

Nos. 25-5502

GRANTED
COURT OF APPEALS

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 16 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES-CIVIL

AISHA ASHA BRADLEY,
Petitioner.

vs.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
Respondent,

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit of Pennsylvania, for Consolidated Case Nos. 24-3324

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari

Attached: Exhibits 2123a, 2130a, 2135a, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2526, 2565b, 2565c, 2565d, 2565e, Proof of Service, Certificate of Compliance, Verification, and Affidavit. IFP Application for the Supreme Court, Orders Granting IFP at the Appellate Court, Previous IFP Application filed at the Third Circuit Appellate Court

August 18, 2025

Aisha Bradley
**Aisha Bradley, Pro Se
Petitioner**

6225 Ellsworth St., Phila., PA 19143

BRDL3690@gmail.com

**NO CELL, NOR RELIABLE MESSAGE PHONE
CURRENTLY OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF PA**

**ALL CONTACT IS VIA EMAIL-PLEASE DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL; IT IS NOT
GUARANTEED PETITIONER WILL RECEIVE THE POSTAL MAIL**

I. Question Presented

1. **Did the Federal Appellate Court for the Third Circuit, ignore statutory directive 1443(1), by NOT doing a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C. §1443(1); when Petitioner-Bradley listed that her Removal is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1443(1), as is required by 28 U.S.C. §1446(d)? see exhibit 2244- *Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.***

II. LIST OF PARTIES

All parties DO NOT appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the state court, whose judgment is the subject of this petitioner is as follows:

As listed in the Common Pleas Court of Philadelphia

SIMON, MAJORIE

SIMON, MARGUERITE P

SIMON DECEASED AKA, MARJORIE P

ANY AND ALL HEIRS KNOWN AND UNKNOWN

PETITIONER-BRADLEY IS THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE

900 CRESTVIEW ROAD

PHILADELPHIA PA 19128

ADDRESS IS NOT VALID DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL

SIMON ESTATE OF DECEASED AKA, PATRICIA

ANY AND ALL HEIRS KNOWN AND UNKNOWN

PETITIONER-BRADLEY IS THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE

900 CRESTVIEW ROAD

PHILADELPHIA PA 19128

ADDRESS IS NOT VALID DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL

SIMON, ETHEL F

SIMON DECEASED AKA, ETHEL F

ANY AND ALL HEIRS KNOWN AND UNKNOWN

PETITIONER-BRADLEY IS THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE

900 CRESTVIEW ROAD

PHILADELPHIA PA 19128

ADDRESS IS NOT VALID DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL

SIMON, EDMUND D

SIMON DECEASED AKA, EDMUND D

ANY AND ALL HEIRS KNOWN AND UNKNOWN

PETITIONER-BRADLEY IS THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE

6225 ELLSWORTH ST

PHILADELPHIA PA 19143

CURRENTLY OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF PA

ALL CONTACT IS VIA EMAIL-PLEASE DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL; IT IS NOT

GUARANTEED PETIONER WILL RECEIVE THE POSTAL MAIL

RODVILL, HERBERT VINCE
AS EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF PATRICIA SIMON DECEASED
Court Documents are mailed to **PETITIONER-BRADLEY**
6225 ELLSWORTH ST
PHILADELPHIA PA 19143

CURRENTLY OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF PA
ALL CONTACT IS VIA EMAIL-PLEASE DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL; IT IS NOT
GUARANTEED PETIONER WILL RECEIVE THE POSTAL MAIL

AISHA BRADLEY
AS EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF PATRICIA SIMON DECEASED AND
INDIVIDUALLY
6225 ELLSWORTH ST
PHILADELPHIA PA 19143

CURRENTLY OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF PA
ALL CONTACT IS VIA EMAIL-PLEASE DO NOT SEND POSTAL MAIL; IT IS NOT
GUARANTEED PETIONER WILL RECEIVE THE POSTAL MAIL

III. RELATED CASES

United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit of Pennsylvania

24-3324-Consolidated
24-3325-Consolidated
24-3326-Consolidated
24-3339-Consolidated
24-3340-Consolidated
24-3341-Consolidated

25-1309-Consolidated
25-1320-Consolidated
25-1321-Consolidated

25-1502-Consolidated
25-1503-Consolidated
25-1504-Consolidated

25-1505-Consolidated
25-1506-Consolidated
25-1507-Consolidated

25-1309-Consolidated
25-1320-Consolidated
25-1321-Consolidated

24-1209-Consolidated
24-1210-Consolidated
24-1211-Consolidated

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-06054-JS,
E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-06155-JS,
E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-06156-JS.
E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-00269-GEKP,
E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-00015-GEKP,
E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:24-cv-00116-GEKP.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

2305T0155-MAY-2023-CONSOLIDATED
2305T0156-MAY-2023-CONSOLIDATED
2310T0202-OCT-2023

II. Table of Contents

I.	Question Presented	i
II.	Table of Contents	ii
III.	Table of Authorities	iii
IV.	Disclaimer for Exhibits.....	8
V.	Petition for Writ of Certiorari	9
VI.	Opinions Below	9
VII.	Jurisdiction	9
VIII.	Constitutional Provisions Involved	9
IX.	Statement of the Case	12
a.	Violation of 1443(1)	
b.	Violation of 1446(d)	
X.	REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	23
	Setup for Dismissal by a Fraudulent Determination Under Federal Question; when Petitioner admitted to the District Court and the Appellant Court she does NOT have federal question jurisdiction. The Appellate Court went along with the Setup.	
XI.	Conclusion.....	27

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- 24-3324 IFP_Affidavit-completed dec 23-24
- 24-3324 IFP_Affidavit_COUNSEL_ONLY-AMENDED
- 24-3324 ORDER JAN 8-25 GRANTING IFP STATUS
- 24-3324-DOC 16 IFP APPLICATION
- 24-3341 ORDER JAN 8-25 GRANTING IFP STATUS
- 2123a FEDERAL COURT-NOTICE OF REMOVAL T0202 NOV 12-2024 combined docs
- 2130a FEDERAL COURT-NOTICE OF REMOVAL 55 NOV 12-2024
- 2135a FEDERAL COURT-NOTICE OF REMOVAL 56 NOV 12-2024 combined docs
- 2427 ORDER DENYING APPEALS 24-3324
- 2428 ORDER 12-13-24 REMANDING CASE BACK TO STATE COURT 2.24-cv-06054-JS
- 2429 Feb. 5-25 RULE SHOW CAUSE ORDER FILED WITH PETITION
- 2526 ORDER MAY 7-25 DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING FOR CONSOLIDATED CASES 24-3324
- 2565c ORDER 12-13-24 REMANDING CASE BACK TO STATE COURT 2.24-cv-06054-JS
- 2565d ORDER 12-13-24 REMANDING CASE BACK TO STATE COURT 2.24-cv-06155-JS
- 2565e ORDER 12-13-24 REMANDING CASE BACK TO STATE COURT 2.24-cv-06156-JS
- 2565f PROOF of SERVICE for WRIT OF CERTIORARI and IFP
- AFFIDAVIT
- CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE
- IFP APPLICATION SUPREME COURT-COMPLETED shorten
- VERIFICATION

