurance Portability and accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).

This information along with other medical documentation makes the petitioner feel unsafe as a veteran, there is no resolution for respondents accessing medical files. Fed. R. Civ. P, Rule 41 search and seizure. When the petitioner left the area of Indiana to work in the state of Florida, in correlation to petitioner's military career as a transportation Officer, the respondents searched for the petitioner and had her fired from her job at CSX Transportation. The Fourth Amendment states that we have the right to be secure in their persons, houses,

papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures. The lodge members have a way of finding people and that's by alerting all lodge members in all states (defamation) if they are looking for someone. 28 U.S.C & 4101

Defamation. Releasing information to a third party is proven defamation. This activity should be illegal, but it's part of the affiliation of the lodge. 19 U.S Code & 482 Search of vehicles and persons. The petitioner is requesting the court for a name change and witness protection for herself and children.

In 2013 11-12-13 EEOC No. 470-2013- 00080X Agency number 200J-0326-2012101769. U. S Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Eric Shinseki Secretary. Due to those two cases, it resulted in a snowball effect that has brought us to the Supreme Court today. The petitioner was never given a fair trial in these cases. The unresolved issues in this case became more and more prevalent, as the petitioner has not been consistently and gainfully employed since this case in 2012- 2017, everyone deserves the right to a fair trial, in the past and the current. FED R. CIV P. Rule 38. Due to the cases that were filed, resulted in The Department of Veteran Affairs receiving a HIPPA Violation and the petitioner currently is being harassed as a form of retaliation from the respondents in lieu of the cases listed above. Petitioner is asking respectfully for the court to review The Department of Veteran Affairs hearings in 2012 and allow the petitioner the opportunity to file "retaliation" on this entity, effective immediately. As the petitioner has just become knowledgeable of this fact and would like to

administer the statute of limitations of Indiana and the Fed. R. Civ. P Rule 18 U.S.C 3282.

As the respondents continued to harass the petitioner, this resulted in monies being removed from banks and also monies in my Mother's Morgan Stanley stock account, USAA and MetLife. Murtland stated that my Mother life was taken and this policies allegedly is the reason why. 18 U.S.C &1111. The petitioner continued to seek legal counsel and filed with the EEOC during this period and no legal recourse available to help gain any relief or justice in this matter. The government has 10 years from the date of the offense to initiate criminal proceedings. 18 U.S.C & 641.

The respondents tried to suppress the petitioner by not allowing her to have a job and removing funds from her personal bank account. The petitioner dealt with issues of robberies at her home and large amounts of money was stolen as well as fine jewelry, computers and more. 18 U.S.C & 371 conspiring to violate && 17 and 24. Respondents were also in violation of 18 U.S.C & 134. Pinkerton v. United States 328 U.S 64, 66 S Ct. 1180, 90 L Ed, 1489 (1946). Collectively, the respondent did their best to take advantage of the petitioner by causing harm to her and her mother to keep it alive by allegedly causing death in 2017. 18 U.S.C & 2245. Causing injuries to a child, by priming a child with psychology, and trying to coerce children to be "alternative", by intercepting the petitioners home internet

and violating the petitioner and her child by watching us and reporting what they see in our homes, this behavior has been going on since 2012 to current. This is considered baiting , to violate a child, during the acts of conspiracy, revenge and blackmail. My family is under attack and the respondents are trying to attack a child. 18 U.S.C & 3509. Protection of the privacy of child victims and child witnesses. And at this point, the respondents, they all now share the same consequences as this behavior is egregious and unlawful.

It is alleged that the next-door neighbor is also an ex police officer who has affiliation to this case, who will be subpoenaed if necessary. There is always someone close to keep the respondents informed of the petitioners coming and going from her home. Due to the respondent's reckless behavior, I am asking the court to enforce rules that protect the petitioner and her children as per the Foreign intelligence surveillance Act of 1978 50 U.S.C 1803. Every person has the right to live their life, without being attacked for no reason, this behavior is against our constitutional rights as human beings.

B. Procedural History (Year 2017-Current)

The petitioner was hired at FedEx 12-15-17 and was hired as a material handler. Immediately upon the petitioner's arrival, she was requested to come to line 3 of David Murtland manager Barbara Hutchinson on line 2. This is when the harassment switched from the 'African American lodge members of 2012 to the 'Caucasian lodge members who work for FedEx. So, information from the

petitioner's medical records are being sent to the new harassers and this is considered defamation. Ms. Hutchinson is friends with J.M in regard to medical records from 2012. This harassment starts again; these females like to provoke. 10 U.S.C & 917. These employees would not have any knowledge of me unless they were told by another lodge member or a family member. All of these respondents are conspiring against the petitioner. 18 U.S.C & 241.

Upon the petitioner's arrival to FEDEX, someone was trying to induce panic in the workplace and in the community. There are four men, police officers and Hutchinson who were hired to attack the petitioner and to keep her quiet about any funds in accounts. These four police officers have been used many times by the respondents to help them harass, intimidate, coerce, steal, kill and destroy. The respondents are fully aware of these individuals as they are currently using those public

officials that are connected to the lodge members to retrieve these life insurance policies and more. These public officials as well as Ms. Hutchinson are known for their superior gathering of information and can find anything on anyone, as this is part of their side business to investigate and search for Monies, Policies and pertinent data to use for shaming. Digging for information is a violation of the Privacy Act of 1974. As soon as the petitioner arrived, Police Officer/ Private Investigator Murtland was friendly and became an informant to the petitioner and informed her of information that I am revealing the court, in regard to the lodge

members. The respondents like to pick a fight and provoke you and then go tell all members, now everyone is attacking the petitioner based off of information that the respondents are sending, by USB sticks or phone conversations. Electronic communication is prohibited. 18 U.S.C & 2511 to cause harm to others.

This makes it unfair to the petitioner because once they tell their side of the story to members, the attack starts and once the damage is done after finding out the truth it is "the cat out the bag" irreparable damages to the petitioner.

The petitioner filed EEOC complaint in 2018 and a case was established case #1:19-cv-04282-JRS-MPB, the court erred in this case as this case number dates were changed, and all the evidence to this case was thrown out. This case had all the evidence of the scares that was put on my bottom, monies stolen from banks, reports of my mother arms being bruised and causing her death, teeth, my online business, burning out my hair as well as my son more importantly, allegations of rape, and enticing a child and much more. This case naming all respondents was thrown out and Denied. The court erred and this case needs to be reviewed and I'm respectfully asking the court to reverse this case and for it to go under interlocutory review. Case # 1:19-cv-04282-JRS-MPB also involves Barbara Hutchinson as this respondent was being trained on the craft (coached), as she dates one of the other respondents named in this case. FedEx employees thought it would be funny to have me fired and brought over to FedEx to train, harass, torture the petitioner for entrapment and revenge.

They start by instigating and picking a fight or causing an injury so that you will have to hang around longer, while they mentally play games with you. In the year 2018 the petitioner goes to the hospital to get a checkup in the ER @ IU West Hospital, while on the examiner table in stirrups the Doctor is examining petitioner, and the nurse is administering an I.V. I felt a pinch on my left side when I got off the table. I was feeling in that area as it itched really bad. The next day I saw a large bruise on my left side scarred and damaged. I had my ex-husband view the injury as he was shocked and questioned where that came from as he doesn't have anything on his body to this magnitude. I told him that the ER Doctor bruised my bottom. It feels like acid on my skin causing an irritation that will not stop. We both took photos and videos to document the injury. The petitioner is requesting that the ER Doctors refrain from causing injuries to people's skin and bottoms for their personal pleasure and revenge. If an injury sustained during employment as a result of intentional foul is severe enough to terminate about, the employee or public official causing the injury loses by disqualification. 24 Del Admin code 8800-c 15.0 I- injuries.

Throughout this case the petitioner has suffered many injuries and have tried wholeheartedly to get justice for me and my children. The injury that was put on my bottom was to "confirm" a crime, "commit" a crime and or "erase" a crime. A review needs to be done on FedEx on how many employees have reported this same injury and combine us all in a class action lawsuit against FedEx.

After the ER visit, I went to work that night. I went into the bathroom crying like what is this. Murtland standing by the trailers gestured to be quiet, as management watched in the bathrooms at FedEx. So, every day I came in to work with officer Murtland he would reveal new information to me in regard to the lodge members and Ms. Hutchinson's involvement in harassing me. So, one day I picked up an envelope from a new supervisor and it had a letter in it on company letterhead that read, the petitioner had sex with David Murtland, and he gave her herpes. (a lady wrote that letter) (allegedly Hutchinson) who would know this information? The letter was created for blackmail for the insurance policies that are missing and is also a HIPPA violation replicated like the VA case in 2012. It is a medical breach to speak about personal medical information to another person who doesn't have a need to know. More people are getting involved and the hate is growing, this is revenge.

The respondents have pretty much bruised every part of my body and revealed all information they can find on the petitioner in order to gain privileges to these life insurance policies. 1.) Morgan Stanley 2.) USAA 3.) MetLife. It is my belief that Murtland, Miller and or the executor have the money to these accounts.

