

25-6733

No. _____

RECEIVED
NOV 13 2025

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY CHEN
(PETITIONER)

FILED
NOV 13 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

vs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STATE OF MARYLAND
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE OF TEXAS
EEOC
(RESPONDENTS)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT (CASE #25-7106)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI



10M63860631

United States Supreme Court

Recipient:

Clerks Office

Sender:

May Chen

Processed:

11/13/2025 10:47:28 AM | 588



May Chen (Petitioner)

Address: Illegally Demolished and Sold

Mailing Add: 4713 Wisconsin Ave NW DC 20016

ECF Noticing: nationalhealthcarefdn@gmail.com

RECEIVED
NOV 17 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 20, petitioner hereby further appeal the U.S. Court of Appeals judgment due to unresolved complaints (U.S. Court of Appeals Case No. 25-7106). All other Petition for a Writ of Certiorari were filed as following:

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari: filed on June 27, 2023 No. 23-5501 "May Chen v. MPD"

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari: filed on August 6, 2024 May Chen v. EEOC et.al.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari: filed on March 18, 2025 May Chen v. District of Columbia et.al.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari: filed on Nov 3, 2025 May Chen v. M & T Bank et.al.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari: filed on Nov 12, 2025 May Chen v. District of Columbia et.al.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 13, all of the above referenced petition was filed within 90 days after the issuance of judgment. Petitioner strictly followed all court rules in a timely manner.

1. Supreme Court Rule 20 and Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1, "a judge(s) shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct". For example, in regards to the subject case, judge Katsas; Walker; Childs and the U.S. Court of Appeal Clerk Clifton B. Cislak disobeys the law F, R.C.P. Rule 55 (default / default judgment) based on F. R. C. P. Rule 12 (failure to answer Summons & Complaints), F. R. App. P. Rule 31 (failure to file Reply Brief), F. R. App. P. Rule 27 (Emergency Motions) as well as all other applicable law refenced under Table of Authorities. Failure to correct the U.S. District Court errors upon petitioner's timely filing "Request to Enter Default Judgment". Pursuant to F.R. App. P. Rule 34(a)(2) and 34(j): failure to conduct hearing, deny Petition for Rehearing, wrongfully dispose of appeal.

2. Supreme Court Rule 10. Pursuant to the Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.2, "a judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially". For instance, the petitioner was treated extremely unfairly and discriminated against. The Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Carol W. Elswick et.al. made wrongful judgment for an untaken table cloth (\$30) caused by sexual assault. On the contrary, U.S. Court of Appeals judges and clerks dismissed all of the crimes accused herein supported by the statement of the facts, applicable law, clear and convincing evidence, court docket sheet etc.

LIST OF PARTIES

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

MAY CHEN (Petitioner)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATE OF MARYLAND STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE OF TEXAS EEOC (Respondents)

[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:

Carol W. Elswick (State of California West Covina Court Judge) / Robinson's May

Robert Hoffman (State of Maryland Prince George's County Judge) / Teresa Micky et.al.

Karen Mason (State of Maryland Prince George's County Judge) / Springfield Hospital

Thomas Springfield/ Robin Weisse (State of Maryland Carroll County Circuit Court Judge)

Ingrid Turner (State of Maryland Prince George's County Circuit Court Judge) and Gail Fransis

(Prince George's County Tax Collector); DPIE staffs; Benjamin M. Decker (FNA Maryland LLC.)

Patrick L. Woodward (Maryland Court of Special Appeals Judge)

Michael Rankins (District of Columbia Superior Court Judge)

Anna Blackburne Rigsby (DC Court of Appeals Judge)

Police Officer Meyers #349 (State of California West Covina Police Department)

Police Officer Brown; Mitchell#3570; Taylor#3672 (Prince George's County Police Department)

Police Officers Rambo #3877 and Wall (Prince George's County Police Department)

Police Officer Bryant A #3472 (DC Metropolitan Police Department)

Cobb, C #00364 et.al. (Department of Public Works Dept 15)

Police Officers Stephen Franchak #3123, Suzie Stears #3985, English #3911, Homer Whyte #3749 et.al. (DC Metropolitan Police Department) / Tilden Garden Inc tenants et.al.

RELATED CASES

25-00681 / 25-7106 "May Chen v. D. C., Maryland, California, Texas, EEOC"

25-02438 / 25-7121 "May Chen v. D.C., Maryland, California, Texas, EEOC"

24-CV-03620 / 25-7068 "May Chen v. M & T Bank, Capital One Bank, Bank of America et.al."

24-CV-01396 / 24-7105 "May Chen v. State of California, State of Maryland, D.C."

24-CV-03213 "May Chen et.al. v. All Black People" (multiple filed complaints)

23-CV-01493 & 23-CV-01496 / 23-5287 & 23-5292 "May Chen v. EEOC et.al."

EEOC Appeal case #0120113914 "May Chen v. Department of Health & Human Services" (Case HHS-OS-0046-2011; HHS-CMS-2015-0267) Field Office Hearing: "May Chen v. Department of Health & Human Services" (Case #530-2013-00032X; 530-2014-0004X; 530-2017-00081X)

EEOC Appeal: "May Chen v. Department of Justice" (Case # EOI-2022-000320 / Appeal #20230003157) Field Office Hearing: "May Chen v. Department of Justice" (Case #570-2022-01117X)

22-CV-00693 / 23-7011 "May Chen v. State of California, State of Maryland, D.C."

22-CV-0039 "May Chen v. Metropolitan Police Department" DC Court of Appeals

2021 CA 004151 B "May Chen v. Metropolitan Police Department" DC Superior Court

19-CV-00912 U.S. District Court for Maryland "May Chen v. Prince George's County et.al."

17-CV-02068 U.S. District for Maryland "May Chen v. Prince George's County et.al."

CSAREG009952018 Maryland Court of Appeals "May Chen v. Prince George's County et.al."

CAL 18-27463 "May Chen v. FNA Maryland LLC and Prince George's County et.al."

CAE 17-39047 Maryland Circuit Court "FNA Maryland LLC v. May Chen"

15-MIPG-1228133 Maryland Tax Court "May Chen v. Prince George's County et.al."

13-PWG-02564; 13-PWG-02565 "May Chen v. Prince George's County et.al."

CALI 827463 Maryland Circuit Court for PG County "May Chen v. State of Maryland"

3E00484571 "State of Maryland v. May Chen" April 16, 2012

4E00513797 "State of Maryland v. May Chen" March 22, 2013

06C13064504 "In the Matter of May Chen" Maryland Circuit Court for Carroll County

0502SP098652012 Maryland Circuit for PG County "Prince George's County v. May Chen"

2JM00716 California West Covina Court "State of California v. M Chen"

01S00192 California Monrovia Court "M Chen v. Marvin Quon et.al."