IV. Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021)...	12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25
<u>Cilettieri v. Verizon Wireless</u> , 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59939, *4.....	10, 12
<u>Collura v. City of Philadelphia</u> , 590 Fed. Appx. 180, 184.....	12
<u>Dille v. Geer</u> , 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 240860, *1.....	18
<i>Justice Elena Kagan Discussing Class Based Justice 1:16-1:19, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qVDP_z0vzOl&t=5914s</i>	17
<i>In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II</i> , 940 F.2d 832.....	12, 21, 27, 29
<i>Kloeckner v. Solis</i> , 568 U. S. 41, 56, n. 4, 133 S. Ct. 596, 184 L. Ed. 2d 433 (2012).....	12, 14, 25
<u>Kovalev v. Callahan Ward 12th St. LLC</u> , 548 F. Supp. 3d 498, 501, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a)-(b).....	12
<i>Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros</i> , 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999).....	21
<u>Merkin v. Belyi</u> , 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66784, *4-5.....	12
<u>Pennsylvania v. Boldrini</u> , 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134168, *5-6.....	12

Statutes

28 U.S.C. §1443(1).....	2, 9, 11, 23, 24, 29
28 U.S.C. §1446(d).....	2, 11, 23, 24, 25, 29

Constitutional Provisions

USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1.....	9, 10, 12, 20, 21, 27, 29
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV.....	10

VI. Disclaimer for Exhibits

NOTE: ALL EXHIBITS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT CAN BE SEEN AT:

see exhibits the Federal District Court Employees Broken Up the Document into 3 Separate Documents - Reconsideration of Rule to Show Cause Part 1 of 3-Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 52 Filed 02/10/25 Page 1 of 215. see Reconsideration of Rule to Show Cause Part 2 of 3-Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 53 Filed 02/10/25 Page 1 of 100. see Reconsideration of Rule to Show Cause Part 3 of 3-Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 54 Filed 02/10/25 Page 1 of 90.

On December 5, 2024, Respondent filed with the Federal District Court exhibits 700-2161 on USB Flash Drives. see Case: 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 19 Filed 12/05/24 Page 1-10. see exhibits 1265m-1a, 1265m-1a-1, 1265m-1a-2-December 5, 2024, Miscellaneous Motion to Add Exhibit on USB Flash-Drive to the Docket and List of Exhibits.

NOTE: MATERIAL FACTS and ALL EXHIBITS FILED WITH THE APPELLATE COURT CAN BE SEEN AT:

see Exhibits Provided to the Appellate Court at Consolidated Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-364 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.

Also, exhibits 700-2276 are on a USB Flash-Drive filed with the Appellate Court on January 13, 2025. see Case: 24-3324 Document: 58 Page: 1-131 Date Filed: 01/13/2025. see exhibit 2235-January 13, 2025, Miscellaneous Motion to Add Exhibit on USB Flash-Drive to the Docket. see exhibit 1265m-1c-January 13, 2025, List of Exhibits Provided to the Appellate Court. see Case 24-3324 Document 58 Page 13-131 Date Filed 01-13-2025-January 13, 2025, List of Exhibits and Miscellaneous Motion to Add Exhibit on USB Flash-Drive to the Docket.

NOTE: MATERIAL FACTS and ALL EXHIBITS Mailed to City of Philadelphia, Linebarger Goggan & Blair Law Firm, and Attorney Lauren Burgess

On April 7, 2025, Respondent mailed a USB Flash-Drive to the City of Philadelphia, Linebarger, and Attorney Lauren Burgess, which has on the USB Flash-Drive, the March 28, 2025, Amended Answers and Affidavit of Defense, April 7, 2025, List of Exhibits, the November 20, 2024, Amended Answers and Affidavit of Defense, Trial Court Records, Videos, Pictures, and Exhibits 700 through 2437 at cases 2310T0202 and 2305T0155, via USB Flash-Drive.

Respondent made a copy of all the USB Flash-Drives provided to the aforementioned, and provided them with a list of exhibits, they should all have saved on the USB Flash-Drives. see exhibit 1265m-1e-April 7, 2025, List of Exhibits provided to the City of Philadelphia, Linebarger, Attorney Lauren Burgess on USB Flash-Drive. see exhibits 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446-April 9, 2025, Delivery Confirmation for the USB-Flash-Drive to the City of Philadelphia, Linebarger, and Attorney Lauren Burgess. On April 27, 2025, Complainant-Bradley mailed exhibits 2438-2510q to Respondent-City of Philadelphia at cases 2310T0202 and 2305T0155, via USB Flash-Drive, which was "REFUSED" by Respondent-City of Philadelphia. see exhibits 2519, 2519a-1, 2519b-USB Flash-Drives and Documents "REJECTED" by Respondent-City of Philadelphia on April 30, 2025.

NOTE: MATERIAL FACTS and ALL EXHIBITS Provided to the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office.

On April 17, 2025, Respondent mailed a USB Flash-Drive to the City of Philadelphia District Attorney's Office, which has on it the "Entire" April 16, 2025, Criminal Complaint, Trial Court Records, Videos, Pictures, and Exhibits 700 through 2468. Respondent made a copy of all the USB Flash-Drives provided to the aforementioned, and provided them with a list of exhibits, they should all have saved on the USB Flash-Drives. see exhibit 1265m-1e-April 7, 2025, List of Exhibits 700 through 2437, provided to the City of Philadelphia District Attorney's Office

NOTE: MATERIAL FACTS and ALL EXHIBITS Provided to the Common Pleas Court of Philadelphia, via USB Flash-Drive on April 28, 2025, via USB Flash-Drive. see exhibit 2492-April 27, 2025, List of Exhibits 700 through 2510q, provided to the Common Pleas Court of Philadelphia at cases 2310T0202 and 2305T0155.

V. Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Pro se Petitioner-Bradley, respectfully petition this court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of Pennsylvania Third Circuit Court of Appeals

VI. Opinions Below-NOT Sited in Lexis Nexis

The decision by the Pennsylvania Third Circuit Court of Appeals denying Petitioner-Bradley's direct appeal is reported as **CITY OF PHILADELPHIA vs. AISHA ASHA BRADLEY, Consolidated Case: 24-3324 Document: 103 Page: 1 Date Filed: 05/07/2025; City of Phila. v. Bradley, Nos. 24-3324, 24-3339, 2025 U.S. App. LEXIS 14907, at *1 (3d Cir. Mar. 7, 2025)**. The Pennsylvania Third Circuit Court of Appeals denied Petitioner-Bradley's petition for rehearing on May 7, 2025. That order is attached at *exhibit-2526-May 7, 2025, Court Order Denying the Petition for Rehearing at Consolidated Cases 24-3324, 24-3325, 24-3326, 24-3339, 24-3340 and 24-3341*.