Murtland wanted half the policy funds so that we wouldn't have to go to court and that the policies was a secret. It was his job to reveal information to me and build trust to later stab me in the back for revenge from leadership. The goal was to try to get me in bed so that he could shame the petitioner for revenge.

Murtland was told to do this to me and caused mental and physical harm to the petitioner out of revenge, he said there was strings in getting the money and that's when the proposition of sex became a part of the harassment.

Murtland was knowledgeable of the accounts and the lodge members attacking me I am respectfully requesting the court to have these funds returned to the petitioner. 28 U.S.C & 1357. The purpose for all this harassment is a decoy to take my mind off of looking for these policies. Again, the body demoralization doesn't stop as the petitioner has ongoing issues with her teeth, hair, my boys hair, eyes, stomach and using doctors to help them to facilitate these injuries. Petitioner caught Covid from someone spitting in a dental tube, which could have resulted in death, the respondents think this stuff is funny because they been doing it, without getting caught. Once they do their dirt, they follow you around to antagonize you and laugh and tell you exactly what they did. Hearsay is not admissible if it is true. Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule. 803 & 804, the information obtained is from a police officer at FedEx. This is my life these respondents are playing with and not fair to keep enduring this, with situations being added.

On 11/06/19 from the docket sheet the petitioner filed a motion to serve the respondents and the motion was Denied. On 02/13/20 FedEx filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, when the company was fully aware of the wrongdoings of their employees. Granting a motion to dismiss was an error on the courts behalf, the respondents are prohibiting the petitioner from stating a claim

and gaining relief that should have been granted. I am asking the court to have this decision reversed, if at any time there are issues that result in death, and agatizing children, should be reviewed or even given a chance for an oral or evidentiary hearing. This is a 'mistrial' because there wasn't any evidence submitted by the attorney to support this case. The judge stated in the docket sheet that the attorney needed to return discovery notes, no evidence was recorded on the court's docket to support my case. I'm asking for a review on this cases and ask that the District Court & Appellant Court to do their job.

On 04/21/20 the defendants motion to dismiss was granted in part and denied in part. The petitioner's claims against the respondents were dismissed with prejudice. The court erred by dismissing this case with prejudice, when evidence shows that monies from my mother's estate had been missing since 2017 and now there is a life insurance policy that has been stolen again, and the court did not ask for evidence to this matter. The company is fully aware of their employees behavior and is covering it up by filing felonious pleadings. 18 U.S.C & 2.

Two of the fraternal members, Barbara Hutchinson and David Murtland are allegedly married and one is being "coached" on the craft of their membership and lodges. The purpose of training is return back with another family member. FedEx allegedly is an organized crime syndicate that allows police officers to work for their companies and abuse employees with their powers.

The harassment became more and more persistent because Ms. Hutchinson thought that the petitioner and boyfriend had a relationship going on in the workplace. With Ms. Hutchinson being on the next line over from Mr. Murtland in the FedEx warehouse made it really hard for the petitioner to do her job as she would monitor the way I looked and would have the team leader give me extra assignments to make me 'sweat' out my hair and clothing, which replicates pharmacy prescriptions from The Department of Veteran Affairs. 18 U.S.C 3286. This type of information shouldn't be accessible to the respondents as they use it as a weapon.

The respondents not only were harassing the petitioner; they also were harassing my child from school age to current, (priming) this causes self-esteem issues in children, so that later the respondents can come back and terrorize to bully and try to get what they want. They're sending out inappropriate messages that he is gay, and that he has a different father. The respondents are trying to show that the Petitioner was raped, so not only are they trying to demoralize me but my child as well. This would explain the friend from Facebook who I met for the first time brought this up in a conversation, while on a trip. Someone was contacting her before and during our trip to the Dominican Republic. Child enticement is illegal. 18 U.S. Code & 2422 Coercion and enticement.

Children are off limits, and the petitioner has tried very hard to contain herself, but no relief has been awarded in any trial since 2012. The military unit

has been added as this information is newly discovered information, it plays a significant role in the case and can change the results of the trial. This information was never presented in trial as all cases have been denied. The petitioner would like to make a motion for a NEW TRIAL or consider this information during this Writ of Mandamus. The respondents was persistent in their search for information, through phones, hacking emails, USB sticks, watching and listening, which resulted in informing the petitioner of alleged allegations.

Another issue is with an ex-girlfriend who was "fishing" for information was really upset about rumors of a pregnancy. During the time the information was spread out, the first opportunity to get my hair done professionally, the respondents sought revenge to burn out the petitioner's natural hair. This same act was done to my sons' at the barber shop. The respondents are out of control, the courts want to do their jobs and someone is covering up information, so that the petitioner suffer anguish. This is constant and consistent irreparable damage and very devastating to children. These individualized injuries are caused by the respondents and their powers of revenge, and the petitioner is seeking statutory damages. 18 U.S.C & 2255. Ms. Hutchinson and a friend tried to take my eyesight, and I was off work for days at FedEx due to this incident. I reported this incident to Police Officer Murtland who was my supervisor at the time. This again is about money and revenge, if my eyesight was gone I couldn't see the money that was left to the

petitioner. The employees' behavior shows a consistent pattern of harassment and embezzlement. 18 U.S.C 657.

The petitioner is seeking monetary damages, injunctive relief, and equitable relief. These damages are to stop the respondents from being continuous public nuisance in society and attacking the petitioner and her children, from committing tortuous harms. The petitioner is aware that this extraordinary power is to be exercised under demanding circumstances, the petitioner has no other adequate means of relief. The petitioner is respectfully requesting that FedEx & Respondents be warned and revoked from their activities against the petitioner and her children effective immediately.

C. Procedural History (Year 2018)

In 2018, while working and taking care of my family, the harassers continue to cause more harm to the petitioner with no regard to her family entity. Again, an EEOC complaint has been filed, and the respondents are harassing the petitioner. The petitioner served each defendant with a cease-and-desist letter. 15 U.S.C 57 (b).

The petitioner hand delivered a letter to Barbara Hutchinson and sent a letter through human resources to David Murtland all other letters were sent through USPS. Cease and desist letters were sent on 08-01-18 again and the harassment started immediately upon the petitioner's arrival and did not cease. The Human Resources Director called me and said, "I understand you hand carried

cease and desist letters to staff yesterday". And I said yes I did, and I explained who and why they received the letter. A cease-and-desist letter is a written demand for a recipient to stop a specific harmful activity, often with a threat of legal action if they don't comply. It's a formal legal warning that can be used before pursuing legal action, aiming to resolve issues without going to court. Title VIII rule 65 Provisional and final remedies.

The respondents then went as far as trying to threaten the petitioner of having her Veteran Benefits removed the petitioner reported the employees, by submitting a patient advocate intake form and found that this employee of FedEx Barbara Hutchinson, name had allegedly been reported several times in regard to harassing veterans their behavior at FedEx shows a consistent pattern, they continue to get away with these same crime. Veterans fight for their country to come back to the United States and be treated like trash. N.H. Admin Code & Per 102.85.

This incident "correlates" with the most recent EEOC charge of 2024, where the employee stepped on the petitioner's foot, in hopes to provoke the petitioner and have her sent to jail to lose her Veteran Benefits. (Jail would make the petitioner lose everything). The Respondents don't like the petitioner having benefits because it makes it harder for the respondents to 'Control You'. Title I of the ADA prohibits "discrimination" against a qualified individual on the basis of disability" in employee compensation and other terms, conditions and privileges of

employment. 42 U.S.C & 12112. The respondents were fully aware of the petitioner's disability as stated above in 2012, the petitioners medical records continue to be a "topic" as the petitioner medical records were violated at The Department of Veteran Affairs.

In or about 2020, the respondents learned of an online boutique business that the petitioner had to make monies for her family. The respondents started stealing money and causing issues with the acceleration of her business. The petitioners used a follower on Facebook and had her accuse the petitioner of many fabrications and the petitioner lost more followers and the growth of her business. The respondents don't want the petitioner to have anything, as everything they're doing is revenge.

The petitioner is seeking statutory damages against the respondents and is requesting respectfully that the court help in this process. Also, the petitioner is requesting an "access review" on the petitioner's medical records. A protection question was put on my records to block intrusion after the lawsuit, somehow the respondents still can retain information. Only medical workers who have a need to know should have access. This behavior needs to stop; I'm asking the court for help. The Department of Veteran Affairs needs to know that their employees are still seeking revenge and accessing records since 2012. I am requesting the Supreme Court to address this issue and to speak with Officials of The Department Of Veteran Affairs.

I am asking that the petitioner be given a new legal name, so that when the petitioner leaves the state of Indiana, the respondents will not be able to access my medical records and or my children. The harassment is out of control, and we need the help of The Supreme Court, and I will be reporting this to local FBI.

D. PROCEDURAL HISTORY In 2019-2020-2021

During this procedural history the petitioner has an attorney as the docket sheets show his date of arrival and the progression throughout the case upon his appearance from 2020-2025. #1:19-cv-04282-JRS-MPB. On 01/20/21 Appearance of Attorney Cummings of HennsWorth Cummings & Page. For case 1:19-cv-04282-JRS-MPB that Ms. Hutchinson is also named. Mr. Cummings is the Attorney, and his assistant is Anna Sifuentes. The petitioner is claiming that she had ineffective counsel and that Mr. Cummings allowed issues to arise without properly addressing them or addressing his assistant. Counsel's job is to submit information to effectively represent their client. Including the ability to challenge the admissibility of 404 (b) evidence to help prove the petitioner case.

On 11/09/20 the petitioner filed a petition for an expedited trial. The petitioner was seeking help from the court and the petition was also Denied. The petitioner was never given the opportunity to go to trial. In criminal cases, like this one in regard to murder, embezzlement and child enticement, speedy trial rights in criminal cases are enshrined in the Sixth Amendment of the U.S Constitution, requiring that cases and trials commence within a reasonable time

frame. The petitioner was never given that opportunity. The court erred as Attorney Cummings signed on as legal Counsel and 3 months later this case was dismissed. The docket sheet references many telephonic conferences, but there was not one done before this case was dismissed and all evidence was thrown out. Again, someone is hiding information to protect and conceal. Ineffective Counsel Attorney Cummings did not appeal this case.

Appeals are a mechanism for correcting errors made by lower courts and ensuring that legal principles are applied consistently. The petitioner proceeded to appellant court alone as Attorney Cummings was still on record as legal counsel and did not remove himself and restricted another attorney from signing on. Attorney Cummings was instructed by the District Judge in 2025 to remove himself properly from the petitioner's case per docket sheet.

The petitioner is asking that The Supreme Court grant a Summary Judgement against the Opposing party. The petitioner is fully aware that the burden of proof falls on the Moving party and that the factual interpretation hinges on the factual evidence presented. Summary Judgement will save time and can clarify and resolve cases. As a matter of law, the petitioner will demonstrate genuine disputes on material facts and the entitlement of the judgment. This request is suitable due to the length of time these cases have already taken away from the petitioner and her children.

#1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB

On 03/29/21 an entry and order, the motion to dismiss was granted. The court stated that the petitioner wasn't entitled to certain claims and "Denied" all claims. All federal claims against defendants were immediately dismissed on the arrival of counsel. All individual claims against the respondents were dismissed with prejudice. And all pending state claims were dismissed with prejudice.

The appellate court erred on case # (02652) was created against one individual versus FedEx. The court erred in allowing a new case to be established and throwing out all information and then recreating a new one in only in Hutchinsons name and not FedEx. This is a Default Judgement because FedEx failed to respond. This was a mistake on the part of the Courts a case was created only against Ms. Hutchinson although she is respondent she is not the only one in the workplace named for harassment. The court erred because the petitioner was filing against the agency for a hostile work environment and allowed this case to sit for years with no justice. With constant case dismissal this is someone with power helping and is motivated by money and is seeking 50% of funds for doing or assisting in criminal activities.

A motion for ADR and a settlement conference was another solution to the problem and the courts Denied this opportunity as the petitioner continued to be harassed. Alternative Dispute Resolution is always a good starting point to resolve issues; it is a form of restorative justice.

On 3/29/21 the court Closed Judgements of all federal claims, and they were dismissed with prejudice. The district court closed this case and made a final judgement and stated that this case was resolved, nothing regarding this case was resolved. The courts are covering up for a police officer and respondents, who stole funds from the petitioner. Every case, and motion made towards this company was Denied. FedEx and the Attorney Cummings are working together, just like the cases they have worked on in the past.

Attorney Cummings made a notice to appear 1/20/21 and 3 months later a new case was established 1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB for Ms. Hutchinson and the respondents. The petitioner waited nine months for a new case to be established. The court erred in waiting almost a year when the attorney was already on the docket months prior. On 12/22/21 there was a scheduling order for a telephonic hearing scheduled 01-14-22, in this conversation nothing was asked in regard to the petitioner's safety, or if there were any other hearings scheduled to help the petitioner. On 04/15/22 case #1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB there was an entry for status conference, there were no updates given to the judge in regard to the respondents behavior. Counsel filed documents stating that the respondents were torturing the petitioner, but in the conference call counsel made no mention to the facts. On 04/25/22 case #1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB there was a settlement conference scheduled, and this is when \$5,000 was offered to me to remedy the case, just like The Department of Veteran Affairs Case in 2012. On 08/02/22 Entry for settlement Conference, again this was another opportunity to seek relief,

but the conference was concluded without any settlement. On 03/17/23 almost another year later, another entry and order from telephonic conference where counsel discusses the status of the case and again no relief.

