

41,
25-6290

ORIGINAL

No. 25-cv-00201-DJH ✓

SDIN^N 25-cv-00563-TWP-TAB

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUL 29 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re Jerry E. Robertson — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

dead case from 2008^a inactive civil case

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Jerry Eugene Robertson
(Your Name)

3122 Virginia ave.
(Address)

Louisville, Ky. 40211-3454
(City, State, Zip Code)

(502) 500-6589
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED
 I've a civil case petitioned since 20-21 taken apart attempted to
 force a change cover up their 8 pages e-filed by Southern Dist.
 of Indiana to Paducah, Ky. I'm denied my copy prevent my using
 the three docket no's an file code from this ct. given to me back
 In 2008 leaving only my original/ssi claim from 2008

my case
 25-cv-00563-TWP-TAB

Jerry E. Robertson,
 plaintiff/appellate

vs

Jeff. Co. atty's office's
 defendants/appellee's
 dead case used by
 Kentucky from 2008
 25-cv-00201-DJH

Jerry E. Robertson,
 plaintiff

vs

Comm'n of Kentucky et al.
 defendants

"both civil case's taken apart to prevent prosecution"

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[X] 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: *but added to an In proceeding's.*

RELATED CASES

*u.s. dist. ct. district of Columbia and u.s. ct. of apps district of Columbia
also Supreme Ct. of u.s. trial set for u.s. ct. of apps Seventh cir. of Chic-
ago, Illinois.*

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 - affidavit & declaration
APPENDIX B - petition for writ of mandamus
APPENDIX C - question(s) presented
APPENDIX D - reasons for granting petition
APPENDIX E - statement of the case
APPENDIX F - constitutional & statutory provisions involved
Appendix G - jurisdiction
Appendix H - table of authorities cited
Appendix I - conclusion

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

u.s. dist. ct. western dist. of (25-cv-00201-DJH)	PAGE NUMBER
u.s. ct. of app's seventh cir. (25-cv-00563-TWP/TAB)	8 pages
entry-judge code-4415, transaction-id.109871	25-30 pages
	25-30 pages

STATUTES AND RULES

28 usc § 1915-proceedings In forma pauperis
42 usc § 1983-civil action for deprivation of rights
42 usc § 1985-conspiracy to interfere with civil rights-(2+3)
42 usc § 1986-action for neglect to prevent

OTHER

Petition writ of Mandamus
petition writ of Certiorari to u.s. ct. of app's
petition 42 usc § 300aa 12(f)
appeal-28 usc § 2522
ct. of supreme ct. no. 21-779(1) 5745.6, 5585.05
part xxi. 1-780 R, S, CC 34, 5714
426 us 374. 96 sct 2119, 48 Led 2d 725 (1976) 28 usc § 1291-1615a

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of mandamus issue.

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 has had a chance to get case; 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 tried to just dispose of case; 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 state ct. litigation's removed; or,

[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the nothing said or done 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.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was (5-30-23) took my mandate

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. don't remember

☐ 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).
moved on to seventh cir district, asked to see old papers from 2008 then e-filed to paducah, Ky.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was denied.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ 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).
State Ct. litigation's taken out of Ct. house by Jeff. Co. attys' office's nothing said or done period.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

[Computer Fraud + Conspiracy to Commit Computer Fraud].
[Falsification^o n falsifying cts + trial records].

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

8 pages involved Clerk of the Ct. Southern Dist. of Indiana requested to see my papers from 2008 I've let two other Ct's all together three the Seventh Cir. Ct. App's even stamped them but was e-filed to paducah, Ky. (4-9-25) I sent Transfer Order (4-9-25) the U.S. Southern Dist. of Indiana, Indianapolis, Div.

First order (4-20-25) U.S. Dist. Ct. Western Dist. of Ky. my transfer order taken at law library I kept it in envelope from paducah, Ky. It's my copy of e-file paper was the perfect response to Order (4-20-25) using entry judge code-transaction-id, received in office (5-19-25) no response.

Second order (6-2-25) Western Dist. of Ky. I'm to petition my original ss claim from 2008 to U.S. Ct. App's Sixth Cir. + Cirr. not my case a response to Order (4-20-25) due by (6-20-25) nothing change of venue notarized (6-20-25) submitted to U.S. Dist. Ct. paducah, Ky. Not a word still.

Third order two of them one (7-25-25) they've assigned a new judge, no judge code, r transaction-id, one (7-29-25) my change of venue denied both addressed to Western Dist. of Ky. but from U.S. Dist. Ct. Owensboro, Ky. I'm to repetition proceedings to a so called different judge, one submission to each Ct. I'm denied copy of 8 pages prevent using the three docket no's a n file code. proceedings forwarded to U.S. Ct. App's Seventh Cir. + Chicago, Ill.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Two Case's

one being petitioned and one being forced thru to
cover up the wrong doing's periods

9.
civil case re stored trial at U.S. Ct. of App's Seventh Cir. at
Chicago, Illinois.
their way of not using the three docket no's as file code,
nothing else petitioned to Sixth Cir. Since 2008.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of mandamus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry E. Robertson

Date: November 6, 2025