

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 25-6604

In re: Angeliina L. Lawson, Petitioner

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus


Judge John Broomes and Magistrate Judge Teresa James, Respondents

SUPPLEMENTAL LETTER REGARDING POST-FILING DISTRICT COURT ACTION

(Supreme Court Rules 15.8 and 20)

Petitioner Angeliina L. Lawson, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, respectfully submits this Supplemental Letter pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 15.8, to notify the Court of a material intervening development that occurred after the filing of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and while that petition remains pending under Rule 20.

1. Post-Petition District Court Action: On February 9, 2026, in the underlying federal action *Lawson v. Bolton et al.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-02251 (D. Kan.), the Chief District named in this Petition, Judge John Broomes, entered a text-only order (Docket #38) overruling Petitioner's objection (Docket #37) to a magistrate judge's order (Docket #36) and characterizing the objection as "frivolous." The text order was entered without findings of fact, conclusions of law, or analysis of the federal statutes and rules cited in the objection.



2. Procedural Context Relevant to the Pending Mandamus: Although the February 9, 2026 order was entered in a separate district-court action, it was issued by the same Article III district judge and magistrate judge identified in the pending mandamus petition and employs the same procedural mechanisms challenged therein. The order does not adjudicate the merits of Petitioner’s claims; does not authorize service of process pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); does not permit discovery, evidentiary preservation, or jury adjudication; and does not enter a final judgment from which ordinary appellate review may be taken. As in the matters described in the Petition, the case remains nominally pending while meaningful access to adjudication and appellate review is effectively foreclosed. This post-petition development is submitted to demonstrate that the procedural closure and absence of judicial remedy at issue are not confined to a single docket, but reflect a continuing pattern involving the same judicial officers. The text-only disposition operates functionally as a dismissal of access rather than a merits-based judicial determination.

3. Purpose of This Submission: This letter is submitted solely to advise the Court of an intervening procedural development that occurred during the pendency of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and that bears directly on the Petition’s showing that no adequate alternative means of relief exist, and the writ is sought in aid of this Court’s supervisory and appellate jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 10, 2026



/s/ Angeliina L. Lawson, Petitioner, Pro Se
1914 5th Avenue, Leavenworth, KS 66048 | (913) 972-1661

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE