

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

**Diamond King,
Petitioner**

v.

**United States Postal Service, et al.,
Respondents**

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

**Diamond King
7302 Cloverglenn Dr
Dallas, TX, 75249
682.247.7360
Diamondking0120@gmail.com
Pro Se Petitioner**

CERTIFICATION:

**I, Diamond King, certify that this petition for rehearing complies with
Supreme Court Rule 44 and is presented in good faith and not for purposes of
delay.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Diamond King', with a large circular flourish at the end.

**Diamond King
April 7, 2026**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iii
Petition for Rehearing	1
Statement of the Standard Under Rule 44.2	1
Grounds for Rehearing	1
I. Substantial Grounds Not Previously Presented	1
II. Controlling Federal Significance	2
III. Vehicle Suitability	3
Conclusion	4
Certificate of Service	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)

Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)

Rules

Supreme Court Rule 44.2

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner Diamond King respectfully petitions for rehearing of this Court's Order entered March 2, 2026, denying the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. This Petition is filed pursuant to Rule 44.2 of the Rules of this Court.

STATEMENT OF THE STANDARD UNDER RULE 44.2

Under Rule 44.2, rehearing is appropriate where:

There exists an intervening circumstance of substantial or controlling effect; or

There are substantial grounds not previously presented.

This Petition does not merely reargue prior claims. Instead, it clarifies substantial federal structural implications and controlling procedural concerns not previously presented in their full context.

GROUND FOR REHEARING

I. SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED

While the original Petition raised constitutional and statutory violations, it did not fully present the systemic procedural implications arising from dismissal with prejudice at the pleading stage in federal employment retaliation and whistleblower actions.

This case presents a recurring federal procedural issue:

Whether a federal employee alleging retaliation, constitutional violations, and statutory whistleblower protections may be permanently barred at the pleading stage without meaningful opportunity to amend under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a).

The Fifth Circuit affirmed dismissal with prejudice at the Rule 12(b)(6) stage. The structural implication is not merely individual error, but the broader effect on:

Access to jury trial in federal constitutional claims

Uniform treatment of pro se pleadings

Application of liberal amendment standards in civil rights litigation

The tension between strict pleading enforcement and liberal amendment policy has substantial federal impact when applied to constitutional and whistleblower claims involving federal agencies.

II. CONTROLLING FEDERAL SIGNIFICANCE

This matter concerns:

Procedural safeguards in federal employment retaliation cases

Scope of access to jury trial under the Seventh Amendment in federal statutory actions

Uniform application of Rule 12 and Rule 15 standards across circuits

Protection of constitutional petition rights under the First Amendment

Because Respondents are a federal agency and federal actors, the implications extend nationally beyond private litigation. The denial of review leaves unresolved a recurring federal question concerning early-stage termination of constitutional and whistleblower claims before discovery, amendment, or factual development. These structural concerns were not fully presented in the prior Petition.

III. VEHICLE SUITABILITY

This case presents a clean procedural vehicle:

Final judgment entered

Appellate review exhausted

Constitutional and statutory claims preserved

No jurisdictional defects

The record squarely presents the question whether dismissal with prejudice at the pleading stage in federal constitutional employment litigation is consistent with uniform federal procedural standards.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully submits that substantial grounds not previously presented warrant rehearing under Rule 44.2. The Petition for Rehearing should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Diamond King', with a large, stylized initial 'D'.

Diamond King

Petitioner Pro Se

7302 Clover Glen Drive

Dallas, Texas, 75249

682.247.7360

Diamondking0120@gmail.com

Date: March 2, 2026