Case 1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KM a notice of Judge reassignment, on 05/09/23 an entry and order conducted again, petitioner waited until 07/13/23 another telephonic hearing in regard to discovery was completed, but the court erred by not asking counsel if he released discovery notes to FedEx for review. Counsel responsibility was to send the documentation so FedEx could gauge questioning for discovery. Counsel assistants never turned them in to the opposing counsel for review, with Mr. Cummings in charge of his law firm it was his duty to make sure evidence was submitted. The assistant and Ms. Hutchinson reviewed the petitioner's discovery notes and spread rumors about confidential information and took the information and shared it out to others in their organization. Ms. Hutchinson and Murtland both have a problem and are involving the petitioner to resolve their personal intimate issues the petitioner is being put in the middle of their love spat.

It is the duty of the Courts and Attorneys to do right by the petitioner. This Mandamus is being filed because there is no other form of relief or legal remedy. I request that The Supreme Court review this case and provide a Summary Judgement the lower courts did not do their duties and Attorney Cummings failed to perform his duties. I am respectfully requesting that the District Court and the

Appellate Court do their job correctly and give the petitioner and her children the relief that we have been seeking since 2012.

#49D11-2106CT-o18457 State of Indiana Summons

In this case the Attorney Cummings filed in a court complaint in the State Court, in regard to tortious behavior, the respondents never responded back, and one hired an Attorney.

If the respondents don't reply back to the complaint, the petitioner can file a default judgement asking the court to rule in their favor based on the respondents inaction. However, Attorney Cummings sat on this case and then withdrew. It's ironic that this state case was filed in Michigan with the life insurance policies and that the petitioner was never made aware until counsel withdrew. If the petitioner was aware of this case years ago this case would have been resolved. I am asking the court to review this case and overturn the decision of the state court and allow the petitioner to file a default judgement against the respondents, due to their lack of cooperation. Essentially the respondents forfeited they didn't want to take the time to defend themselves, and this prime example of why the petitioner should be granted a Writ of Mandamus.

The consequences for the respondents actions is to pay damages, fulfill obligations and if not completed face legal ramifications. There are strict timelines in responding back to the court and all the respondents refused to adhere to the court's rulings. The respondents again take nothing seriously and they believe

they are above the law, I'm asking that all respondents named wages be garnished, and that the default judgement be put on their credit reports for 7 years and pay a monetary fee per respondent, if the fees are not paid, seizure of your personal belongings. Because the petitioner is just finding out about this judgement being filed in State court, I have 2 years with statue if limitations to collect damages.

Case # State of Indiana Summons 49D11-2106CT-o18457 Submitted by Attorney Cummings HennsWorth Cummings and Page Marion County Superior Court Ms. Hutchinson is also involved in this case. Fourth Amended Complaint for damages and request for jury trial. Count 1 Race, Count II Retaliation Count III Defamation against Tamika Dickerson and Jocelyn Miller, Count IV Tortuous Interference with a business relationship between Respondent Tamika Dickerson and Respondent Jocelyn Miller, Count V Tortuous Interference with an employment relationship between Tamika Dickerson and Jocelyn Miller, Count VI Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress – David Murtland, Barbara Hutchinson, Tamika Dickerson and Jocelyn Miller. The Attorney made a complaint For Damages and Request for Jury Trial against Federal Express and lodge members; no justice was served. This case was never tried in court. In 2024 the attorney withdrew from this case as well. Filed 10-15-21 Terminated: 04/24/24. Counsel breached his contract of fiduciary responsibilities, and the court allowed this error. The petitioner is asking for a full refund of \$10,000 for a breach of contract, breaking confidentiality and not releasing discovery notes to the respondents before discovery.

On 01/21/2025 the Judge requested that Counsel return all discovery notes to petitioner. The petitioner was lacking effective counsel throughout the years, as the Attorney prolonged the petitioners case and did not submit evidence in support of the brief to factualize the allegations.

Petitioner respectfully request that Attorney Cummings refunds the petitioner and give a clear explanation as to why he did not fulfill his ethical fiduciary responsibilities to his client. I am respectfully mandating this to be reviewed and the respondents held accountable for their actions.

F. Procedural History Year 2022- 2023

On 06-07-22 the petitioner filed a protective order, with no attorney appearance in regard to monies allegedly stolen from a life insurance policy.

1:21-cv-02652-JPH-DML this order was Denied against David Murtland the police officer in connection to this conspiracy case.