KS 011439 California Pomona Court "Jeffrey L. Romig v. M Chen"

S-1500-CV-269865-LSE California Kern Superior Court "Southern California Edison v. M Chen

15-F-13183; 15-F-13184; 15-F-I 3185 State Bar of California Client Security Fund Complaints

150206-001675, 150209-001493, 210927-7331735 etc. All CFPB Complaints

7KRTTJVA; MK25050844; MK25051924; MK20070767; PA001932581; PA0019343379;

PA001941689; PA0019455655; PA0019463071; all other Dept of Insurance Complaints

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OPINIONS BELOW	P.11
II. JURISDICTION	P.12
III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	P.13
IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	P.23
V. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	P.35
VI. CONCLUSION	P.38

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Mandate issued by U.S. Court of Appeals Clerk Clifton B. Cislak (non-issuance)

APPENDIX B: Judgment issued by U.S. Court of Appeals Clerk Clifton B. Cislak before U.S. Court of Appeals Judges Katsas; Walker; Childs on Nov 3, 2025

APPENDIX C: Order issued by U.S. Court of Appeals Clerk Clifton B. Cislak on Oct 29, 2025

APPENDIX D: U.S. Court of Appeals Case 25-7106 docket sheet

APPENDIX E: Order issued by U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Judge Amit P. Mehta on June 20, 2025

APPENDIX F: Memorandum Opinion issued by U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Judge Amit P. Mehta on June 20, 2025

APPENDIX G: U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Case No. 25-00681 docket sheet

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Supreme Court Rule 10
Supreme Court Rule 11
Supreme Court Rule 12
Supreme Court Rule 13
Supreme Court Rule 14
Supreme Court Rule 20
Supreme Court Rule 22
Supreme Court Rule 29
Supreme Court Rule 39
F. R. C. P. Rule 12
F. R. C. P. Rule 55 / 65
F. R. C. P. Rule 8(a)(2)
F. R. App. P. Rule 31
F. R. App. P. Rule 27
F. R. App. P. Rule 34 (a)(2)
F. R. App. P. Rule 34(j)
F. R. App. P. Rule 24 (Proceedings in Forma Pauperis)
42 U.S.C.
28 U.S.C. 1331/1332
28 U.S.C. 1407 (Multidistrict Litigation)
29 C.F.R. 1614.501 (Remedies & Relief)
5 U.S.C. 3115 (Expedited Hiring Authorities for College Graduate)
5 U.S.C. 2302 (Prohibited Personnel Practice)
38 U.S.C. 4214 (Veteran Recruitment Authority)
Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967
Equal Pay Act of 1963
Title VII Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Race, Color, National Origin, Sex – Female etc.)
12 C.F.R. 1024 (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Complaints)

15 U.S.C. 1681 (The Fair Credit Reporting Act)
21 U.S.C. 342 (Poisoning Food)
12 U.S. C. 1831
47 C.F.R. 64.1507 (Prohibition on Disconnection or Interruption of Phone Service)
DC Official Code 50-2303.11(g) & (b) (DC DMV Hearing Decision over 180 days)
DC Official Code 50-2303.03 C-1(4) (Burden of Proof)
DC Official Code 50-2302.06 (Hearing)
DC Official Code 50-2303.05(a)(2)(E) (DC DMV Defense on Parking Ticket)
DC Official Code 50-1050.01 (Historical Vehicle Emissions Exemption)
DC Code 50-2201.04; 50-2201.05 (Hit & Run and Reckless Endangerment)
DC Code 31-2231.17 (Unfair Claim Settlement Practices)
DC Official Code 50-2455 (Impoundment)
DC Code 21-521 & Code 7-1231.08 (Misapply Law & Forced Medication)
DC Code 22-3211 (Theft of Money, Theft of the Cell Phone; Theft of 115 Clothing Items)
DC Code 28-3152 (Merchant's Civil Recovery for Dishonored Checks)
DC Code 22-3212 (Penalties for Theft)
DC Code 22-404 (Simple Assault)
DC Code 22-2803 (Carjacking);
Code 22-404.01 (Aggravated Assault)
Code 22-2801 (Robbery)
DC Code 22-3227.02 (Theft of Driver's License)
DC Code 4-502 (Crime Victim Compensation Program)
DC Attorney General COVID-19 pandemic order 2020-10
Maryland Code Sec. 3-801 Course of Conduct
Maryland Code Sec. 6-401 and 6-402(a) (Prohibits Trespassing on Property)
Maryland Code Sec. 3-802 Stalking; Code Sec. 3-803 Harassment
Maryland Code Sec. 3-2-4 Reckless Endangerment
Maryland Code Sec. 6-408 Entry on property for purpose of invading privacy of occupants
Maryland Code Sec. 6-202 (first degree burglary and felony home invasion)

Maryland Code Sec. 10-708 (g) Forced Medication
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-403 Neighborhood; Community Assistance Program
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-405 Proposals for projects in priority funding areas
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-602. Housing; Community Development Program
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-606 Community Development Fund
 Maryland Code Sec. 10-202 Purpose of the Fund Affordable Housing Trust Fund
 Maryland Code Sec. 2-203 Reviews of Assessments
 Maryland Tax Code Sec. 6-401 (Determining Amount of Property Tax)
 Maryland Code Sec. 4-201. Collecting and Remitting Taxes
 Maryland Code Sec. 4-202. Depositing and Reporting Collections
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-301 (Malicious Property Destruction is Punishable)
 Maryland Code Sec. 10-304 Property Tax Payment Damaged Property Proration
 Maryland Code Sec. 3-808 (Filing Fraudulent Lien Prohibited)
 Maryland Code Sec. 6-302 (Malicious Destruction Throwing Object at Vehicle)
 Maryland Code Sec. 14-817 (Tax Sale)
 Maryland Code Sec. 7-104 (Theft and Related Crimes)
 Maryland Code Sec. 8-103 (Obtaining property or services by bad check)
 California Corporation Code 2203
 California Penal Code 243.4 (Felony Sexual Assault); Penal Code 261 (Rape)
 California Penal Code 148.5 (False Police Report)
 California Penal Code 520 (Burden of Proof)
 California Civil Code 1689.7 (Notice of Cancellation) and Code 1057.3 (Release Deposit)
 California Business Professions Code 6200-6206 (Attorney Client Fee Dispute)
 California R& T Code 155.20; 170
 County Adopted Resolution 2005-524; 2009-061 Ordinance 4.24
 California PC Code 487
 California Civil Code Unlawful Detainer 1161
 Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1; 2.2; 2.3
 Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 3.8; 3.3; 1.16; 1.5; 6.1; 8.4

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 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 United States district 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.

