

No.

~~25-5794~~

ORIGINAL

Jasmine Golden v. Amazon

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jasmine Golden v. Amazon

FILED

MAY 31 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Jasmine Golden

PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

Amazon

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

the North Carolina Supreme Court

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jasmine Golden

(Your Name)

1800 Trogdon Street

(Address)

Greensboro, NC 27403

(City, State, Zip Code)

(336) 447-0921

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Petitioner was denied appropriate justice and retribution for the intentional maligning of her brand name, GoldenPrints, LLC, and intellectual property on the part of Respondent, Amazon.

Is it just that an American citizen be denied rightful retribution and access to justice because they are uninformed of court procedures, jurisdictions, and protocol? Further, is it just that an American citizen be denied rightful retribution and access to justice because they are unable to obtain appropriate counsel due to lack of funds.

2. Guilford County Court issued a Gatekeeper Order on 19 May 2023 against Petitioner, thereby disallowing Petitioner access to justice by denying Petitioner the ability to file legal documents against Respondent, Amazon, or even respond to court documents and proceedings, which further impeded Petitioner's legal action. Respondent's counsel referred to Petitioner's appeals as "needless filings that placed an undue burden on both the judicial system and Amazon." In fact, the Respondent referred to any filings made by Petitioner similarly. Respondent's counsel did not wish to address any of the points made in Petitioner's claim nor did they wish to have the facts from Petitioner's lawsuit be heard in court. Respondent's counsel focused solely on objections to Petitioner's purported errors in filing protocol, which culminated in the 16 December 2022 Dismissal Order and subsequent 19 May 2023 Gatekeeper Order. It is clear that Amazon has unlimited ability to fund any and all courtroom proceedings on their behalf through counsel. It is Petitioner's belief that not only did Amazon have no limit in their actions in impeding Petitioner's civil rights for the purpose of robbing Petitioner of her legal action, their counsel along with parties from Guilford County court acted together to obstruct justice for the profit and benefit of those same parties. Respondent's counsel, along with parties from Guilford County court were aware that without the ability to obtain legal counsel, knowing Petitioner's filing status as Indigent, Petitioner was unable to obtain representation, ensuring that the true and legitimate claims in Petitioner's lawsuit against Respondent would not be heard. Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to also review those herein named orders on certiorari review.

3. Respondent acknowledged that Petitioner appealed the 16 December 2022 Dismissal Order in a timely fashion; however, falsely claimed Petitioner never took steps to prosecute this appeal. In fact, Petitioner attempted at various times to meet procedural requirements in order to properly address the orders. Not only was the Petitioner already challenged by a lack of procedural knowledge as well as direct interference by persons employed at Guilford County Courthouse and Guilford County Superior Court, Guilford County Superior Court also issued the Gatekeeper Order disallowing Petitioner further access to her case file. It came to the Petitioner's attention on several occasions when Petitioner went to Guilford County Court to file legal documents or look through the case file that documents were missing, misfiled or filed out of order in a manner that convoluted understanding of the case matter and facts. Notably, Petitioner's Exhibits, specifically those evidencing the marring and maligning of Petitioner's intellectual property with linked images of garbage and garbage bags by Amazon were missing from the files when Petitioner appeared in court on the day of hearing. Petitioner was told that these were likely in the file inside the courtroom.

LIST OF PARTIES

- [] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- [] 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 court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

Jasmine Golden

v

Amazon

From Guilford

(23CVS2130)

From N.C. Court of Appeals

(P23-105)

From Guilford

(22CVS6301)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Supreme Court of North Carolina, Order of March 26, 2025.

APPENDIX B North Carolina Court of Appeals, Order of May 29, 2025.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D North Carolina Court of Appeals, Order of September 17, 2024.

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX G Screenshots (pages 1 - 8) showing Petitioner's brand name and intellectual property linked and replaced with images of garbage and garbage bags on public online forums and websites perpetrated by Respondent, Amazon.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Jasmine Golden

v

Amazon

From Guilford

(23CVS2130)

From N.C. Court of Appeals

(P23-105)

From Guilford

(22CVS6301)

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at Supreme Court of North Carolina; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals, Supreme Court of North Carolina court appears at Appendix B - E to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at North Carolina Court of Appeals, Supreme Court of North Carolina; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was March 19, 2025. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A, F.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Rules of Appellate Procedure allow review by writ of certiorari “in appropriate circumstances ... to permit review of the judgments and order of trial tribunals when the right to prosecute an appeal has been lost by failure to take timely action.” N.C.

