

U.S. Supreme Court of the United States of America

No.

25-5753

Original

---

WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

Eddie Scott, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Respondents

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF FOR PETITIONERS

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Eddie Scott  
3617 NE 24 Court  
Ocala, Florida, 34479  
Eddiescott1234@yahoo.com  
(904) 795-6627

**Petition Question Presented**

- I. The question presented is whether a Judge can keep a case closed even after the plaintiff overcame the Younger Doctrine by being acquitted after a state trial on 8/1/2024, and now that the state proceedings have ended? Although Federal Rule 60(B) states a judgment can be discharged, void, released, or no longer equitable, or any other reason that justifies relief. Will being acquitted at a jury trial meet the relief for one of those options under Federal Rule 60(B)? And is it lawful for federal judges to use the Federal Anti-Injunction Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2283, which provides that a federal court may not enjoin state court proceedings "except as expressly authorized by an Act of Congress when use of 28 U.S.C. 2241 and Section 1983 is petitioned. Are 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which expands Habeas Corpus to state citizens who are under state authority (Habeas Corpus 2241), and 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, both expressly authorizing Acts of Congress? Did the District Court in Ocala, Florida, "misinterpret" the Federal Anti-Injunction Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2283, by not allowing the petitioner to file a Section 1983 pursuant to this court-established precedent, *Mitchum V. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225 (1972)? And did the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals err in "judicial proceedings" by not following Mandate Rule 41 pursuant to this court-established precedent, *Mullane V. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950).

II

**List of Parties Proceeding and Rule 29.6 Statement**

The corporate disclosure statement in the petition for a writ of certiorari remains accurate.

III

**Statement of Related Proceedings**

Pursuant to this court's Rule 14.1(b)(iii), the following proceedings are directly related to this case:

- District Court Judgement entered 8/30/24 Eddie Scott V. Crystal Blanton & City of Ocala, Florida No: 5-24-CV-139-TJC-PRL.
- The Eleventh Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals ignored, delayed, and defaulted on the Writ of Mandamus. No: 24-12908, 1/13/25.

IV

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Concise Statement of the Case.....7.8

Argument.....9,10,11,12

(A)The Federal District Court's deviation from the U.S. Constitution and egregious use of the *Younger Doctrine* violate the Due Process Clause.

(B)Federal courts are duty-bound to comply with AEDPA (1) "was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States"; or (2) "was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding."

Conclusion.....12

V

TABLES OF AUTHORITIES

New Cases:

Klein v. Martin, 607 U.S. \_\_\_ (2026)

Coney Island Auto Parts Unlimited, Inc. v. Burton, 607 U.S. \_\_\_ (2026)

Constitution, statutes, and rules related to the New Cases:

Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA).....

Federal Rule 60 (B)(4).....

Due Process Clause .....

U.S. Supreme Court of the United States of America

No. 25-5753

---

WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

Eddie Scott, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Respondents

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF FOR PETITIONERS**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Rule 15.8. This supplemental brief under the Supreme Court Rule is applicable to new cases. The Second Congress passed the Anti-Injunction Act in March of 1793, which states "no writ of injunction" shall be issued to stay proceedings in State Court. Some will say that means a firm, absolute bar, but this cannot be true, because if so, then the Anti-Injunction Act would have been void on its face since the beginning. After all, it would be a statutory construction to the Supremacy Clause stated in the Federal Constitution, which was effective in March of 1789. The Supremacy Clause says the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. To say Federal Courts can't enjoin State proceedings as an absolute would mean that judges of the states could disregard the Federal Constitution and laws of the United States without being bound by the Supremacy Clause. Congress later revisited the Anti-Injunction Act in 1948 with 28 U.S.C. 2283, a federal law that restricts federal courts from