☐ 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.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was October 29, 2025.

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

☒ A timely Emergency Motion was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date November 3, 2025, and a copy of the order denying Emergency Motion appears at Appendix B.

☒ Petition for Rehearing was denied according to previous cases.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was NA in Application No. A . The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from state courts: N/A

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. Supreme Court Rule 10

A petition for a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law.

Supreme Court Rule 11

A petition for a writ of certiorari to review a case pending in a United States court of appeals, before judgment is entered in that court, will be granted only upon a showing that the case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court. See 28 U. S. C. § 2101(e).

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 12.4. When two or more judgments are sought to be reviewed on a writ of certiorari to the same court and involve identical or closely related questions, a single petition for a writ of certiorari covering all the judgments suffices. A petition for a writ of certiorari may not be joined with any other pleading, except that any motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis shall be attached.”

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 12.5.

No more than 30 days after a case has been placed on the docket, a respondent seeks to file a conditional cross petition.

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 13

Unless otherwise provided by law, a petition for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment in any case, civil or criminal, entered by a state court of last resort or a United States court of appeals (including the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces) is timely when it is filed with the Clerk of this Court within 90 days after entry of the judgment.

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 20.

Issuance by the Court of an extraordinary writ authorized by 28 U. S. C. § 1651(a) is not a matter of right, but of discretion sparingly exercised. To justify the granting of any such writ, the petition must show that the writ will be in aid of the Court’s appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court’s discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 22 (1). An application addressed to an individual Justice shall be filed with the Clerk, who will transmit it promptly to the Justice concerned if an individual Justice has authority to grant the sought relief. (2). The original and two copies of any application addressed to an individual Justice shall be prepared as required by Rule 33.2, and shall be accompanied by proof of service as required by Rule 29 follows that of the most junior Justice.

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 29

Ordinarily, service on a party must be by a manner at least as expeditious as the manner used to file the document with the Court. An electronic version of the document shall also be transmitted to all other parties at the time of filing or reasonably contemporaneous therewith, unless the party

filing the document is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis or the electronic service address of the party being served is unknown and not identifiable through reasonable efforts.

U.S. Supreme Court Rule 39 Proceedings in Forma Pauperis A party seeking to proceed in forma pauperis shall file a motion for leave to do so, together with the party's notarized affidavit or declaration (in compliance with 28 U. S. C. § 1746)

F. R. C. P. Rule 12.

(a) TIME TO SERVE A RESPONSIVE PLEADING. (1) In General. Unless another time is specified by this rule or a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows: (A) A defendant must serve an answer: (i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint; or

F.R.C.P. Rule 55. Default; Default Judgment ENTERING A DEFAULT. When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party's default. (b) ENTERING A DEFAULT JUDGMENT. (1) By the Clerk. If the plaintiff's claim is for a sum certain or a sum that can be made certain by computation, the clerk— on the plaintiff's request, with an affidavit showing the amount due— must enter judgment for that amount and costs against a defendant who has been defaulted for not appearing and who is neither a minor nor an incompetent person.

F. R. C. P. Rule 65 (b) Temporary Restraining Order. (1) Issuing Without Notice. The court may issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party or its attorney only if: (A) specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and (B) the movant attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.

F. R. C. P. Rule 8 (a) Claim for Relief. A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain: (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court jurisdiction, unless the court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new jurisdictional support; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief;

F. R. App. P. Rule 31. Serving and Filing Briefs (a) Time to Serve and File a Brief. (1) The appellant must serve and file a brief within 40 days after the record is filed. The appellee must serve and file a brief within 30 days after the appellant brief is served.

F. R. App. P. Rule 27. Requests for Expeditious Consideration. Any party may request expedited action on a motion on the ground that, to avoid irreparable harm, relief is needed in less time than would ordinarily be required for this court to receive and consider a response. The motion on which expedited action is sought must be labeled an "Emergency Motion" and the request for expedition must state the nature of the emergency and the date by which court action is necessary. The motion must be filed at least 7 days before the date by which court action is necessary or counsel must explain why it was not so filed. Counsel for the party seeking expedition must communicate the request and the reasons therefor in person or by telephone to the clerk's office and to opposing counsel.

F. R. App. P. Rule 34(a)(2) (2) Standards. Oral argument must be allowed in every case unless a panel of three judges who have examined the briefs and record unanimously agrees that oral argument is unnecessary for any of the following reasons: (A) the appeal is frivolous; (B) the dispositive issue or issues have been authoritatively decided; or (C) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the briefs and record, and the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument.

F. R. App. P. Rule 34 (j) Disposition Without Oral Argument. (1) Procedure. Whenever the court, on its own motion, or on the motion of a party or stipulation of the parties, concludes that oral argument is not needed, the court may, after causing notice of that determination to be given to the parties by the clerk, proceed to dispose of the case without oral argument.

5 U.S.C. 3115(b) Appointment. (1) In general.-The head of an agency may appoint, without regard to any provision of sections 3309 through 3319 and 3330, a qualified individual to a position in the competitive service classified in a professional or administrative occupational category at the GS-11 level, or an equivalent level, or below.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act 1967 The ADEA prohibits employment discrimination against persons 40 years of age or older.

Equal Pay Act 1963 The EPA prohibits sex-based wage discrimination between men and women in the same establishment who perform jobs that require substantially equal skill, effort, and responsibility under similar working conditions.

29 C.F.R 1614.501 (b) Relief for an applicant. (1) (i) When an agency, or the Commission, finds that an applicant for employment has been discriminated against, the agency shall offer the applicant the position that the applicant would have occupied absent discrimination or, if justified by the circumstances, a substantially equivalent position unless clear and convincing evidence indicates that the applicant would not have been selected even absent the discrimination. The offer shall be made in writing. The individual shall have 15 days from receipt of the offer within which to accept or decline the offer. (iii) If the offer of employment is declined, the agency shall award the individual a sum equal to the back pay he or she would have received, computed in the manner prescribed by 5 CFR 550.805, from the date he or she would have been appointed until the date the offer was declined, subject to the limitation of paragraph (b)(3) of this section. Interest on back pay shall be included in the back pay computation. The agency shall inform the applicant, in its offer of employment, of the right to this award in the event the offer is declined.

