

No: 25 - 6376

---

In The Supreme Court of The United States

---

|  |
|--|
| FILED<br>NOV 01 2025<br>OFFICE OF THE CLERK<br>SUPREME COURT, U.S. |
|--|

In Re: Evelyn Thomas-Pro-Se Petitioner

On Petition for Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus

---

Petition For Writ of Mandamus

Ms. Evelyn Thomas  
1413 Tree Creek Pkwy  
Lawrenceville, GA 30043  
Email: thomasevelyn@ymail.com  
Mobile: (404)-914-2618

Charles M. Poplstein  
cpoplstein@thompsoncoburn.com  
P: 314 552 6095 || M: 314.602.6095  
Thompson Coburn LLP || One US Bank Plaza  
St. Louis, MO 63101

Timothy McDonald | Partner | Thompson Hine LLP  
Two Alliance Center, 3560 Lenox Road, Suite 1600  
Atlanta, Georgia, 30326  
O: 404-407-3623 | M: 404-401-9009  
[Tim.McDonald@ThompsonHine.com](mailto:Tim.McDonald@ThompsonHine.com)

### Questions Presented

1. Whether the Supreme Court should issue an extraordinary writ of mandamus where the petitioner has provided documented evidence of fraudulent docket entries which includes overwritten judicial orders, altered metadata, iText-modified PDF's inconsistent judicial signatures, and CM/ECF backend interference that replaced legitimate court filings with fabricated files?
2. Whether the mandamus is warranted where the petitioner direct appeal was falsely misclassified as interlocutory depriving petitioner of her appellate rights, and to remove the misclassified file 66 from the docket?
3. Whether intervention is necessary where multiple judicial filings were never mailed, where filings were mis-docketed and ignored. And, where both the District Court and the D.C. Circuit have failed to act on the petitioner's motions, leaving Ms. Thomas with no adequate alternative remedy?
4. Whether this court should intervene to protect the integrity of the judiciary where the pattern of obstruction began at the Atlanta division EEOC and continued through the defense counsel, and individuals with docket access, and CM/ECF administrators, resulting in the petitioner-a pro-se black woman being denied access to the courts?

Parties to the Proceeding

Petitioner-Appellee Evelyn Thomas, Pro-SE.

Respondents: QuikTrip, Inc. Defense Attorneys: Charles M. Poplestein of  
Thompson Coburn LLP, and Timothy McDonald | Partner | Thompson Hine LLP

The Supreme Court of The United States  
Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosures  
Statement (CIP)

According to Fed.R.26.1, Petitioner Evelyn Thomas submits the certificate of interested persons and corporate disclosures with the listed parties involved in the outcome of this case:

Petitioner Ms. Evelyn Thomas

Mr. Timothy McDonald

Mr. Charles Popelstein

QuikTrip, Inc.

### Statement of Related Proceedings

The following are directly related to the case in this Court within the meaning of the Rule 14.1(b)(iii): Northern District Court of Georgia 1:23-cv-3964 (Sept 5, 2023). U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit 24-90033 (Feb. 12, 2024). Supreme Court of the United States 24-6869 (June 2, 2025 July 21, 2025), and D.C. Circuit of Appeals 25-7085 (July 8<sup>th</sup> 2025).

## Table of Contents

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| MOTION FOR LEAVE IFP.....                             | I     |
| AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT.....                             | I     |
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....                              | II    |
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING .....                       | III   |
| STATEMENT (CIP).....                                  | IV    |
| STATEMENT OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS .....                | V     |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS.....                                | VI    |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....                            | VII   |
| PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS .....                   | VIII  |
| OPINIONS BELOW .....                                  | VIII  |
| JURISDICTION.....                                     | VIII  |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... | VIII  |
| STATEMENT OF CASE .....                               | IX    |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT .....                       | X     |
| CONCLUSION:.....                                      | XII   |
| RELIEF REQUESTED .....                                | XII   |
| APPENDIX MATERIALS (EXHIBITS):.....                   | XIII  |
| ADDENDUM .....  | XIII  |
| CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....                        | XV    |
| CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....                           | XVI   |
| APPENDIX A .....                                      | XVII  |
| APPENDIX B .....                                      | XVIII |
| APPENDIX C .....                                      | XIX   |
| APPENDIX D .....                                      | XX    |
| APPENDIX E .....                                      | XXI   |
| APPENDIX F .....                                      | XXII  |
| APPENDIX G .....                                      | XXIII |
| APPENDIX H.....                                       | XXIV  |
| APPENDIX I .....                                      | XXV   |