The opinions of the United States District Court denying the Notice of Removal can be found in Lexis Nexis. see exhibits 2565c, 2565d, and 2565e.
*City of Phila. v. Bradley, No. 24-CV-6155, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 226665, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2024), City of Phila. v. Bradley, No. 24-CV-6156, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 226656, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2024), City of Phila. v. Bradley, No. 24-CV-6054, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225694, at *8 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2024)*

VI. Jurisdiction

The Pennsylvania Third Circuit Court of Appeals denied Petitioner-Bradley's, petition for rehearing on May 7, 2025. Petitioner-Bradley invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1443(1), having timely filed this petition for a writ of certiorari within ninety days of the Pennsylvania Third Circuit Court of Appeals' judgment.

VII. Constitutional Provisions Involved

USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1:

Article III
Section 2 Justiciability
Clause 1 Cases or Controversies

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;— to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;—to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State,—between Citizens of different States,—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

All Courts have jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction over a matter, pursuant to USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1; therefore, the District Court and the Federal Appellate Courts has a duty, and obligation to determine on its own jurisdiction, and whether it has jurisdiction over Petitioner-Bradley's cases under 28 USCS § 1443(1); without Petitioner-Bradley stating so within her Notice of Removal.

The Court begins with its independent obligation to satisfy itself of its subject matter jurisdiction. *Zambelli Fireworks Mfg. Co. v. Wood*, 592 F.3d 412, 418 (3d Cir. 2010) (stating that the Court “always has jurisdiction to determine its [own] jurisdiction.” (citing *United States v. Ruiz*, 536 U.S. 622, 628, 122 S. Ct. 2450, 153 L. Ed. 2d 586 (2002). 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a)-(b), *Cilettieri v. Verizon Wireless*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59939, *4

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Federal Statutes Involved

Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. §1443(1)

Any of the following civil actions or criminal prosecutions, commenced in a State court may be removed by the defendant to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending:

(1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;

28 U.S.C.S. § 1443 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 119-12, approved May 19, 2025)

Federal Statute

28 U.S.C. §1446(d)

(d) Notice to adverse parties and State court. Promptly after the filing of such notice of removal of a civil action the defendant or defendants shall give written notice thereof to all adverse parties and shall file a copy of the notice with the clerk of such State court, which shall effect the removal and the State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded.

28 U.S.C.S. § 1446 (LexisNexis, Lexis Advance through Public Law 119-12, approved May 19, 2025)

VIII. Statement of the Case

1. The Appellate Court's March 7, 2025, Court Orders are NOT in "COMPLIANCE" with Acts of Congress, which are USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1, and or, U.S. Code § 1443(1)(2); **therefore, consideration by the full court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity.** *In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II*, 940 F.2d 832, Collura v. City of Philadelphia, 590 Fed. Appx. 180, 184, Kovalev v. Callahan Ward 12th St. LLC, 548 F. Supp. 3d 498, 501, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a)-(b), Cilettieri v. Verizon Wireless, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59939, *4, Pennsylvania v. Boldrini, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134168, *5-6, Merkin v. Belyi, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66784, *4-5
2. The federal appellate court ignored a statutory directive 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1), and gave a "BOGUS" argument for doing so. *Even the most formidable policy arguments CANNOT overcome a clear statutory directive.* (*Gorsuch, J., Joined by Roberts, Ch. J., and Thomas, Breyer, Kagan, Kavanaugh, and Barret, JJ.*) *Kloeckner v. Solis*, 568 U. S. 41, 56, n. 4, 133 S. Ct. 596, 184 L. Ed. 2d 433 (2012)., *BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt.*, 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).
3. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement when it stated a plenary review was done. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's court order CANNOT claim a plenary review was done, when her court order added statements, to Judge Juan Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, that were NEVER made within the Remand Order.
4. Petitioner-Bradley is going up against the court because Judge Juan Sanchez and Judge Arianna Freeman do NOT want to uphold state court judges accountable for colluding together, to setup a million-dollar property for Sheriff Sale; when the victims are black, and NOT represented by an attorney. *see State Court Judicial Corruption Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 15-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 14-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 11-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-332. see Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Parcels-Case: 24-3324 Document: 76 Page: 153-168 Date Filed: 01/22/2025. see exhibits 2008-2014-Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Five Parcels 1.2 Million-Dollars*
5. Petitioner believes and feels that because she is a Black working-class woman; she is being discriminated against, and subject to a deprivation of procedural due process in the federal courts and within the state courts.
6. Petitioner believes and feels because of her race, the white judges, Patrick F. Dugan, Judge Daniel Anders, Judge Joshua Roberts, Judge Michele D. Hangle, and others; are NOT being held accountable for their frauds on the court. *see State Court Judicial Corruption Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 15-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 14-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 11-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-332. see Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Parcels-Case: 24-3324 Document: 76 Page: 153-168 Date Filed: 01/22/2025. see exhibits 2008-2014-Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Five Parcels 1.2 Million-Dollars.*

7. Petitioner believes and feels because of her working-class, and race, that the black female judges Crystal Bryant-Powell, Judge Tamika Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Arianna J. Freeman; are too scared to apply the law, serve and protect the constitution, and uphold the white judges, accountable for wrong doing.
8. Judge Crystal Bryant-Powell, Judge Tamika Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Arianna J. Freeman; in all their court orders, contains false statements, that cover up the white judges wrong doing, and or flat out, the white judges wrong doing. for deprivation of due process see December 29, 2023, Answers to the Rule Returnable, p. 4073, Document 44-4, Filed 1/30/2024, Page 173 of 200, at case 2:24-cv-00015-GEKP, CCP- CCP-2305T0156-May 31-2023, for deprivation of due process see December 29, 2023, Answers to the Rule Returnable, p. 4073, Document 12-2, Filed 1/23/2024, Page 1189 of 1496, at case 2:24-cv-00269-GEKP, CCP-2310T0202-October 31-2023. Collusion see Answers to the Rule Returnable, p. 3664-3700, Document 44-2, Filed 1/30/2024, Page 164-200, at case 2:24-cv-00015-GEKP, CCP-2305T0156-May 31-2023. Municipal Fraud see Answers to the Rule Returnable, p. 4238-4305, Document 44-5, Filed 1/30/2024, Page 138-205, at case 2:24-cv-00015-GEKP, CCP-2305T0156-May 31-2023. see Judge Reeves' Order Denying Screening Letter at Case: 24-1209 Document: 64-1 Page: 1 Date Filed: 05/08/2024. see Judge Reeves' Order Denying Petition at Case: 24-1209 Document: 116 Page: 1 Date Filed: 07/26/2024. see Judge Crystal Bryant-Powell's Opinion, NOT Holding Judge Dugan Accountable for Ex Parte Communication, which Setup Petitioner's Private Criminal Complaint for Dismissal-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 77-84 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see exhibit 1359a-Judge Crystal Bryant-Powells Opinion. see Judge Tamika Montgomery-Reeves May 8, 2024, Order Denying the Screening Letter-Case: 24-1209 Document: 64-1 Page: 1-7 Date Filed: 05/08/2024. see Judge Tamika Montgomery-Reeves July 26, 2024, Order Denying the Petition for Rehearing Case: 24-1209 Document: 117 Page: 1 Date Filed: 07/26/2024. see Case: 24-1209 Document: 117 Page: 1 Date Filed: 07/26/2024. see exhibit 1340-Judge Montgomery-Reeves' Order Denying the Screening Letter. see exhibits 1506l, 1506j-Judge Montgomery-Reeves' Orders Denying the Screening Letter. see Judge Arianna J. Freeman Order Denying Screening Letters see Case: 24-3324 Document: 96-1 Page: 1-3 Date Filed: 03/07/2025.
9. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement, when it stated, we conclude, for substantially the reasons provided by the District Court, that Bradley did not advance a facially permissible theory of removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(a), § 1442(a), or § 1443(1) or (2). In the copy Petitioner Bradley's has, Judge Jaun Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, NEVER mentioned 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1). see Judge Arianna J. Freeman Order Denying Screening Letters see Case: 24-3324 Document: 96-1 Page: 1-3 Date Filed: 03/07/2025.
10. In the copy Petitioner Bradley's has, Judge Jaun Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order states, Bradley relied on two federal statutes to establish the Federal Court's jurisdiction over the state civil tax action. The Federal Court stated that the two federal statutes that Bradley relied on are 28 U.S.C. § 1442, and 28 U.S.C. § 1346. see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 29 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. FRAUD ON THE COURT- see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS

Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.

11. Judge Jaun Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, does NOT mention 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1). Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement, when it stated, we conclude, for substantially the reasons provided by the District Court, that Bradley did not advance a facially permissible theory of removal under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1447(a), § 1442(a), or § 1443(1) or (2). *see Judge Arianna J. Freeman Order Denying Screening Letters see Case: 24-3324 Document: 96-1 Page: 1-3 Date Filed: 03/07/2025. see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 29 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. **FRAUD ON THE COURT-** see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.*
12. Judge Jaun Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, does NOT conclude, that Bradley did not advance a facially permissible theory of removal under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1) or (2). **FRAUD ON THE COURT-** *see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.*
13. **JUDGE FREEMAN'S FRAUD ON THE COURT:** Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement to cover up, that Judge Juan Sanchez, did NOT do a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) or (2), and the district court ignored statutory directive 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1). *Even the most formidable policy arguments CANNOT overcome a clear statutory directive. (Gorsuch, J., Joined by Roberts, Ch. J., and Thomas, Breyer, Kagan, Kavanaugh, and Barret, JJ.). Kloeckner v. Solis, 568 U. S. 41, 56, n. 4, 133 S. Ct. 596, 184 L. Ed. 2d 433 (2012)., BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).*
14. We have revisited, that Judge Jaun Sanchez excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)(2), and does NOT mention 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)(2), within his December 13, 2024, Remand Order. *see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 29 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. **FRAUD ON THE COURT-** see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.*
15. Now, what is Judge Arianna J. Freeman's "EXCUSE" for NOT doing a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)(2), and ignoring statutory directive 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)? *Even the most formidable policy arguments CANNOT overcome a clear statutory directive. (Gorsuch, J., Joined by Roberts, Ch. J., and Thomas, Breyer, Kagan, Kavanaugh, and Barret, JJ.). Kloeckner v. Solis, 568 U. S. 41, 56, n. 4, 133 S. Ct. 596, 184 L. Ed. 2d 433 (2012)., BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City*

Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021). see Judge Arianna J. Freeman Order Denying Screening Letters see Case: 24-3324 Document: 96-1 Page: 1-3 Date Filed: 03/07/2025.

16. **JUDGE FREEMAN'S FRAUD ON THE COURT:** Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, excludes a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1), and ignores statutory directive 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1).
17. Petitioner told Judge Jauan Sanchez, and Judge Arianna J. Freeman, she does NOT have federal question jurisdiction, so why did Judge Arianna J. Freeman do a jurisdiction determination for federal question, instead a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)? *see Petitioner Telling the Federal Appellate Court She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Screening Letter-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see Petitioner Telling the District Court She Does Not have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Reconsideration of Order for the December 13, 2024, Remand Order-Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 31 Filed 12/31/24 Page 2.*
18. The District Court setup Petitioner's cases for dismissal by a jurisdiction determination being done under federal question, when Petitioner has already told the district court, the federal appellate court, Judge Jauan Sanchez, and Judge Arianna J. Freeman; she does NOT have federal question jurisdiction, within the Reconsideration of Order, for the Remand Order, and within the Screening Letter for the current case. *see Petitioner Telling the Federal Appellate Court She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Screening Letter-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see Petitioner Telling the District Court She Does Not have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Reconsideration of Order for the December 13, 2024, Remand Order-Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 31 Filed 12/31/24 Page 2.*
19. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order states, *“Because this appeal does not present a substantial question, we summarily affirm the District Court’s December 13, 2024 decisions.* If Judge Arianna J. Freeman is talking about Federal Question being a substantial question, that is missing; Petitioner told the courts, she did NOT have federal question jurisdiction. *see Petitioner Telling the Federal Appellate Court She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Screening Letter-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see Petitioner Telling the District Court She Does Not have Federal Question Jurisdiction within the Reconsideration of Order for the December 13, 2024, Remand Order-Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 31 Filed 12/31/24 Page 2.*
20. *To say there was NO SUBSTANTIAL QUESTION, period; we would have to strongly disagree with Judge Freeman.* *see Screening Letter Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-364 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.*
21. *For Judge Freeman to say, there is NO substantial question period, would mean, that there was NO argument, that Judge Juan Sanchez excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1), and relief requested by Petitioner was to remand the cases back to the district court for*

a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1) . see Screening Letter Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-364 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.