U.S. Supreme Court of the United States of America

enjoining state court proceedings unless authorized by an Act of Congress. The Burger Court used this statute for the Younger Doctrine. 28 U.S.C 2283 had important exceptions, one of which was an Act expressly authorized by Congress, Necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, and to protect or effectuate its judgments. This is extremely important because the Act of Congress that I used was 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, which was expressly authorized and enacted on April 20<sup>th</sup> 1871. 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 is used when the defendant acted under the color of state law and when the defendant's actions deprived the plaintiff of a right secured by the Constitution or federal laws, and one of the remedies under Section 1983 is "injunctive relief," see appendices (E) of the rehearing petition 4/10/2024. The Appendices(D) search warrant is attached with the initial writ of certiorari sent to this court and docketed on September 29, 2025, proving that I was in custody under the State of Florida, unlawfully, in violation of the U.S. Constitution and laws of the United States. The District Court also disregarded and violated federal law 28 U.S.C. 1343 Civil rights (A)(3)(4), 28 U.S.C 1331 by not allowing me to petition Section 1983, these federal laws gives District Courts original jurisdiction over the subject matter **(3)** to redress the deprivation, under color of any state law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the constitution of the united states or by any act of congress providing for equal rights of citizens or all persons within the jurisdiction of the united states. **(4)** To recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to vote. 28 U.S.C. 1331; The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Habeas Corpus 2241 is a expressly authorized act, enacted by Congress on June 25<sup>th</sup> 1948 allowing prisoners under authority of the United States or is committed for trial before some court [*State Court*] thereof or, is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States, this Federal statute was also petition to the Federal District Court but was denied and dismissed without prejudice, no hearing was administered. I asked this court for its interpretation of 28 U.S.C. § 2283 and the established precedent *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U. S. 37 (1971), clarifying the use of Section 1983 and Habeas Corpus 2241 with a more Uniform interpretation for consistency throughout the country.

**ARGUMENT**

**A. The Federal District Court's deviation from the U.S Constitution and the egregious use of the *Younger Doctrine* violate the Due Process Clause.**

Due process is so vital that *Coney Island Auto Parts Unlimited, Inc. v. Burton*, 607 U.S. \_\_\_ (2026) States "Therefore, a party in Coney Island's position would need to show that some principle of law, such as the Due Process Clause, gives a party the right to allege voidness at any time. Page 607 U.S. \_\_\_ 4. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 permits a court to "re-lieve a party ... from a final judgment, order, or proceed-ing," and subdivision (b) (4) specifically authorizes a court to grant relief from a "void" judgment. Parties may seek relief under Rule 60 by filing a motion with the court. Page 607 U.S. \_\_\_ 2-3. Opinion written by Justice Alito. This authorized procedure was not followed by the Federal District Court of Florida after the petitioner was acquitted, which made *Younger* and failure to state a claim void, with the facts of the state's proceeding being over, and with it ending in favor of the petitioner. After filing a motion to reopen the case on 8/12/2024, the Federal District Court did not follow Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4), denying the petitioner relief and due process on 8/30/2024, an unauthorized abuse of discretion. The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. Due process guarantees protect individual rights by limiting the exercise of government power. The Supreme Court has held that the Fifth Amendment, which applies to federal government action, provides persons with both procedural and substantive due process guarantees. If the federal government seeks to deprive a person of a protected life, liberty, or property interest, the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause requires that the government first provide certain procedural protections. Procedural due process requires the government to provide a person with notice and an opportunity for a hearing before such a deprivation. The Supreme Court has interpreted the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause to include substantive due process guarantees that protect certain fundamental constitutional rights from federal government interference.

U.S. Supreme Court of the United States of America

The Federal District Court failed to give the petitioner a hearing to present the law and the facts of the case. I was deprived of the opportunity to be heard before the government barred me from seeking Justice. The Fifth Amendment is a ministerial duty the government must follow under oath, 28 U.S. 453. This ministerial duty was not followed by the Federal District Court. The Fifth Amendment is an absolute right that the government cannot infringe on; this power is given to the people to use when necessary. Taking away this absolute right is a clear unauthorized abuse of discretion and usurpation of power. The case that was used against the petitioner, unjustifiably and unlawfully, was *Younger V. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37(1971). This case gives judges too much discretion, which allows law enforcement and prosecutors to engage in unfair prosecutions. It allows judges, law enforcement officials, and prosecutors to be arbitrary while violating persons' due process rights. The Federal statute 28 U.S.C. 2283 is enough to maintain federalism, it states a court of the United States may not grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State court except as expressly authorized by an Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments. It does not say if a State case is being brought in Good Faith federal courts may not enjoin State court proceedings, it says no such thing; so a State court stating that there case is being brought in Good Faith does not give Federal Courts the right to not uphold the Federal Constitution by validity the facts of the persons redress of grievances with a opportunity to be heard in court, which is a ministerial duty of due process. *Younger* is a "Gatekeeper" that keeps doors closed, violating the Petition Clause and Due Process Clause. I have standing to challenge this law with a "Concrete and Particularized" injury because it could have cost me my entire life in state prison; *Younger* caused me to receive irreparable harm, leaving me with emotional distress by being forced to go to trial, knowing that I could be taken away from my family and loved ones. This could have been avoided if the Federal District Court hadn't abused *Younger*, barring the petitioner from getting federal assistance or intervention, and enjoining the state prosecution. Even with the State case being brought in Bad Faith pursuant to *Dombrowski*, see the rehearing Certiorari petition appendices (E), I was forced to either become a trial lawyer with representing myself, having to win or face the rest of my life in State prison. Observance of due process of law 1368( 42 Edw. III, C.3), which reaffirmed the Magna Carta, which has a huge influence on the U.S. Constitution Due Process Clause; States "It is assented and accorded, for the good Governance of the Commons, that