## Table of Authorities

| <u>Cases:</u>   | <u>Page(s)</u> |
|---|----------------|
| Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. White, 548 U.S. 53 (2006) .....                   | 9              |
| Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court, 542 U.S. 367 (2004) – mandamus standard.....              | 9              |
| Coleman v. Donahoe, 667 F.3d 835 (7th Cir. 2012).....                                 | 9              |
| Crawford v. Carroll, 529 F.3d 961 (11th Cir. 2008) .....                              | 9, 15          |
| Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248 (1981).....                       | 9              |
| EEOC v. Family Dollar Stores, No. 1:07-cv-06996 N.D. Ill. settled Feb. 17, 2009 ..... | 9              |
| Ex parte Fahey, 332 U.S. 258 (1947) – limits on mandamus, extraordinary relief...     | 9              |
| Ex parte Peru, 318 U.S. 578 (1943) – extraordinary writ power.....                    | 9              |
| G.A. Enters., Inc., 65 F.3d 372 (4th Cir. 1995) – fraud justifies vacating judgments  | 9              |
| Gillis v. Georgia Dept. of Corrections, 400 F.3d 883 (11th Cir. 2005).....            | 9              |
| Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12 (1956) .....   | 16             |
| Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944) – fraud on the ..   | 9              |
| McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792 (1973) .....                           | 9              |
| Mooney v. Holohan, 294 U.S. 103 (1935) – use of false evidence violates due proces.   | 9              |
| States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61 (1878) – fraud as basis for relief.....            | 9              |
| United States v. Barker, 542 F.2d 479 (D.C. Cir. 1976) – obstruction of justice ..... | 9              |
| Yarbrough v. Glow Networks, Inc., Civil No. 4:19-CV-905-SDJ (E.D. Tex. Apr. 18)..<    | 9              |

## STATUTES

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 18 U.S.C. § 1001 – False statements .....  | 10         |
| 18 U.S.C. § 1503 – Obstruction of justice .....                                  | 9          |
| 18 U.S.C. § 1505- Obstruction of proceedings.....                                | 8          |
| 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – Tampering with witnesses/records .....                        | 9          |
| 18 U.S.C. § 1519 – Destruction or falsification of federal records .....         | 10         |
| 18 U.S.C. § 2071 – Concealment/removal of records .....                          | 10         |
| 18 U.S.C. § 242 – Deprivation of rights under color of law.....                  | 10         |
| 18 U.S.C. § 245 – Interference with federally protected rights .....             | 10         |
| 18 U.S.C. § 505 – Forgery of judicial signatures .....                           | 10, 16     |
| 18 U.S.C. § 912 -Officer or Employee of the U.S.....                             | 10, 16, 25 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 124(1) – Judicial districts.....                                     | 10         |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1257 – Supreme Court jurisdiction over state/federal questions ..... | 10         |
| 28 U.S.C. § 144 – Bias or prejudice of judge.....                                | 10         |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1651 – All Writs Act (mandamus power) .....                          | 10,13,16   |
| 42 U.S.C. § 1981 – Equal contract rights.....                                    | 10         |
| 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil rights violations under color of law .....              | 10         |
| 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq. – Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.....               | 10         |
| Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.1 – Corporate disclosure requirements .....                   | 10         |
| Sup. Ct. Rule 20 – Extraordinary writ.....                                       | 10         |

## Petition for Writ of Mandamus

Petitioner, proceeding pro-se, respectfully submits this Petition for Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus pursuant to Rule 20 of the Supreme Court.

## Opinions Below

The orders relevant to this petition were issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, however several of those orders were entered on the electronic docket without being served to the petitioner as required by Rule 77(d). As a result, petitioner did not receive any mail notices on the orders dated November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024 (dks. 61, 62), March 2025 (docket 82), November 5<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> (dks.123 and 125). Prior filings in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit falsely docketed the petitioner's filings on June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025, and petitioner did not receive a mailed notice.

Because these orders and administrative actions were not properly served, there are no formally served "opinions below" in the traditional sense. The orders noted in the mandamus appears on the electronic docket, yet the petitioner did not receive them through the required Federal Rules, therefore authenticated copies from the chambers cannot be attached.

## Jurisdiction

This court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1651, All Writs Act:

- Supreme Court Rule 20
- Supreme Court Rule 14
- Supreme Court Rule 39

## Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

- U.S. Const art. III
- 28 U.S.C. § 1651 All Writs Act
- Fed. R. Civ. P. 77(d)
- Relevant Title VII provisions (42 U.S.C. § 2000e seq).
- U.S.C. 18 § 1505 § 1509 § 1519



## Statement of Case

### 1. Early Obstruction at the EEOC

In August 2023 at the outset of Thomas vs. QuikTrip, the petitioner had to email Chairwoman Charlotte Burrows of the EEOC to release both the Notice of Right to Sue and Position statement because of the refusal from the Atlanta EEOC. Only after escalating to Chairwoman Burrows the documents were released. This evidence was presented in the petitioner first Certiorari (24-6869) denied June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### 2. Chronological Pattern of Procedural Irregularities and Docket Fraud