22. Within the Screening Letter Petitioner reported Judge Jaun Sanchez's "FRAUD ON THE COURT" and that he excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1); and that is NOT a substantial argument, which builds a substantial question?
23. We believe and feel, that Petitioner CANNOT receive due process because Judge Freeman and Judge Sanchez are too afraid to uphold white judges accountable for wrong doing; when their accuser is a working-class black woman, and NOT represented by an attorney.
24. Judge Freeman and Judge Sanchez will NOT go near a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1), which would hold white judges accountable for deprivations of due process, NOT enforcing civil rights, and or "FRAUD ON THE COURT".
25. Petitioner lost her job of 16 years behind these cases, racism, classism, white privilege, and white supremacy. Petitioner has a right to call out Racism, Classism, and Judge Freeman's, Cowardliness. *see State Court's Judicial Corruption Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 15-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 14-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 11-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-332. see Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Parcels-Case: 24-3324 Document: 76 Page: 153-168 Date Filed: 01/22/2025. see exhibits 2008-2014-Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Five Parcels 1.2 Million-Dollars.*
26. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement when it stated, "*We have appellate jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, see 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d); BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021), and we exercise plenary review over the District Court's remand decisions, see Lazorko v. Pa. Hosp., 237 F.3d 242, 247 (3d Cir. 2000)".*
27. **Judge Arianna J. Freeman did NOT exercise a "PLENARY REVIEW" because she added a statement to Judge Jaun Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, that was NEVER said within the Remand Order.**
28. Within Judge Jaun Sanchez's February 5, 2025, Rule to Show Cause Orders, the court states, "*Bradley has NOT shown any basis for reconsideration of the Remand Order. Bradley contends that in remanding the case, the Court failed to consider whether removal was proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1). Aside from referencing § 1443(1), Bradley made no attempt in her Notice of Removal to assert that removal was warranted under this statute". see Rule to Show Cause, p. 2., see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 49 Filed 02/05/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 55 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 48 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5. FRAUD ON THE COURT- see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.*

29. **JUDGE FREEMAN'S FRAUD ON THE COURT:** Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, gave a false statement when it stated, "we exercise plenary review over the District Court's remand decisions. Judge Arianna J. Freeman could NOT have exercised a plenary review, when her March 7, 2025, court order lied about statements made in, Judge Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, and instead discussed, mention, and or described, statements made in a totally separate order, that is NOT within the December 13, 2024, Remand Order, which instead, is within Judge Jaun Sanchez's, February 5, 2025, Rule to Show Cause Orders. *see Judge Arianna J. Freeman Order Denying Screening Letters see Case: 24-3324 Document: 96-1 Page: 1-3 Date Filed: 03/07/2025. see Judge Jaun Sanchez's February 5, 2025, Rule Show Cause Order at cases 2:24-cv-06054, 2:24-cv-06155, and 2:24-cv-06156. see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 49 Filed 02/05/25 Page 1-5. see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 55 Filed 02/05/25 Page 1-5. see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 48 Filed 02/05/25 Page 1 of 5.*
30. Judge Jaun Sanchez's February 5, 2025, Rule to Show Cause Orders states, "Bradley contends that in remanding the case, the Court failed to consider whether removal was proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1). Aside from referencing § 1443(1), Bradley made no attempt in her Notice of Removal to assert that removal was warranted under this statute", *see Rule to Show Cause, p. 2., see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 49 Filed 02/05/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 55 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 48 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5. **FRAUD ON THE COURT-** see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17*
31. Why is Judge Arianna J. Freeman, Judge Tamika Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Jaun Sanchez fearful of doing a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1)?
32. Matter before the Court is what Justice Elena Kagan spoke against, at the Birth Right Citizenship hearing, which is "Class Based Justice" in regards to obtaining Citizenship. *see Justice Elena Kagan Discussing 1:16-1:19, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qVDP_z0vz0I&t=5914s.*
33. The matter before the court is that a Black Woman CANNOT receive due process because she is "BLACK and Working Class", and the black female judges, and Latino judge are too scared to uphold the white judges accountable for wrong doing. This is what Petitioner believes and feels based on the black female judges' and the Latino judge's false statements within their court orders, the material facts presented to the court, and the law.
34. A "FACT" is a "FACT", regardless if, that fact is presented to the court by an attorney, or a non-attorney, or a black person, or white person. The law should be applied based on the facts, NOT based on if the accused are white judges, and the accuser is a black woman.
35. The Matter before the Court is the Epitome of Racism and Classism. Petitioner does NOT make the cut of being, deserving of justice, and due process because of her race, and or class, and

because of the race, and or class of the accused is majority white, and or pass for white. *This is the Epitome of Racism and Classism.*

BACKGROUND-FRAUD ON THE COURT

36. Judge Jaun Sanchez December 13, 2024, Remand Order is a “FRUAD” on the court because the document contains false statements; therefore, the REMAND ORDER should have been “VACATED”.

To state a claim for fraud upon the court, a plaintiff must properly plead: (1) an intentional fraud; (2) by an officer of the court; (3) which is directed at the court itself; and (4) that in fact deceives the court. Only egregious misconduct such as bribery of a judge or jury or fabrication of evidence by counsel is covered. Because fraud upon the court challenges the very principle upon which the judicial system is based—finality of a judgment—stating a claim must be not just a high hurdle to climb but a steep cliff-face to scale. Dille v. Geer, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 240860, *1

The fourth element of fraud upon the court is met only where the misconduct at issue has successfully deceived the court and thus impugned the integrity of the judicial process. Dille v. Geer, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 240860, *1

37. Intentionally, false statements are made in Judge Juan Sanchez’s court order, regarding Petitioner Bradley’s removals and court documents; to setup the cases for “REMANDING” back to the state courts.
38. The December 13, 2024, Remand Order, gave a false statement in regards to Petitioner’s removals NOT being submitted under statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1).
39. Within the December 13, 2024, “REMAND” order, the Federal District Court stated, Bradley relied on two federal statutes to establish the Federal Court’s jurisdiction over the state civil tax action. The Federal Court stated that the two federal statutes that Bradley relied on are 28 U.S.C. § 1442 and 28 U.S.C. § 1346. *see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 29 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6. see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 23 Filed 12/13/24 Page 6.*
FRAUD ON THE COURT- see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17