5 U.S.C. 2302 (4) deceive or willfully obstruct any person with respect to such person's right to compete for employment; (6) grant any preference or advantage not authorized by law, rule, or regulation to any employee or applicant for employment (including defining the scope or manner of competition or the requirements for any position) for the purpose of improving or injuring the prospects of any particular person for employment;

38 U.S.C. 4214 for veterans' recruitment appointments, and for subsequent career-conditional appointments, under the terms and conditions specified in Executive Order Numbered 11521

(March 26, 1970), except that- (A) such an appointment may be made up to and including the level GS-11 or its equivalent;

15 U.S.C. 1681 Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) was enacted in 1970 as part of the consumer credit protection act. Its primary purpose is to promote the accuracy, fairness, and privacy of information to the files of consumer reporting agencies (CRAs), such as credit bureaus.

DC Official Code 50-2303.11. Reconsideration (g) Failure by a hearing examiner to issue a decision within 180 calendar days after receipt of an application for reconsideration shall be deemed a decision in favor of the applicant. (b-3 Probable error committed by the hearing examiner in the proceeding, including failure to judicially notice a fact on which the decision of the hearing examiner rests or failure to inform the respondent of a judicially noticed fact on which the decision of the hearing examiner rests;

DC Official Code 50-2303.03 C-1(4) Notice of Infraction. The Notice shall include a copy of the photo or digitized image of the violation.

DC Official Code 50-2302.06 (a) Each hearing for the adjudication of a traffic infraction pursuant to this subchapter shall be held before a hearing examiner in accordance with Chapter 10 of Title 18 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations except as provided by this chapter. The burden of proof shall be on the District and no infraction shall be established except by clear and convincing evidence. (b)(1) If a person to whom a notice of infraction has been issued fails to appear at a hearing for which he or she received notice,

DC Official Code 50-2303.5(a)(2)(E) That the facts alleged on the parking violation notice are inconsistent or do not support a finding that the specified regulation was violated;

DC Official Code 50-1501.01 10(a) The term "class F(I) historic motor vehicle" means any motor vehicle whose manufacturer's model year is at least 25 years old, not exceeding a total driving mileage under all conditions of 1,000 miles annually".

DC Official Code 2455 (d) The impoundment notice required by subsection (c) of this section shall be mailed no later than 5 days after the vehicle is received at an impoundment or storage facility and shall:

DC Official Code 22-1510. Making, drawing, or uttering check, draft, or order with intent to defraud; proof of intent; "credit" defined. Any person within the District of Columbia who, with intent to defraud, shall make, draw, utter, or deliver any check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money upon any bank or other depository, knowing at the time of such making, drawing, uttering, or delivering that the maker or drawer has not sufficient funds in or credit with such bank or other depository for the payment of such check, draft, order, or other instrument in full upon its presentation, shall, if the amount of such check, draft, order, or other instrument is \$1,000 or more, be guilty of a felony and fined not more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01 or imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years, or both; or if the amount of such check, draft, order, or other instrument has some value, be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01 or imprisoned not more than 180 days, or both.

DC Code 28-3152. Merchant's civil recovery for dishonored checks.(a) Any person who, for himself or herself, or for another person, with intent to defraud, makes, draws, utters, or delivers any check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money for goods or services upon any bank or other depository and knows or should have known that payment of the check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money for goods or services will be refused by the drawee bank or other depository, either because the drawer does not have sufficient funds in or credit with the bank or other depository, or the drawer, with intent to defraud, has ordered a stop payment on the check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money for goods or services, shall be civilly liable to the payee who has presented the check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money as provided in this section. (b) A person shall be liable under subsection (a) of this section only if the check, draft, order, or other instrument for payment of money is dishonored and the drawer fails to pay the face amount of that check, draft, order, or other instrument for payment of money within 30 days following the mailing by the merchant of a written demand for payment as provided in subsection (f) of this section. (c) Any person liable under subsection (a) of this section shall be liable to the merchant for the face amount of the check, and:(1) Additional damages in the amount of 2 times the amount of the check, draft, order, or other instrument for the payment of money, or \$100, whichever is greater;(2) Costs; and (3) Reasonable attorney fees.

DC Code 21-521. Detention of persons believed to be mentally ill; transportation and application to hospital. An accredited officer or agent of the Department of Mental Health of the District of Columbia, or an officer authorized to make arrests in the District of Columbia, or a physician or qualified psychologist of the person in question, who has reason to believe that a person is mentally ill and, because of the illness, is likely to injure himself or others if he is not immediately detained may, without a warrant, take the person into custody, transport him to a public or private hospital, or to the Department, and make application for his admission thereto for purposes of emergency observation and diagnosis. The application shall reveal the circumstances under which the person was taken into custody and the reasons therefor.

DC Code 7-1231.08. Administration of medication a) Except as provided in this section, no consumer shall be administered medication for the purpose of mental health treatment without his or her informed consent.

DC Code 22-3211 Theft (b) A person commits the offense of theft if that person wrongfully obtains or uses the property of another with intent.

DC Code 22-3212. Penalties for theft. (a)(1) Theft in the first degree. – Any person convicted of theft in the first degree shall be fined no more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01, or incarcerated for no more than 10 years, or both, if: (A) The value of the property obtained or used is \$1000 or more; (2) A conviction for first degree theft under paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection merges with any other conviction for robbery under § 22-2801, and malicious destruction of property under § 22-303, arising from the same act or course of conduct.

DC Code 22-404 Assault (2) Whoever unlawfully assaults, or threatens another in a menacing manner, and intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly causes significant bodily injury to another shall be fined not more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01 or be imprisoned not more than

3 years, or both. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “significant bodily injury” means an injury that requires hospitalization or immediate medical attention.

DC Code 22-2803. Carjacking (b)(1) A person commits the offense of armed carjacking if that person, while armed with or having readily available any pistol or other firearm (or imitation thereof) or other dangerous or deadly weapon (including a sawed-off shotgun, shotgun, machine gun, rifle, dirk, bowie knife, butcher knife, switch-blade knife, razor, blackjack, billy, or metallic or other false knuckles), commits or attempts to commit the offense of carjacking.(2) A person convicted of armed carjacking shall be fined not more than the amount set forth in §22-3571.01 and be imprisoned for a mandatory-minimum term of not less than 15 years and a maximum term of not more than 40 years, or both

DC Code 22-404.01 Aggravated Assault (a)A person commits the offense of aggravated assault if:(1) By any means, that person knowingly or purposely causes serious bodily injury to another person; (b) Any person convicted of aggravated assault shall be fined not more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01 or be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

DC Code 22-2801 Robbery Whoever by force or violence, whether against resistance or by sudden or stealthy seizure or snatching, or by putting in fear, shall take from the person or immediate actual possession of another anything of value, is guilty of robbery, and any person convicted thereof shall suffer imprisonment for not less than 2 years nor more than 15 years. In addition to any other penalty provided under this section, a person may be fined an amount not more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01.