no Man be put to answer without Presentment before Justices, or Matter of Record, or by due Process and Writ original, according to the old Law of the Land [Magna Carta]: And if anything from henceforth be done to the contrary, it shall be void in the Law, and holden for Error. The *Younger Doctrine* was used to bar me from making a Matter of Record; a court hearing never occurred, it stopped me from receiving due process, and a Writ original[ a legal document issued to start a lawsuit] was barred with Section 1983 and Habeas Corpus 2241, both being civil lawsuits enacted by Congress, so this Court must protect the Bills of rights from Due Process Clause violations. Section 1983 preempts any State conflicting law, but the Younger Doctrine of 1971 is a statutory construction of Section 1983, which was enacted in 1871.

**B. Federal courts are duty-bound to comply with AEDPA.**

Klein v. Martin, 607 U.S. \_\_\_ (2026) States "But federal courts are duty-bound to comply with AEDPA, and we have granted summary relief when the lower courts have departed from the role AEDPA assigns". Page 607 U.S. \_\_ 1. Per Curiam opinion. The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 grants limited federal courts habeas corpus relief to state prisoners unless the state court's adjudication of the claim resulted in a decision that was (1) contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law as determined by the US Supreme Court or (2) based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding. According to statement (2), the evidence to be presented to the District Court was on the state court record, the search warrant, see appendices(D) of the initial Certiorari petition, proving the petitioner's innocence. Step (1) was committed by the Federal District Court, in 1972 the U.S. Supreme Court stated that 28. U.S.C. 2283 is not to be used for an expressly authorized act of Congress pursuant to *Mitchum V. Foster*, 407 U.S 225 (1972), Pp. 407 U.S. 228-243. Habeas Corpus 2241, see appendices(E) of the rehearing petition is also an expressly authorized act of Congress enacted by Title 28 U.S. CODE on June 25<sup>th</sup>, 1948, allowing prisoners under authority of the United States or is committed for trial before some court [*State Court*] thereof or, is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States. This was determined in 1948 over seventy

U.S. Supreme Court of the United States of America

years ago. I amended the petition and asked the court for relief by Habeas corpus 2241, but that was also denied without a hearing with an opportunity to present the law and facts. The Federal District Court also did not follow step (2) of the AEDPA because the evidence that proved the petitioners' innocence was on the State Court record, the search warrant, see appendices (D) of the initial certiorari petition. This Honorable Court just stated in an opinion by the Court that Federal Courts are duty-bound to comply with AEDPA, see *Klein v. Martin*(2026), the Federal District Court of Florida did not comply with AEDPA or 5 U.S. 706(2). "AEDPA review provides an important but limited safeguard: It protects against 'extreme malfunctions'" in the state courts' adjudication of constitutional claims. The habeas claimant must instead establish that the state court "blunder[ed] so badly that every fairminded jurist would disagree" with the decision.' *Klein v. Martin*(2026). Pp 607 U.S. \_\_\_ 7-8. The Florida Supreme Court issued a Habeas Corpus 5/31/2024, after seeing the evidence that was on the State Court record, see appendices (E) of the rehearing petition for Certiorari, and see appendices (D) for the search warrant in the initial petition for Certiorari. Furthermore, a jurist who presided over the State trial saw the evidence(search warrant) and found the petitioner not guilty.

**CONCLUSION**

This Court should grant the rehearing petition for Certiorari and vacate and remand the case for further proceedings. The Federal District Court judgment after being acquitted would be void with Federal Rule 60(B)(4). Due to the irreparable harm, I have not been able to work or take care of the necessities of life; protecting my due process rights will guarantee me my day in court to present the law and facts, and the irreparable harm is redressable.

I declare (or certify, verify, or state under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on 2/1/2026.

Signature Eddie Scott 28 USC 1746.

Respectfully Submitted by

Counsel of Record Eddie Scott.