40. Within Judge Jaun Sanchez's February 5, 2025, Rule to Show Cause Orders the court states, "Bradley has NOT shown any basis for reconsideration of the Remand Order. Bradley contends that in remanding the case, the Court failed to consider whether removal was proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1). Aside from referencing § 1443(1), Bradley made no attempt in her Notice of Removal to assert that removal was warranted under this statute". see Rule to Show Cause, p. 2., see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 49 Filed 02/05/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 55 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 48 Filed 2/5/25 Page 2 of 5. **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit 2244- *Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17*
41. On the first page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she states, "**NOTICE OF REMOVAL, Deprivation of Procedural Due Process, Official Oppression, Obstruction to the Administration of the Law, Fraud and Fraudulent Misrepresentation, alleged.** The District Court has Jurisdiction Pursuant to 28 USCS § 1291, Part 1 of 3, and or 28 USCS § 1292(a)(1) (b)(c)(1), and or 28 USCS § 1331, Part 1 of 3, and or 28 U.S. Code § 1441 (a)(c) joinder of Federal Law Claims and State Law Claims, and or 28 USCS §1442 (a)(1) (2)(3), and or 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), and or 28 U.S. Code § 1447(b)(d), and or 28 USCS § 1450, and or 42 USCS § 1983, Part 1 of 16, and or USCS Const. Amend. 5, and or USCS Const. Amend. 14, and or 42 USCS § 1983, and or 28 U.S. Code § 1346(a)(b)(1)(c)- United States as defendant. **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit 2244- *Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17*.
42. On the first page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she gives the court a brief description of the purpose for the removal, state the statutes the removal is pursuant to, and some of the alleged offenses, which meets the requirement of 28 USCS § 1446(d). **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit 2244- *Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17*

To remove a case "pursuant to" §1442 or §1443, then, just means that a defendant's notice of removal must assert the case is removable "in accordance with or by reason of" one of those provisions. BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).

43. On the first page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she tells the court, "**The District Court has Jurisdiction Pursuant to 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2).** **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit

2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17

44. On the eighth page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she gives the court another brief description of the purpose for the removal, and alleged some of the violation of laws.
45. On the eighth page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she tells the court the Notice of Removal is due to Lack of Jurisdiction, Violation of Federal Laws, and Conflict of Interest, and state the removal is pursuant to **28 USCS § 1443(1)(2)**, which meets the requirement of **28 USCS § 1446(d)**.

To remove a case "pursuant to" §1442 or §1443, then, just means that a defendant's notice of removal must assert the case is removable "in accordance with or by reason of" one of those provisions. BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).

46. On the sixteenth page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she tells the court, "**To Secure uniformity with 28 U.S. Code § 1346(a)(b)(1)(c), and or U.S. Code § 1441(a)(c) (1)(A), and or 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), and or 28 USCS § 1331; the Notice of Removals should be "GRANTED". FRAUD ON THE COURT-** see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.
47. On the sixteenth page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she tells the court, "**To Secure uniformity with 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2); the Notice of Removals should be "GRANTED". FRAUD ON THE COURT-** see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.
48. In the December 13, 2024, Remand Order, Judge Juan Sanchez's court orders, frauds the court, and gives a false statement in regards to Petitioner's removals NOT being submitted under statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), which has caused a premature Notice of Appeal submitted to the federal appellate court because Judge Juan Sanchez excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), which is a violation of USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1.

49. Because the District Court; NOR the Federal Appellate court is in compliance with the USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1, or 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2); a consideration by the full court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity with USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1. *In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II, 940 F.2d 832,*
50. It is well established that a court may only grant a motion for reconsideration if the movant can show: (1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence that was not previously available; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice. *see Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999).*
51. Petitioner alleged the 800 Seffer Street parcels were setup for Sheriff Sale by State Court Employees, State Court Judges, and other Third-Party Participants; therefore, she CANNOT receive due process within the State Courts. *see Exhibit 1265j on the Blue USB Flash-Drive filed at case 2:24-cv-06054, on December 5, 2024. see exhibit 1265j-November 20, 2024, Amended Answers to the Rule Returnable and Affidavit of Defense, see Exhibit 1265j-on the Blue USB Flash-Drive filed at case 2:24-cv-06155-JS, on December 5, 2024. see exhibit 1265j-November 20, 2024, Amended Answers to the Rule Returnable and Affidavit of Defense, see Exhibit 1265j on the Grey USB Flash-Drive filed at case 2:24-cv-06156-JS, on December 5, 2024. see exhibit 1265j-November 20, 2024, Amended Answers to the Rule Returnable and Affidavit of Defense, State Causes of Action see exhibit 1265j-November 20, 2024, Amended Answers to the Rule Returnable and Affidavit of Defense, p. 5658-7598. see November 20, 2024, Amended Answers to the Rule Returnable and Affidavit of Defense-Cases CCP-51-MD-0003368-OCT-20-2021 and CCP-211001594-OCT-20-2021 were Setup for Dismissal, Criminal Case, p. 187-188, 200-203, 206-210, 217-238, 2575-2684, 3525-3984, 3910-3912, 3913-3920, 3928-4037, Civil Case p. 274-288, 324-328, 953-1474, 1475-1778, 3474-3505, 3506-3520, 3521-3524, 4097-4127, 4128-4186, Federal Cases Setup for Remanding, p. 4186-5381, 5382-5470, Alleged Municipal Fraud, p. 2507-2773, 3197-3473, Treatment Received from Government Employees, p. 5470-5489.*
52. Within the State Courts, Petitioner CANNOT enforce Civil Rights, to establish, why the 800 Seffert Street parcels, should NOT be sold in a Sheriff Sale because to do, so would establish, the State Court Judges' guilt in setting up the parcels for Sheriff Sale; therefore, the state court judges are controlling the outcome of the cases within the state courts.
53. Within the State Courts, Petitioner CANNOT establish why the 800 Seffert Street parcels, should NOT be sold in a Sheriff Sale because to do, so would establish the State Court Judges' guilt in setting up the parcels for Sheriff Sale; therefore, the state court judges are controlling the outcome of the cases within the state courts. *see State Court Judicial Corruption Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 15-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-*

06155-JS Document 14-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 11-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-332. see Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Parcels-Case: 24-3324 Document: 76 Page: 153-168 Date Filed: 01/22/2025. see exhibits 2008-2014-Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Five Parcels 1.2 Million-Dollars.

- 54. Currently, the State Court Judges, Judge Joshau Roberts and Judge Daniel Anders are controlling, which documents are entered to the docket as material facts, to establish their guilt in setting up the property for Sheriff Sale.**
- 55. Judge Daniel Anders decides on, which documents the IFP will cover the cost of; therefore, controlling the outcome of the case, and which documents entered to docket to establish his guilt.**
- 56. Judge Joshua Roberts have DENIED all of Petitioners motions in the state court except for the IFP motion, and one of the motions for reconsideration. The motion to intervene that was once "GRANTED"; Judge Joshua Roberts later denied May 12, 2025.**

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT- Judge Arianna J. Freeman “IGNORED” Statutory Directives 28 U.S.C. §1443(1) and 28 U.S.C. §1446(d). Plus, Petitioner’s Removals were Setup for “REMANDING” by the District Court, and Judge Juan Sanchez’s December 13, 2024, Remand Order, for a Fraudulent Determination under Federal Question; when the Removals Lack Federal Question Jurisdiction, and Judge Arianna Freeman went along with the Setup.