- A. On November 15<sup>th</sup> 2 am, two fraudulent docket entries 61, 62 appeared impersonating Magistrate Judge Walker. These files overwrote Magistrate Judge Walker judicial orders entered on November 8<sup>th</sup> at 4 pm-a week before. Forensic analysis using Exif tool, Didier Stevens, PDF tools, and PDF/A verification revealed:
  - Modifications timestamp inconsistent with courthouse workflow.
  - Editing software, "iText 7.2.3," not used by federal judges
  - Failed PDF/A validation
- B. On November 22, 2024 (dkt. 66) petitioner's direct appeal was falsely reclassified as an interlocutory appeal denying petitioner her appellate rights, petitioner did not receive a notice of the change, and no advisory under Fed.R.P. 3(d).
- C. On March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, a termination order 82 appears on the docket bearing a signature inconsistent with Judge Tiffany Johnson's established signature. However, file 82 was constructed using a mixture of petitioner's own filings and language patterns consistently used by the defense counsel. The resulting document mimicked judicial formatting, but did not reflect the structure, tone, or terminology. The signature block was inconsistent with the judge's known signature, and metadata confirmed modification through non-judicial software. Petitioner immediately objected to this filing because the language, sequencing and substantive assertions aligned with the defense counsel's prior arguments-not with any judicial authority. This strongly indicates that File 82 was fabricated by individuals with access to CM/ECF, using portions of petitioner's documents to create the appearance of a legitimate termination order. Moreover, the most recent files 123 on November

5<sup>th</sup>, and 125 November 24<sup>th</sup> were never mailed to the petitioner violating Rule 77(d).

- D. In June 2025, the Eleventh Circuit mis-docketed Petitioner's mandamus petition and never mailed the notice mirroring the Northern District of Georgia pattern of not mailing orders, preventing the petitioner from a fair case denying her due process.
- E. D.C. Circuit entered writ of mandamus on July 8th and never mailed a notice the petitioner.
- F. Forensic Confirmation of Fabrication Across Dockets using exiftool, Didier Stevens tools, and PDF validation, Petitioner confirmed:
  - Overwritten filings
  - Altered metadata
  - Modified PDF structures
  - Mismatched judge signatures
  - CM/ECF backed interference
- G. In July 2025, Petitioner sent detailed notices and email with proof to:
  - Magistrate Judge Walker
  - Judge Tiffany Johnson
  - Chief Judge Martin
  - D.C. Circuit

These findings presented show fraud committed by the defense counsel and individuals with access to the internal docketing system, not by the assigned judges. These were not judicial orders, the language in the fraudulent files is consistent with the defense counsel not judicial authority thus denying the petitioner due process and failing to refute the petitioner claims. The evidence was presented to this Court as Notice of Emergency Mandamus due to fraud on the court on August 26<sup>th</sup> 2025, followed by supplemental notices documenting the ongoing procedural violations, including violating Rule 77 (d). Although notices were sent to judicial authority, no corrective action occurred. This demonstrates exhaustion of remedies and confirms that the obstruction exists within the administrative-docketing chain, not the judiciary. Therefore, petitioner is asking for this writ of mandamus because it is the only adequate relief.

#### Reasons for Granting Writ

1. Petitioner has no other adequate remedy to obtain relief:

The district court entered multiple orders without serving the petitioner contrary to Rule 77(d). Without service, the petitioner cannot respond, appeal, or challenge the rulings in a timely manner. Attempts to obtain relief through the Eleventh circuit and D.C. Circuit failed because notices were not mailed and no corrective action was taken. Therefore, petitioner has no adequate alternative remedy.

Petitioner's case was proven under controlling Title VII precedent: Evelyn Thomas prevailed in her discrimination and retaliation claims under the *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792 (1973), as refined by *Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine*, 450 U.S. 248 (1981), *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. White*, 548 U.S. 53 (2006), and *Crawford v. Carroll*, 529 F.3d 961 (11th Cir. 2008). These decisions protect workers from discriminatory retaliation and unlawful termination, precisely the conduct proven against Respondent QuikTrip.

2. Procedural Irregularities in the Docket Create Exceptional Circumstances:

A highlighted documented pattern beginning from the EEOC to the Courts:

- Atlanta Division EEOC Obstruction
- Defense Counsel Interference
- CM/ECF backend fabrication
- Multiple overwritten orders
- Misclassification of appeals
- Non-mailing of notices
- Docket distortion

Extraordinary intervention is necessary due to fraud on the court and impersonating judicial authority: Fraudulent docket entries (Docs. 61, 62, 66, 82, 123, 125) were uploaded impersonating of Magistrate Judge Walker and Judge Johnson with Doc. 82 purporting to terminate the case. This constitutes fraud on the court under *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944) and *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878). Such conduct strikes at the heart of judicial integrity and nullifies the ability of the lower courts to provide relief.