This case has connections with the State of Michigan Probate Court Oakland County File NO. 2017-378, 193 -DE, this case was denied on 04-06-22, trying to get answer to the Life insurance policies. The executor of the estate filed paperwork from Mr. Cummings office submitted for evidence and the Life Insurance policy documents after the Probate Judge gave "New" Executorship of the Estate. The Attorney in Michigan Ms. Matteson stated there seeking the policy and don't want the petitioner involved in adjournment with any of the policies on 05-27-21, why wasn't this presented back to Attorney Cummings who

was the Attorney at the time. Counsel drafted the paperwork and allowed it to terminate, and then Counsel withdrew. Again, there are 3 accounts missing 1.) Morgan Stanley 2.) USAA 3.) MetLife insurance Policy.

The executor needs to be informed that an "Beneficiary trumps a Will and that those monies was given to the petitioner. The new executor wants the money to be split in five and that is her reason for hiring an attorney, so that she is in control on how it's divided. The executor wants to be in control of the Estate but didn't complete all the taxes and other duties of the Estate, the only thing that is important is the money in this Life Insurance Policy. And because of that money the respondents are using others to cause harm to the petitioner.

I'm asking the court to review this case and have the respondents to return the full amount any funds that belong to the petitioner. This is an inheritance to the beneficiary, and the petitioner is demanding the return immediately. The petitioner has provided clarity and proof to the court to get no relief. I am asking the court to find this benefit and hold the respondents responsible for theft. The Life Insurance Company may require proof and the person requesting is the legal beneficiary the petitioner is capable of doing so.

During this time span the petitioner is still being harassed, organizations that she wanted to be a part of the respondents stopped all entry, along with jobs and other activities in the community. Harassment is still persistent during time in the procedural history.

Procedural History: Year 2024

District Court No. 1:19-cv-04282-JRS-MPB transferred to United States Court Of Appeals For Seventh Circuit 24-1803. Ms. Hutchinson is also involved in case 1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB that states legal counsel was still on the record and did not withdraw until 01-31-2025.

The Appellate Court order caused extraordinary and irreparable harm to the petitioner. The lower courts did not enforce the rules on Counsel. He was still on the docket as Attorney and did nothing to assist in the Appeal process or State Court. The lower courts erred in not having counsel remove himself earlier, so that petitioner could get new legal counseling. Motion For the Appeals Court Request for a lawyer to represent petitioner Denied 1:21-cv-02652-MPB-KMB. Petitioner could not get assistant. A motion filed to combine case no. 24-1803 & 24-1804 both cases together in appellant court, which is now a Writ of Certiorari and a Writ of Mandamus to help save time was Denied.

Granting the petitioner relief will not cause harm to the respondents but send a message that their behaviors are intolerable. The petitioner argues to have this court review all lower court interlocutory orders. United States Alkali Export Ass'n v. United States, 325 U.S 196, 201-204 (1945). A Writ of Mandamus helps but does not hold the respondents to legal ramifications. Denial of this petition would set a problematic precedent and a worldwide surge to the respondents to

continue their activity and basically let them know they are able to get away with any crime.

Procedural History: Retaliation and Reprisal (Year 2025-2026)

Petitioner was employed by Commonwealth hotels and worked part-time to fulltime as a night auditor from 02/24 – 10/24 and was paid wages while employed sufficient to qualify for unemployment compensation benefits. Petitioner alleges that the respondents cheated the petitioner out of her pay so that they didn't have to pay unemployment benefits. The unemployment office stated that petitioner missed unemployment benefits by \$600.00 and was denied unemployment. The petitioner explained to the examiner that they deducted hours from petitioners check, but the examiner stated those hours would have helped if calculated and added before being terminated. The petitioner contacted Labor Laws for help to get back the monies that was owed, but Commonwealth refused to answer the notifications. The petitioner followed all the steps necessary to protect herself under the EEOC the petitioner was wrongfully fired, retaliated against and Denied unemployment benefits and currently has no way to care for herself and family.

The terms of section 704(a) Prohibit third party reprisals. Third party reprisals fall squarely within Title VII prohibition against retaliation. Section 704 (a) forbids an employer "to discriminate against any of his employees because he.... Has made a charge under this title 42 U.S.C &2000e-3 (a).

This employer allowed another employee to bring a gun on the premises, and he then threaten the petitioner in hopes to make her leave the petitioner reported the incident and took days before the employee was removed and no updates was made to the company handbook in reference to no one is allowed weapons, or even telling staff to not allow the employee on the premises. Another employee steps on the petitioner foot from admittance of Sarah that Linda pushed her way to the lockers. This was intentional to start a fight and have the petitioner go to jail as explained above.

There after the petitioner filed an EEOC for hostile work environment. As soon as the company received the EEOC complaint, with other reported offenses, they called me into the office, accused me of causing a hostile work environment for filing complaints. Miss Jennings of Hr. and Sarah Manager stated she didn't want to hear about complaints and fired the petitioner. Although Sarah was sent a letter about accommodating the Veterans reasonable accommodations that was ignored as well, just the reasonable accommodations request at The Department of Veteran Affairs. The respondents are replicating everything in emails, and from the past.