DC Code 31-2231.17. Unfair claim settlement practices (a) No person shall commit or perform with such frequency as to indicate a general business practice any of the following: (2) Refuse to pay a claim for a reason that is arbitrary or capricious based on all available information;

DC Official Code 50-2201.04. Speeding and reckless driving(b-1) A person shall be guilty of aggravated reckless driving if the person violates subsection (b)Of this section and the person does one or more of the following:(1) Operates the vehicle at a rate or speed at or greater than 30 miles per hour over the stated speed limit;(2) Causes bodily harm or permanent disability or disfigurement to another; or (3) Causes property damage in excess of \$1,000.

DC Official Code 50-2201.05. Fleeing from scene of accident

Maryland Code Sec. 3-801 Course of Conducts. In this subtitle, “course of conduct” means a persistent pattern of conduct, composed of a series of acts over time that shows a continuity of purpose.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-402 Trespass on posted property: “Prohibited” (a) A person may not enter or trespass on property that is posted conspicuously against trespass by:(1) signs placed where they reasonably may be seen; or (b) Penalty (b) A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to:(1) for a first violation, imprisonment not exceeding 90 days or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both;(2) for a second violation occurring within 2 years after the first violation, imprisonment not exceeding 6 months or a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or both; and (3) for each subsequent violation occurring within 2 years after the preceding violation, imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or a fine not exceeding \$2,500 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 3-802 Stalking “Stalking” defined (a)In this section: (1) “stalking” means a malicious course of conduct that includes approaching or pursuing another where:(i) the person intends to place or knows or reasonably should have known the conduct would place another in reasonable fear: 1. A. of serious bodily injury; B. of an assault in any degree; C. of rape or sexual offense as defined by §§ 3-303 through 3-308 of this title or attempted rape or sexual offense in any degree; D. of false imprisonment; or E. of death; Prohibited (c) A person may not engage in stalking. Penalty (d) a person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 5 years or a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 3-803 Harassment “Prohibited(a) A person may not follow another in or about a public place or maliciously engage in a course of conduct that alarms or seriously annoys the other: (1) with the intent to harass, alarm, or annoy the other; (2) after receiving a reasonable warning or request to stop by or on behalf of the other; and (3) without a legal purpose. Penalty (1) for a first offense, imprisonment not exceeding 90 days or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both; and (2) for a second or subsequent offense, imprisonment not exceeding 180 days fine not exceeding \$1,000 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 3-2-4 Reckless Endangerment Prohibited (a) A person may not recklessly: (1) engage in conduct that creates a substantial risk of death or serious physical injury to another, Penalty (b) A person who violates this section is guilty of the misdemeanor of reckless endangerment and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 5 years or a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-405 Use of vehicle on private property “Prohibited”(b) Except when traveling on a clearly designated private driveway, a person may not use a vehicle or off-road vehicle on private property unless the person has in the person possession the written permission of the owner or tenant of the private property. Penalty(c) A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 90 days or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-402 Entry on property for purpose of invading privacy of occupants “Prohibited” (a) A person may not enter on the property of another for the purpose of invading the privacy of an occupant of a building or enclosure located on the property by looking into a window, door, or other opening. (b) Penalty. A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 90 days or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-202 Burglary in the first degree and home invasion Intent to commit theft A person may not break and enter the dwelling of another with the intent to commit theft. Intent to commit a crime of violence (b) A person may not break and enter the dwelling of another with the intent to commit a crime of violence. (c) A person who violates subsection (a) of this section is guilty of the felony of burglary in the first degree and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 20 years. (d) A person who violates subsection (b) of this section is guilty of the felony of home invasion and upon conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding in 25 years.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-403 Purpose of Program Neighborhood Community Assistance Program. The purposes of the Neighborhood and Community Assistance Program are to:(1) help nonprofit

organizations to carry out approved projects in priority funding areas; (2) encourage business entities and individuals to invest in priority funding areas; and (3) strengthen partnerships between public and private entities.

Maryland Tax Code 6-401 (a) Except as otherwise provided in this article, to determine the amount of State, county, or municipal corporation property tax that is due, the assessment of the property is multiplied by the applicable rate. (b) The applicable tax rate or rates are expressed in dollars and cents or fraction thereof for each \$100 of assessment.

Maryland Code Sec. 10-304 Property Tax Payment Damaged Property Proration "Damaged property" defined (a) As used in this section, "damaged property" means: (1) Real property that is partially damaged or totally destroyed; or (2) personal property that is totally destroyed. Removal of damaged property from assessment roll (b) As to damaged property that should be removed from the assessment roll: (1) if the damage occurred during the 6-month period from the date of in a city to the June 30 following, property tax is not due for the taxable year beginning on the following July 1; (5) if the damage occurred during the fourth month of the taxable year, 33% of the property tax is due. Refund (c) If property tax is paid on property that qualifies for a property tax abatement under this section, the property tax shall be refunded as provided by Title 14, Subtitle 9 of this article.

Maryland Code Sec. 3-808 False, fictitious, or fraudulent liens or encumbrances prohibited In general (a) A person may not file a lien or an encumbrance in a public or private record against the real or personal property of another if the person knows that the lien or encumbrance is: (1) false; or (2) contains or is based on a materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation. Violations and penalties (b) A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to: (1) for a first violation, imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or both; and (2) for each subsequent violation, imprisonment not exceeding 5 years or a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 6-302 Malicious destruction throwing object at vehicle "Prohibited" (a) A person may not willfully throw, shoot, or propel a rock, brick, piece of iron, steel, or other similar metal, or a dangerous missile at or into a vehicle or other means of transportation that is occupied by an individual. Penalty (b) A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both.

Maryland Code Sec. 7-104 Theft and Related Crimes. (a) A person may not willfully or knowingly obtain or exert unauthorized control over property, if the person: (1) intends to deprive the owner of the property; (g)(1) A person convicted of theft of property or services with a value of: (i) at least \$1,500 but less than \$25,000 is guilty of a felony and: 1. is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 5 years or a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or both; and 2. shall restore the property taken to the owner or pay the owner the value of the property or services; (ii) at least \$25,000 but less than \$100,000 is guilty of a felony and: 1. is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 10 years or a fine not exceeding \$15,000 or both; and 2. shall restore the property taken to the owner or pay the owner the value of the property or services; or (iii) \$100,000 or more is guilty of a felony and: 1. is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 20 years or a fine not exceeding \$25,000 or both;

and 2. shall restore the property taken to the owner or pay the owner the value of the property or services.