The impersonation of federal judicial authority constitutes criminal conduct and compels this court's supervisory authority. The fraudulent use of a judge's name and authority violates:

- 18 U.S.C. § 912 (impersonating a U.S. officer or judge)
- 18 U.S.C. § 505 (forging judicial signatures);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (submitting false documents in federal proceedings).

### 3. The District Court and Eleventh Circuit Failures to Serve Orders:

Despite repeated filings, the lower courts refuse to act: the petitioner has filed four separate motions to strike fraudulent entries (Dkts. 96, 107, 109, 110), yet the Northern District of Georgia has taken no action. The inaction denies Petitioner due process, contrary to *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12 (1956) and *Mooney v. Holohan*, 294 U.S. 103 (1935). With both the Eleventh Circuit and D.C. Circuit refusing to remedy the fraud, petitioner has no adequate alternative but to invoke this Court's extraordinary jurisdiction under the All-Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

The integrity of the federal judiciary requires immediate correction. Allowing fraudulent orders impersonating federal judges to remain on the docket undermines the rule of law and public confidence in the judiciary. This Court has repeatedly held that fraud on the court warrants the most severe remedy. Here, intervention is required not only to restore petitioner's judgment, but to safeguard the legitimacy of the judicial process itself.

### Conclusion:

What is consistent is a clear pattern of interference in a federal case from the start with collusion from QuikTrip and the Atlanta division EEOC, to their defense counsel and individuals impersonating judicial authority, and violating Rule 77(d) not mailing entered notices to the petitioner.

This raises questions about the fair application of civil rights discrimination laws in cases involving black individuals. Further, it questions how non-black people remain discriminatory towards black people, yet use discriminatory laws, citing being discriminated against.

Ms. Thomas's claims will not be devalued because she is a black woman who won on merit. Title VII-42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, 2000e; Obstruction of justice-18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1512, 1519, 1001, 505, 912; OCGA 51-12-33 applied equally. Any jury will recognize that QuikTrip's misconduct not only injured the petitioner and exemplifies systemic racial inequity.

### Relief Requested:

1. Issue an extraordinary writ of mandamus directing the District Court and D.C. Circuit to:
  - Remove fraudulent docket entries, 61, 62, 66, 82, 123, 125
  - Restore authentic judicial orders

- Correct petitioners' appellate classification
  - Review and enforcement of petitioner's settlement
2. Order forensic audit of petitioner's docket. Immediate prohibit of remote access to CM/ECF due to unauthorized browser trackers, digital interference, and procedural contamination. Relief is necessary to preserve docket integrity, prevent further sabotage, and ensure constitutional due process.
- Reinstate the case to the last uncontaminated point-November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2024, 4 pm.
  - Penalties of disbarment for impersonation of judicial authority.

#### Appendix Materials:

- A: File analysis for file 61 not meeting legitimate archival validation.  
 B: File analysis 62 not meeting legitimate archival validation and authored by a party not relevant to the case.  
 C: File analysis 82 file path shows tmp (temporary) not traceable to the CM/ECF or chambers.  
 D: D.C. Circuit of Appeals screenshot of entered Mandamus on July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025  
 E: Notice of Settlement Demand  
 F: Emergency Notice submitted to Chief Judge Martin and Magistrate Judge Walker  
 G: Email to Chairwoman Burrows of the EEOC  
 H: Screenshot of Eleventh Circuit falsely docketing Mandamus.  
 I: Emails to Judge Walker and Judge Johnson.

#### ADDENDUM OF CLARIFICATION FOR FILE 82 AND SETTLEMENT POSITION

This addendum corrects the procedural file for striking from the docket. Document 82, falsely submitted March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, terminating the case, is an unauthorized submission, impersonating judicial authority to avoid trial and obstruct enforcement. Furthermore, given the fraudulent filings, impersonation of federal judicial authority, concealment of appellate filings, and retaliation against Plaintiff, the full measure of damages now owed is \$6,275,000, which includes:

- \$3,000,000 (baseline damages: discrimination, retaliation, hostile work environment).
- \$2,750,000 (11 counts of obstruction of justice at \$250,000 each).
- \$525,000 (accountability damages for Supervisor, Trainer Manager, and Trainer at \$175,000 each).

The plaintiff is willing to accept a limited-time settlement of \$5,200,000 in immediate payment. This reflects a discount of over \$1 million compared to full trial damages.