In a discrimination claim under section 703 (a) a plaintiff must show not only that the action complained of was motivated by the petitioner's race, color, religion, sex or national origin, but also that discrimination adversely affected the

plaintiff's own employment, this is when the petitioner filed Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Here are the following charges:

- 1.) Southern District Court filed 05-05-25 1:25 cv-00869-SEB-MG.
- 2.) Xena Ames v. Commonwealth EEOC Charging No. 470-2025-00145

The petitioner is respectfully requesting a review of her unemployment benefits, Labor Laws, and the EEOC and ask them to do their jobs. The EEOC investigator stated, the company didn't violate the rules. (See the trend here). It is against the law to fire an employee while protected under the EEOC. That's the purpose of EEOC it is a protected activity, so employees can get the help they need or sue. This again shows the petitioner seeking help.

It's important that the court understands that the petitioner was brought into a confrontation between Hutchinson and Murtland and that the petitioner was used as a financial resource to push this case passed the Indiana Jurisdiction to rectify their relationship issues. Due to that reason as well as greed, has resulted in the petitioner suffering irreparable harm upon their search and seizure to cause shame and embarrassment to get revenge for their "friends" and to cause harm to the petitioner and her children. The defendants have been luring children since school age and trying to break their confidence and self-esteem, so that they can cause harm later. The psychological games and the revealing of information on the petitioner and my family has been relentless and unresolved. The abuse of power by using the local police and hearing conversations on the "PHONE" gives the

defendants to much personal information to retaliate. Due to this behavior has caused devastating financial harm to my immediate family. The issues between FedEx employees has caused tremendous damages on my jobs before I was hired at FedEx and afterwards, due to their constant tracking and watching has halted many of my daily activities, due to shame and embarrassment. I'm Mandating the court to ask all names listed to STOP there abuse of power immediately or suffer consequences for their actions. The petitioner is seeking jurisdictional relief from The District Court of Indiana & Appellant Court of Chicago.

The petitioner is also seeking monetary relief from FedEx, Lodge members and Police, Family, Commonwealth, The Department of Veteran Affairs, Hennsworth, Cummings & Page, Disabled American Veterans (DAV) and 718th Battalion Military Unit of the 656th Transportation Co.

- I am respectfully asking the court to do an interlocutory review of all cases on the District Court and Appellate Court.
- Attorney Cummings return deposit of \$10,000. By 7-15-25
- Family Members to return any Life Insurance accounts in the recipient's name or petitioners name.
- Lodge Members and Police who are affiliated together to return any Stock accounts, any accounts money was stolen, and or life insurance accounts back to the petitioner. Cashapp, Paypal, Banks Forum credit union and etc.

- To stop defendants from causing harm to the petitioner through doctors.

The defendants tried to kill the petitioner through a dental procedure and continue this behavior with other tactics.

- An interlocutory review on the cases with Department of Veteran Affairs.

The Department of Veteran Affairs I'm asking for a Summary Judgement or to include them into New Trial.

- To stop changing medical records, to be cohesive to the defendants my medical records was changed twice in regard to this case, to use as blackmail. I'm an Army Veteran I'm seen on a regular basis and take good care of myself.

- To stop defendants from using members to cause destruction to my home.

Neighbors preventing the sale of my home and putting rats in my home.

The remaining respondents I ask that there is a "MISTRIAL", or a "NEW TRIAL" established from new evidence that was discovered, because the petitioner was not knowledgeable of the information that has caused irreparable harm to the petitioner and family, due to the respondents search and seizure procedures.

The petitioner is seeking back pay, front pay, Compensatory damages, punitive damages as well injunctive relief to prevent from future damages. Mandating a paternity test, and for all opposing parties to halt their harassment towards petitioner and children. The petitioner hopes and prays, for a victorious outcome and hope to see you all in The United States Supreme Court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Writ of Mandamus can correct an abuse of discretion such as when an order is made without or exceeding jurisdiction, or when authority is influenced by outside factors. Many of the respondents take orders from their leaders and they do as they are instructed. The Writ of Mandamus will hold public officials, Attorneys, lower court, or government agency accountable to perform a clear legal duty that has been unreasonably delayed. Especially in my case there are no other adequate remedies available, and the delay is causing significant harm to me and my children. Thank you kindly.

CONCLUSION


The Petition for Writ of Mandamus should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted

Xena Ames- Pro Se

July 1, 2025

Signature



Date

8.5.25