Maryland Code Sec. 8-103 Obtaining property or services by bad check; penalties prohibited issuing check with intent to stop payment (b) A person may not obtain property or services by issuing a check if: (1) when issuing the check, the person knows that the person or, if the case of a representative drawer, the person principal intends, without the consent of the payee to stop or countermand the payment of the check, or otherwise to cause the drawee to disregard, dishonor, or refuse to recognize the check; and

California Corporation Code 2203 (a) Any foreign corporation which transacts intrastate business and which does not hold a valid certificate from the Secretary of State may be subject to a penalty of twenty dollars (\$20) for each day that unauthorized intrastate business is transacted; and the foreign corporation, by transacting unauthorized intrastate business, shall be deemed to consent to the jurisdiction of the courts of California in any civil action arising in this state in which the corporation is named a party defendant. (b) The penalty established by subdivision (a) of this section shall be assessed according to the number of days it is found that the corporation has been willfully doing unauthorized intrastate business. Prosecution under this section may be brought, and the money penalty recovered thereby shall be paid, in the manner provided by Section 2258 for a prosecution brought under that section. The amount of the penalty assessed shall be determined by the court based upon the circumstances, including the size of the corporation and the willfulness of the violation.

California Penal Code 261 (2) If it is accomplished against a person's will by means of force, violence, duress, menace, or fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the person or another. (4) (D) Was not aware, knowing, perceiving, or cognizant of the essential characteristics of the act due to the perpetrator's fraudulent representation that the sexual penetration served a professional purpose when it served no professional purpose. (6) If the act is accomplished against the victim's will by threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person, and there is a reasonable possibility that the perpetrator will execute the threat. As used in this paragraph, "threatening to retaliate" means a threat to kidnap or falsely imprison, or to inflict extreme pain, serious bodily injury, or death. (7) If the act is accomplished against the victim's will by threatening to use the authority of a public official to incarcerate, arrest, or deport the victim or another, and the victim has a reasonable belief that the perpetrator is a public official. "public official" means a person employed by a governmental agency who has the authority, as part of that position, to incarcerate, arrest, or deport another. The perpetrator does not actually have to be a public official. **Imprisonment:** A minimum of 3 years in state prison, with potential sentences of 6 to 8 years depending on the circumstances. **Registration:** Convicted offenders are required to register as sex offenders, which can have significant restrictions on their daily lives.

California Penal Code 243. (a) A battery is punishable by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by both that fine and imprisonment.

California Penal Code 148.5 (a) Every person who reports to any peace officer listed in Section 830.1 or 830.2, or subdivision (a) of Section 830.33, the Attorney General, or a deputy attorney general, or a district attorney, or a deputy district attorney that a felony or misdemeanor has been committed, knowing the report to be false, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

California Penal Code 520 Burden of Proof The court on all proper occasions shall instruct the jury as to which party bears the burden of proof on each issue and as to whether that burden requires that a party raise a reasonable doubt concerning the existence or nonexistence of a fact or that the establish the existence or nonexistence of a fact by a preponderance of the evidence, by clear and convincing proof, or by proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

California Civil Code 1057.3 (b) Any buyer or seller who fails to execute any document required by the escrow holder to release funds on deposit in an escrow account as provided in subdivision (a) within 30 days following a written demand for the return of funds deposited in escrow by the other party shall be liable to the person making the deposit for all of the following: The amount of the funds deposited in escrow not held in good faith to resolve a good faith dispute.

California Business and Professions Code 6200-6206. (2) Claims for affirmative relief against the attorney for damages or otherwise based upon alleged malpractice or professional misconduct, except as provided in subdivision (a) of Section 6203.

California R & T Code 155.20 (b) (1) (A) The board of supervisors shall have no authority to exempt property with a total base year value, as adjusted by an annual inflation factor pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 110.1, or full value of more than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), County Adopted Resolution 2005-524; 2009-061 "Revenue & Taxation code section 155.20 authorizes a county board of supervisors to exempt all real property up to a base year value of 5000 where that value is so low that if not exempt, the total taxes, special assessments and applicable subventions on the property would amount to less than the cost of assessment and collection. "Effective January 1, 2010, senate Bill 822 amends Revenue & Taxation code section 155.20 and increases the maximum value of property from 5000 to 10000 that a county board of supervisors has authority to exempt from property exemption.

California Civil Code 1161 A tenant is guilty of unlawful detainer when he continues in possession of the property, without the permission of the landlord, after default in the payment of rent, and three days' notice, in writing, requiring its payment. (Cal. Civ. Proc. Code, §1161(2).

California PC Code 487 (a) Grand theft is theft committed in any of the following cases: When the money, labor, real property, or personal property taken is of a value exceeding nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950), except as provided in subdivision (b).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Employment Discrimination

Petitioner relocated from California to Maryland due to federal employment matters in June 2010. Petitioner pursued both state and federal employment from 2001 to current based on the working authorization and advanced education etc. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3115, petitioner qualifies criteria in regards to the Expedited Hiring Authority for College Graduate. From 2001 to 2025, the petitioner applied for more than 200 government job vacancies, 15 contracts, and registration via SAM.gov. Petitioner was interviewed by both state and federal government agencies such as California Department of Health & Human Services; Social Security Administration; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; U.S. Department of Justice. Based on the eligibility and qualifications, petitioner made at least 50 best qualified list as following: (1) HHS-OS-2005-0382 GS-11 Financial Analyst; (2) HHS-OS-2005-0363 GS-13/14 Financial Management Specialist; (3) HHS-OS-2005-0322 GS-13 Program Analyst; (4) HHS-OS-2005- 0437 GS-11/12/13 Program Analyst; (5) HHS-OS-2005-0413 GS-11 Equal Opportunity Specialist; (6) HHS-SMA-2006-0020 GS-11/12/13 Grants Management Specialist; (7) HHS- ACF-2006-0027 GS-9/11 Management & Program Analyst; (8) HHS-OS-2006-0188 GS11/12 Program Analyst; (9) HHS-ACF-2006-0028 GS-9/11/12 Program Specialist; (10) HHS-OS- 2006-0085 GS-9/11/12 Program Specialist; (11) HHS-SMA-2006-2008 GS-11/12/13 Public Health Advisor; (12) HHS-SMA-2006-0014 GS-13 Public Health Advisor; (13) HHS-OS_2008- 0645 GS9/12 Program Analyst; (14) HHS-M-R9-2009-0007 GS9/12 Health Insurance Specialist; (15) HHS-OS-2009-0147 GS9/12 Management Analyst; (16) HHS-OS-2009-0151 GS9/11/12/13 Program Analyst; (17) HHS-OS-2009-0023 GS-9/11 Program Specialist; (18) HHS-OS-2009- 0242 GS-14 Program Manager; (19)CMS-OFM-DE-15-1280442 GS-0301-13 Special Assistant; (20) CMS-CMCHO-DE-15-1278560 GS-0107-9 Health Insurance Specialist; (21) FDA-CBER- 15-DE-1283879-GP GS-0301-11 Regulatory Information Specialist; (22)CMS-CCSQ-DE-15- 1288106 GS-0107-13 Health Insurance Specialist; (23)CMS-OL-DE-15-1305371 GS-0107-12 Health Insurance Specialist; (24)CMS-MCHO-DE-15-1318353 GS-0107-13 Health Insurance Specialist; (25)CMS-OL-DE-15-1303379 GS-0107-12 Health Insurance Specialist (26)CMS- CM-DE-15-1304195 GS-0107-13 Health Insurance Specialist; (27)CMS-CMCS-DE-15- 1275102 GS-0107-14 Health Insurance Specialist; (28)CMS-CCSQ-DE-15-1281309 GS-0107- 9/11/12 Health Insurance Specialist; (29)CMS-CMCS-De-15-1268482 GS-0107-14 Health Insurance Specialist;