57. The District Court selected on the docket cover sheet that the court’s jurisdiction is based on federal question, to setup the cases for “REMANDING”. *see exhibit 2315a-Cover Sheet for the Notice of Removal: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 98, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see exhibits 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281-Docket Sheet Showing the Federal Court’s Jurisdiction is based on Federal Question: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 116-127, Date Filed: 2-3-2025.*
58. On November 19, 2024, Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct the Record, asking the District Court to correct the docket sheet, to reflect that the court’s jurisdiction is under the US being a party. The District Court “DENIED” the Motion to Correct Record because it went against the setup for “REMANDING”. Remember the District Court setup the cases for a determination under federal question; when Respondent does NOT have federal question jurisdiction. *see exhibit 2315-Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the District Court, Requesting Correction to Docket Sheet- see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 13 Page: 1-5, Date Filed: 11-19-2024. see Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the District Court, Requesting Correction to Docket Sheet-see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 37 Page: 1-34, Date Filed: 1-21-2025.*
59. On January 13, 2025, Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct the Record, asking the District Court to correct the false statement made in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order; stating that Petitioner submitted the Notice of Removal under two statutes. The District Court “DENIED” the Motion to Correct the Record. Petitioner is going up against the federal courts and the state courts because they do NOT want uphold white male judges accountable for wrong doing towards a working-class black woman. *see exhibit 2313-Motion to Correct the Record-False Statement in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 68-93, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 36 Page: 1-13, Date Filed: 1-13-2025.*
60. On February 3, 2025, Petitioner filed an affidavit of Service with the federal appellate court for the Motions to correct the Record, filed in the District Courts that were “DENIED”. *see exhibit 2379-All Copies of the Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the Appellate Court, with the Affidavit of Service-see Case: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 1-145, Date Filed: 2-3-2025.*

61. The federal appellate court is aware that Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct the Record, requesting for the District Court, to correct the docket sheet to reflect, that the court's jurisdiction is under the US being a party. *see exhibit 2379-All Copies of the Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the Appellate Court, with the Affidavit of Service-see Case: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 1-145, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see exhibit 2315-Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the District Court, Requesting Correction to Docket Sheet-see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 13 Page: 1-5, Date Filed: 11-19-2024. see Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the District Court, Requesting Correction to Docket Sheet-see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 37 Page: 1-34, Date Filed: 1-21-2025.*
62. The federal appellate court is aware that Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct the Record requesting for the District Court, to correct the false statement made in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order; stating that Petitioner submitted the Notice of Removal under two statutes. *see exhibit 2379-All Copies of the Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the Appellate Court, with the Affidavit of Service-see Case: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 1-145, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see exhibit 2313-Motion to Correct the Record-False Statement in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 68-93, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 36 Page: 1-13, Date Filed: 1-13-2025.*
63. The Judge Arianna J. Freeman went along with the setup for a determination for jurisdiction, under federal question, and even gave a false statement in her March 7, 2025, court order, to cover up, that Judge Jaun Sanchez "IGNORED" statutory directives 28 U.S.C. §1443(1) and 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).

NOTE: To the Court the United States, the United States Government has been added as case parties in the March 28, 2025, Amended Answers and Affidavit filed at the Common Pleas Court of Philadelphia.

64. **FRAUD ON THE COURT:** Judge Arianna J. Freeman's Court Order IGNORED Statutory Directives 28 U.S.C. §1443(1) and 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).
65. *The Supreme Court bears NO warrant to ignore clear statutory language on the ground that other courts have done so. The Supreme Court's duty is to follow the law as it finds it, NOT to follow rotely whatever lower courts once might have said about it. (Gorsuch, J., Joined by Roberts, Ch. J., and Thomas, Breyer, Kagan, Kavanaugh, and Barret, JJ.). BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).*
66. *Even the most formidable policy arguments CANNOT overcome a clear statutory directive. (Gorsuch, J., Joined by Roberts, Ch. J., and Thomas, Breyer, Kagan, Kavanaugh,*

and Barret, JJ.). Kloeckner v. Solis, 568 U. S. 41, 56, n. 4, 133 S. Ct. 596, 184 L. Ed. 2d 433 (2012)., *BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt.*, 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).

67. On the first page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she gives the court a brief description of the purpose for the removal, the state statutes the removal is pursuant to, and some of the alleged offenses, which meets the requirement of 28 USCS § 1446(d). **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17

To remove a case "pursuant to" §1442 or §1443, then, just means that a defendant's notice of removal must assert the case is removable "in accordance with or by reason of " one of those provisions. BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1538 (2021).

68. On the first page of Bradley's Notice of Removal, she tells the court, "**The District Court has Jurisdiction Pursuant to 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2)**. **FRAUD ON THE COURT**- see exhibit 2244- Notice of Removal Discussing Statute 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), p. 1, 8, 16, see Case 2.24-cv-06054-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06155-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17, see Case 2.24-cv-06156-JS Document 2 Filed 11/12/24 Page 2, 9, 17.
69. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, IGNORES that Petitioner meet the Requirement of 28 U.S.C. §1446(d), and made the District Court aware that the Notice of Removal is pursuant to **28 USCS § 1443(1)(2)**.
70. Judge Arianna J. Freeman's March 7, 2025, court order, IGNORES that Petitioner filed Motions to Correct the Record for the false statements made in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order, and for the district court to correct the docket sheet, from listing the court's jurisdiction is federal question jurisdiction. *see exhibit 2379-All Copies of the Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the Appellate Court, with the Affidavit of Service-see Case: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 1-145, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see exhibit 2313-Motion to Correct the Record-False Statement in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 68-93, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 36 Page: 1-13, Date Filed: 1-13-2025.*

Court Retaliation

71. When the District Court and the Federal Appellate Court took away Petitioner-Bradley's electronic filing privileges it made way for District Court's Supervisor, Clerk Kevis Eibel to tamper with Petitioner-Bradley's documents. Kevin Eibel misfiled documents submitted to the court, altered a document submitted to the court, and did NOT file a document at all submitted to the court. *see Kevin Eibel's Court Retaliation and Official Oppression-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 248-298 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see exhibits 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2293, 2294, 2295- Kevin Eibel's Court Retaliation Against Complainant-Bradley Filed a Second Time at the District Court as an exhibit to the Reconsideration of Order for the Rule to Show Cause Order-Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 59 Filed 02/10/25 Page 192-215. see Court Employees broken up the documents; therefore, continues at Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 59-1 Filed 02/10/25 Page 1-23. see Kevin Eibel's Court Retaliation Filed with the Complainant-Bradley Court-Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 248-298 Date Filed: 01/28/2025. see District Court's February 5, 2025, Court Order "DENYING" Request Made of Kevin Eibel-Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 49 Filed 02/05/25 Page 5 of 5. see exhibit 2429-District Court's February 5, 2025, Court Order "DENYING" Request Made of Kevin Eibel. see exhibit 2379-All Copies of the Motions to Correct the Record Filed at the Appellate Court, with the Affidavit of Service-see Case: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 1-145, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see exhibit 2313-Motion to Correct the Record-False Statement in the December 13, 2024, Remand Order: 24-3324 Document: 89 Page: 68-93, Date Filed: 2-3-2025. see Case: 2:24-cv-06054 Document: 36 Page: 1-13, Date Filed: 1-13-2025.*

