

No.

25-6381



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

AUG 30 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT U.S.

ORIGINAL

JAMES PETTUS PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

PETTUS V MAZZALO ET AL - 25-1217

PETTUS V POLICE COMMISSIONER, ET AL - 25-1311 RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
PETTUS V FRANCIS, ET AL - 25-1536

PETTUS V CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, ET AL - 25-1536
2ND CIRCUIT, 40 FOLEY SQ, NY NY 10007

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES PETTUS / PRO-SE
(Your Name)

123 W. 183RD ST
(Address)

BX NY 10453 / APT 51
(City, State, Zip Code)

718-365-1429
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

① PURSUANT TO MARTIN - 9 F.3D 226, 229 (2ND CIR. 1993)
DID THE 2ND CIRCUIT COURT IN 1993, GET CONGRESSIONAL
APPROVAL?, OR WAS THE CHIEF CLERK APPOINTED BY
THE GOVERNOR? SEE: APPENDIX B

② CAN THE 2ND CIRCUIT COURT CREATE LAW
AS THE JUDICIAL BRANCH?

③ CAN THE 'CHIEF' CLERK ORDER THE CHIEF
DEPUTY CLERK - TO DISMISS CASE(S) FOR
THE COURT? SEE: APPENDIX A

④ CAN THE CHIEF CLERK, CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

⑤ WOULD IT BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO MAKE
A (MANDATE) DECISION 'WITHOUT' THE ORIGINAL DECISION?
FIRST?

⑥ SHOULD THE CHIEF CLERK, DEP CHIEF CLERK
BE REMOVED FOR CORRUPTION, DISCRIMINATION
AND PREJUDICE?

DATE

JUN, 25, 2025

James Pettus
JAMES PETTUS

⑦ DOES THE 2ND CIRCUIT HAVE A 3 PANEL
JUSTICES TO MAKE DETERMINATION
ON THE LAW, FACTS, MERITS?

2

3

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

ALL CONSOLIDATED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	MANDATE DECISION
APPENDIX B	MARTIN 9 F.3D 226, 229
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

(6)

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 B to the petition and is **MADE MANDATE WITHOUT ORIGINAL DECISION. DENYING PLAINTIFF A 1ST AMEND VIOLATION**
☐ 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 A 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 _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ 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.

(1) (7)

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 8.15.2025.

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

ONLY DECISION WAS MANDATE ON 8.15.2025

☐ 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 _____.
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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. CONST.

NYS CONST.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1) PETTUS V MAZZALO, ET AL - 25-1217

THIS CASE HAS TO DO WITH ATTY MAZZOLA USING 'DECEPTIVE' TACTICS AND HAD 1ST DEPT CHARGE PLAINTIFF WITH VEX-LITIGANT, WHEN IN FACT, CASE WAS DISMISSED.

2) PETTUS V Police COMMISSIONER ET AL - 25-1311
Police officer confiscated PLAINTIFFS

E-BIKE, WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE. I AM A DISABLED SENIOR CITIZEN w/ STAGE 4 CANCER.

3) PETTUS V FRANCIS, ET AL - 25-1536

LAW FIRM CAUSED SHARE HOLDER TO BE EVICTED BY CAMP 'ORDER-TO-SHOW-CAUSE'

4) CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, ET AL - 25-1778
SEE APPENDIX A.

'PURE CORRUPTION'
DISCRIMINATION, PREJUDICE
1ST, 5TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT
VIOLATION

① PETTUS V MAZZALO ET AL - 25-1217

USED DECEPTION TO 1ST DEPT TO DEEM PLAINTIFF A [EX-LITIGANT] WHEN IN FACT, THE CASE WAS DISMISSED BY JUDGE [THOMPSON] BY SUP. CT AND NEVER APPEALED, THEREFORE 1ST DEPT NEVER OBTAINED JURISDICTION

② PETTUS V COMM. ET AL - 25-1311
POLICE OFFICER CONFISCATED PLAINTIFF'S [E-BIKE] WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE. I AM A 71 YR OLD WHO IS [DISABLED] W/ STAGE 4 CANCER, THEREIN VIOLATED [A.D.A.], AS WELL AS 1ST AMEND, 5TH, 14TH

③ PETTUS V ~~FRANCIS~~ ET AL - 25-1536

MY WIFE, CHARLENE THOMPSON HAD A [STROKE] HOSPITALIZED AT [BURKES], THE DEFENDANT SUBMITTED 'ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE' [WITHOUT] MENTIONING SHAREHOLDER WAS SEEKING HOUSING, THEREFORE 'ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE' WAS DENIED. ONCE AGAIN VIOLATING [A.D.A.] AND 1ST AMEND

④ PETTUS V CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, ET AL - 25-1536
WOLFE AND ANDREW BARNES MADE [MANDATE] ON 8.25.2025 WITHOUT ORIGINAL DECISION. THIS IS A PATTERN, PRACTICE, POLICY, MENTALITY, CULTURE, THAT IS PREVALENT IN 2ND CIRCUIT WHICH IS PURPOSEFUL, WILLFUL, WITH [INTENT] TO DENY BLACK PROSE LITIGANTS THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, ESPECIALLY 1ST, 5TH, 14TH AMENDMENT

(11)

AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES, WHO
IS 71 YRS OLD, DISABLED, W/ STAGE 4 CANCER
SIMPLY THROWS MYSELF AT THE MERCY OF
THE COURT, TO MAKE [WHOLE] AS A MATTER
OF LAW, UNDER THE RULE OF LAW.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION
OF THIS MATTER.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

James Pettus / JAMES PETTUS

Date: OCT 06 2025