(30)CMS-FCHCO-DE-15-1324109 GS-0107-12 Health Insurance Specialist; (31)CMS-CM-DE-15-1307171 GS-0107-9/11/12 Health Insurance Specialist; (32)CMS-OFM-DE-15-1289034 GS-0510-9/11 Accountant; (33)CMS-CMCHO-DE-15- 1318378 GS-0501-9 Financial Management Specialist; (34)CMS-CFMFFSO-DE-15-1325073 GS-0107-9 Health Insurance Specialist; (35)CMS-OTS-DE-15-1295729 GS-0107-9/11/12 Health Insurance Specialist; (36)CMS-CMHPO-DE-15-1283389 GS-0107-11/12 Health Insurance Specialist; (37)CMS-CM-De-15-1266136 GS-0110-9/11/12 Economist; DE-11243215-21-VG.

Due to employment discrimination and prohibited personnel practice, government agencies would rather go against the law 5 U.S.C. 2302 and 38 U.S.C. 4214 instead of hiring the petitioner. In particular, vacancy announcement DE-11243215-21-VG Management Program Analyst, selectees failed to provide proof of U.S. citizenship, prior federal working experience SF-50 or accredited university graduate transcript; proof of veteran DD-214 to reflect equal employment opportunity and fair, transparent hiring policy before vacancy closing date. As such, within 45 days after non-selection, the petitioner started four EEOC hearing processes with the Social Security Administration, U.S. Dept of Health & Human Services, U.S. Dept of Justice. EEOC Appeal case #0120113914 "May Chen v. Department of Health & Human Services" (Case HHS-OS-0046-2011; HHS-CMS-2015-0267) Field Office Hearing: "May Chen v. Department of Health & Human Services" (Case #530-2013-00032X; 530-2014-0004X; 530-2017-00081X). EEOC Appeal: "May Chen v. Department of Justice" (Case # EOI-2022-000320 / Appeal #20230003157) Field Office Hearing: "May Chen v. Department of Justice" (Case #570-2022-01117X). During the long-term EEO process, the petitioner experienced loss of working experience, wage loss (MBA salary \$187000 plus bonus, benefits per year), promotion, long-term mental anguish, competitive disadvantages. Under violation of civil rights (employment and housing) circumstances, pursuant to Age Discrimination in Employment Act 1967, Equal Pay Act 1963, VII Civil Rights Act 1964 (race, color, national origin, female etc.). petitioner pursued civil actions to seek remedies and relief (29 C.F. R. 1614.501). On August 6, 2024 the petitioner filed an employment discrimination case to the U.S. Supreme Court after the applicable civil procedures with EEOC, U.S. District Court and U.S. Court of Appeals. Pursuant to F. R. C. P. Rule 55, F. R. App. P. Rule 31, Supreme Court Rule 10, Rule 12.5, Rule 20, 29 C.F. R. 1614.501, 5 U.S. C. 3115, 5 U.S.C. 2302, 38 U.S.C. 4214 as well as all other applicable law, petitioner demand

\$57000000000000 USD from the EEOC et.al.to compensate citizenship, employment, aging, financial stability, housing, family support, punitive damages.

B. Prince George's County, State of Maryland.

Petitioner moved to the State of Maryland because of housing (1493 Outrigger \$855000) and federal employment matter. Due to unable to provide eligible public housing, petitioner's immediate family member left the P.G. county, Maryland. As such. Petitioner was seeking reimbursement of \$8000 relocation housing expense, \$2500 transportation expense, \$8000 food expense, \$2700 trash fee due to violation of civil rights (housing & employment), economic loss, intentional harm, unfairness, intentional creating grievance, bullying, racial retaliation.

On October 16, 2011, petitioner's vehicle was hit by a shopping cart at Shoppers in P.G. County. Police directed the petitioner to ERIE Insurance. ERIE Insurance denied the hit & run claim and filed a \$1300 lien to Maryland MVA. Petitioner was unable to register the vehicle due to \$1300 lien.

In January 2012 petitioner purchased land and improvement at 16402 Newasa Ln (\$560000 in 2012). On January 26, 2012 Appellant moved to the subject property. On that day, the next-door tenants named "Teresa Micky" called P. G. County Police by using false statements. Two weeks later about 21:00pm, an unknown male driver trespassed to the Appellant's property (garage door) and made a U-turn to ask the petitioner to leave. Since then. Appellant experienced three months trespassing, disturbance of public peace, threat, stalking, gun shots, blocking way, harassment from local people. Petitioner called P.G. County Police Dept. numerous times to report violence. In particular, riding a motorcycle to the petitioner's backyard; driving a vehicle to trespass to the petitioner's front door, taking property photos without consent; blocking public driveway; reckless driving etc. PG county police never took any action. On March 15, 2012 petitioner filed a written complaint to PG County Police 5th district. On April 6, 2012 petitioner was disturbed 72 hours by surrounding motorcycles and trucks. An unknown male motorist rushed out of a wooded area on Newasa Ln on that day. The petitioner came out to stop. The next- door tenants also came out to interfere with the matter by stating "do not listen to her" "bitch" etc. The petitioner called PG county police immediately. After police officer Brown arrived, he charged the petitioner with "disorderly conduct" and wrongfully confined the petitioner for two months because of discrimination. During the confinement, PG county Judge Robert Hoffman issued a Stay Away Order without any evidence alleging petitioner accessing next-door tenant's kids' school, back yard etc. Petitioner opposed Judge Robert Hoffman's false statement to create grievance by refusing to sign. On June 15, 2012, Appellant also filed a Restraining Order against "Teresa & Stephen Micky" to the P.G. County Court accusing burglary, trespassing, stalking, harassment, threat, blocking way, disturbance of peace, intentional harm, discrimination. The court denied petitioner's Restraining Order request.