R App. P. 21(a)(1). Two factors inform if a writ of certiorari should issue:

(1) whether the petitioner can show “merit or that error was probably committed below;” and (2) if the writ is justified by “extraordinary circumstances.” Cryan v.

Nat'l Council of Young Men's Christian Associations of United States, 384 N.C. 569, 572, 887 S.E.2d 848, 851 (2023).

Petitioner, Jasmine Golden, has demonstrated her case meets these criteria such that certiorari review is warranted. Petitioner submits as supplement to her petition for writ of certiorari, which were also submitted to the North Carolina Court of Appeals and North Carolina Supreme Court on 13 July 2024, the following issues for review.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Issue 1:

Petitioner, Jasmine Golden, was denied from the beginning of her filing of 16 December 2022 appropriate resolution to her lawsuit based on, not the points of Petitioner's lawsuit and actual claims against Amazon, but rather points of procedural detail, including legal filing protocol, in order to impede justice and deny Petitioner's motions, which resulted in the dismissal of Petitioner's lawsuit.

Petitioner filed her lawsuit on December 16, 2022 as Indigent. Guilford County Superior Court and Respondent's counsel were aware of Petitioner's filing status as Indigent and, as such, Petitioner was unrepresented and unfamiliar with filing procedures. The courts took advantage of Petitioner's unfamiliarity with filing procedure, case law, and protocol to impede, stall, undermine, and ultimately deny Petitioner a rightful conclusion to her civil action against the Respondent, Amazon.

Issue 2:

In reference to the 19 May 2023 Gatekeeper Order and the 16 December 2022 Dismissal Order, Respondent claims that Petitioner did not file an appeal to the court's decisions at the time those orders were presented. In fact, Petitioner immediately appealed the courts' decisions in both judgements with appropriate action. Respondent's counsel referred to Petitioner's appeals as "needless filings that placed an undue burden on both the judicial system and Amazon."

Issue 3. Respondent was denied request to invoke a waiver that Petitioner purportedly signed as a "click-through." Petitioner repeatedly denied having signed it. Respondent's Counsel ultimately withdrew their claim that Petitioner had signed a waiver removing any ability for Petitioner to litigate against Respondent in any event in the proprietorship of Petitioner's then online store with Amazon. This is clear indication that Amazon from the beginning of Petitioner's lawsuit did not intend for any of the facts from Petitioner's case to be heard.

Issue 4:

Respondent acknowledged that Petitioner appealed the 16 December 2022 Dismissal Order in a timely fashion; however, falsely claimed she never took steps to prosecute this appeal. In fact, Petitioner attempted at various times to meet procedural requirements in order to properly address the orders. Not only was the Petitioner already challenged by a lack of procedural knowledge as well as direct interference by persons employed at Guilford County Courthouse and Guilford County Superior Court, Guilford County Superior Court also issued the Gatekeeper Order disallowing Petitioner further access to her case file, blocking any ability for Petitioner to have her lawsuit resolved without obtaining legal counsel, knowing that Petitioner would be unable to obtain representation, and ensuring the true and legitimate claims in Petitioner's lawsuit against Respondent would not be heard.


REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

WHEREUPON, in review of the facts of this matter from the time of Petitioner's first filing of July 19, 2022 until the Gatekeeper Order issued by Guilford County Superior Court judge Albright on May 19, 2023, and in light of evidence of civil rights violations against the Petitioner on the part of Guilford County Superior Court, Guilford County Supreme Court judge Albright, and the Respondent, Amazon, Petitioner appeals to the judgement and review of the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES that this Court grant Petitioner's petition for certiorari review.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



My August 29, 2025

Date: 30 June, 2025

Jasmine Golden
1800 Trogon Street
Greensboro, NC 27403
Phone: (336) 447-0921
Email: goldenprintsllc.info@gmail.com
jegolden@uncg.edu