Conclusion

72. Because Petitioner's removals are "AUTHORIZED" by Congress, the Federal District Court and the Appellate Court is NOT in compliance with the USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1, and or 28 USCS § 1343(a)(1)(2)(3)(4), and or 28 U.S. Code § 1346(a)(b)(1)(c), and or 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), and or 28 U.S.C. §1447(d),
73. Because the Federal District Court and the Appellate Court is NOT in compliance with the USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1, and or, 28 U.S. Code § 1346(a)(b)(1)(c), and or 28 USCS § 1443(1); **a consideration by the full court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity with USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1.**, *In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II*, 940 F.2d 832,
74. Respectfully, Petitioner request for the cases to be "REMANDED" back to the Federal District Court for a determination of jurisdiction under 28 U.S. Code § 1346(a)(b)(1)(c), and or 28 USCS § 1343(a)(1)(2)(3)(4), and or 28 USCS § 1443(1), and or USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1.
75. Appellate jurisdiction is under 28 USCS § 1443(1).
76. The District Court denied the motion to correct the record; to setup the cases for dismissal; due to lack of jurisdiction under federal question. Judge Jaun Sanchez should "RECUSE" himself. *see exhibit 2380-Affidavit of Service for Motion to Correct the Record-Docket Sheet Incorrect Listing Jurisdiction under Federal Question. see Amended Reconsideration of Order, Petitioner Agreeing with the District Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, Instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 30 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 29 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 35 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44. see Response to Screening Letter, Petitioner Agreeing with the Federal Appellate Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), see Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.*
77. **FRAUD ON THE COURT**-Petitioner's appeal for Judge Juan Sanchez December 13, 2024, Remand Order was setup for dismissal, and Judge Arianna J. Freeman went along with the setup, after being made aware of, Petitioner's requests made to the District Court, to correct the docket sheet from showing, jurisdiction is under federal question. *see Amended Reconsideration of Order, Petitioner Agreeing with the District Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, Instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS §*

1443(1)(2), see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 30 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 29 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 35 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44. see Response to Screening Letter, Petitioner Agreeing with the Federal Appellate Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), see Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025

78. **FRAUD ON THE COURT**-Judge Arianna Freeman “DENIED” Petitioner’s appeals due to lack of substantial question (federal question jurisdiction); when Petitioner admitted to the federal district court, and the federal appellate court; she does NOT have federal question jurisdiction; but Judge Arianna Freeman went along with the setup, and dismissed Petitioner’s appeals for lack of substantial question (federal question jurisdiction). *see Amended Reconsideration of Order, Petitioner Agreeing with the District Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, Instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), see Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 30 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 29 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 35 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 44. see Response to Screening Letter, Petitioner Agreeing with the Federal Appellate Court that She does NOT have Federal Question Jurisdiction, Instead has jurisdiction under 28 USCS § 1443(1)(2), see Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-2 Date Filed: 01/28/2025*
79. *To say there was NO SUBSTANTIAL QUESTION, period; we would have to strongly disagree with Judge Freeman. see Screening Letter Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-364 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.*
80. *For Judge Freeman to say, there is NO substantial question period, would mean, that there was NO argument, that Judge Juan Sanchez excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1), and relief requested by Petitioner was to remand the cases back to the district court for a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1) . see Screening Letter Case: 24-3324 Document: 82 Page: 1-364 Date Filed: 01/28/2025.*
81. Within the Screening Letter Petitioner reported Judge Jaun Sanchez’s “FRAUD ON THE COURT” and that he excluded a jurisdiction determination under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1443(1); and that is NOT a substantial argument, which builds a substantial question?
82. We believe and feel, that Petitioner CANNOT receive due process because Judge Freeman and Judge Sanchez are too afraid to uphold white judges accountable for wrong doing; when their accuser is a working-class black woman that is NOT represented by an attorney.
83. Petitioner is being subject to Racism, Classism, and Court Retaliation at the Federal Courts and State Courts because she is a black working-class woman, accusing white male judges, and judges of a different class then Petitioner, of colluding together, to setup cases **CCP-51-MD-0003368-OCT-20-2021**, and **CCP-211001594-OCT-20-2021**, for dismissal, which resulted to the 800 Seffert Street parcels being setup for Sheriff Sale.

see State Court Judicial Corruption Case 2:24-cv-06054-JS Document 15-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06155-JS Document 14-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-330, see Case 2:24-cv-06156-JS Document 11-1 Filed 11/16/24 Page 1-332. see Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Parcels-Case: 24-3324 Document: 76 Page: 153-168 Date Filed: 01/22/2025. see exhibits 2008-2014-Assessed Value for 800 Seffert Street Five Parcels 1.2 Million-Dollars.

84. Because the Appellate Court is NOT in compliance with the USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1, or 28 USCS § 1443(1); a consideration by the full court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity with USCS Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1., In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II, 940 F.2d 832,
85. Judge Arianna J. Freeman "IGNORED" Statutory Directives 28 U.S.C. §1443(1) and 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).
86. Plus, Petitioner's Removals were Setup for "REMANDING" by the District Court, and Judge Juan Sanchez's December 13, 2024, Remand Order, for a Fraudulent Determination under Federal Question; when the Removals Lack Federal Question Jurisdiction, and Judge Arianna Freeman went along with the Setup.
87. Respectfully, Petitioner ask for the Writ of Certiorari to be "GRANTED".
88. **Due Petitioner's unemployment, and job loss of 16 years, due to the cases, effecting her job performance, respectfully, Petitioner asked to be excused from providing multiple copies of the Writ of Certiorari and the IFP Application.**

4. What To File

Unless you are an inmate confined in an institution and not represented by counsel, file:

—An original and ten copies of a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and an original and 10 copies of an affidavit or declaration in support thereof. See Rule 39.

—An original and 10 copies of a petition for a writ of certiorari with an appendix consisting of a copy of the judgment or decree you are asking this Court to review including any order on rehearing, and copies of any opinions or orders by any courts or administrative agencies that have previously considered your case. See Rule 14.1(i).

—One affidavit or declaration showing that all opposing parties or their counsel have been served with a copy of the papers filed in this Court. See Rule 29.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted
Respectfully submitted,



Aisha Bradley

August 18, 2025