On June 12, 2012 petitioner was released and returned back to the home. Petitioner found that all of the personal belongings were searched and stolen (burglary) including destroyed sexual assault evidence. The stolen personal belongings include; bed frames, five sets mattresses, two sets sofas, two dining tables and chairs, 3 tea tables, 2 rocking chairs, photo frames, toys, cabinet stuffs,

microwave, computer, computer table, 3 printers, tying machine, 5 cameras, 2 fax machines, 20 CDs, sound system, cosmetics, 3 telephones, 2 answering machines, refrigerator, washing machine, TV, TV stand, VCR, Casio musical keyboard, vacuum, juice blender, massagers, 26 boxes of personal belongings and five luggage suitcases including jewelries, multiple handbags, 20 pairs of shoes, 15 pantyhose, clothing items, 3 new comforters, wool blanket, tooth brushes, tooth pastes, 2 oil paintings, flowers, as well as all other items etc. (see shipping list for details).

Petitioner reported the burglary immediately to the police and the county attorney. Also, petitioner filed an instant complaint against PG county police officer Brown for false confinement due to discrimination. On March 21, 2013 petitioner called PG county police to ask for a first-degree burglary report. Because of police negligence, the burglary report was not made but only showed up at the petitioner's residence in Accokeek. When two police officers Mitchell and Taylor approached the petitioner was waiting inside of her car. Officer Mitchell approached to the petitioner's car window stating "come out, we can give you help". Petitioner opened the car door, at that time Officer Mitchell used excessive force to force the petitioner into the police car without issuing burglary crime report. Two Officers forced petitioner to the PG county court. Prince George's County judge Karen Mason and Judge Lewis stated that petitioner has mental disorder. They ordered the petitioner to Maryland Springfield Hospital for 18 months by using forced medication. Petitioner rejected all medical treatment, diagnosis and forced medication during the stay in Springfield Hospital because of severe body injuries and health damages such as abnormal muscle movement, muscle stiffness, dizziness, long-term irritation, anger, fear, anxiety, trauma, pain, suffering. Springfield Hospital brought body injuries to the petitioner due to repeated forced medication which was completely against will.

In August 2013 Springfield Hospital filed a "Guardianship" to Maryland Circuit Court for Carroll County to deprive petitioner's rights in order to conduct forced medication and predatory activities. Carroll County judge wrongfully issued "Guardianship" to treat petitioner as a vulnerable adult by abusing authority. According to the state and federal government official records, the petitioner was over 18 years old, not a disabled person, and never received disability benefits. On December 12, 2013 U.S. District Court Judge Paul Gramm cancelled the wrongful guardianship. However, A Maryland attorney Robin Weisse illegally withdrew petitioner's bank deposit in the amount of \$9889.66 from Bank of America and \$68938.55 from Capital One Bank as well as illegally cashed petitioner's \$750 checks (Well Fargo check #00040379 and check #00042532). Robin Weisse also obtained petitioner's identity to open new bank accounts and to obtain petitioner's bank statement. Petitioner filed fraud claims to the Bank of America in December 2013. Bank of America issued five cashier's checks in the amount of \$8505.16 (check #9485015948); \$1372.38 (check #9485015949); \$4.41 (check #9485015974); \$3.89 (check #9485015972); \$3.83 (check #9485015973) total \$9889.66 and sent five confirmation letters. Due to confinement in Springfield Hospital, petitioner was unable to deposit the subject cashier's checks. Later on, all of the cashier's checks were bounced and returned by the bank. In July 2015, petitioner went to Capital One bank in Fort Washington, Maryland to ask for money back by speaking with PG county police. PG county police issued a report number. Capital One Bank refused to return petitioner's money.

From 2014 to 2025, petitioner filed multiple Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) complaints, FDIC complaints, OCC complaints, FTC Fraud Report, FBI Crime Reports, Theft Reports against Robin, Weisse, Bank of America, Capital One Bank. Petitioner also demand Bank

of America, Capital One Bank to reissue checks plus compensate all theft related damages, losses, irritation, anxiety, trauma since 2014. Petitioner was released from Springfield Hospital in July 2014. As a result, petitioner's EEOC employment discrimination case was delayed three years per EEOC AJ' Order. When petitioner returned back to the residence in Accokeek, petitioner found all four car tires were cut by perpetrators. Petitioner called local lock smith (PG county stole petitioner's keys) in the amount of \$45. Also, Petitioner called a tow truck to transport damaged car to Tire Plus to fix tires \$400.

In March and April, 2015 petitioner participated EEOC Hearings in Baltimore, Maryland. After EEOC hearing, in June 2015 a P.G. county DPIE female staff stepped into petitioner's property without consent. She stated that she was doing housing inspection. Petitioner has completed First Time Home Buyer Certificate (\$25000 down payment and closing cost) and Single - Family Rehabilitation Assistance Program applications. P.G. county Community and Housing Development Program assists Low Income County resident to improve housing condition, to assist eligible P.G. County home owners with health and safety home repairs. Home owners may qualify for HRAP home loans for up to \$60,000. This loan has a 0% interest rate and no monthly payment. Eligible HRAP home repairs include: Lead, mold and asbestos abatement; Roof, electrical systems, plumbing, and flooring; Windows, insulation, air sealing, siding; Ramps, grab bars, railings etc.

On October 13, 2015 P. G. County Department Permitting Inspection and Enforcement (DPIE) 10 staffs and P.G. county police officer Mitchell illegally demolished 16402 NewasaLn in Accokeek, Maryland. Petitioner refused to sign the demolition paper for lack of proof showing the safety and health hazard. Petitioner called U.S. District Court for Maryland in Greenbelt during demolition and unable to stop the demolition because of police officer Mitchell's threat. Petitioner saw the subject residence was torn down in 30 minutes. Also, PG County police Moss forced petitioner to leave premises after demolition. Petitioner drove to U.S. District Court in Maryland and filed an Emergency Motion accusing illegal demolition, destroying personal belongings etc.

On January 25, 2016, P. G. County two police officers Rambo and Wall as well as EMS staffs broke into petitioner's property in Accokeek during snow storm. They refused to leave instead of breaking petitioner's left rear car window into pieces. Petitioner was dragged out of the car by excessive force and was sent to Southern Maryland Hospital in Clinton, Maryland for a week. Due to forced medication, petitioner refused medical treatment. On February 4, 2016 a local none profit organization fixed petitioner's car window per the Damage Report issued by officer Rambo.

On February 6, 2016 a fraudulent lien \$11256 plus 20% interest total \$18500 was assessed on the petitioner's property by P. G. County tax collector. Petitioner reported violation of civil rights to FBI in Baltimore Field Office. According to Maryland Code Property Tax 6-401, only Maryland Department of Assessment & Taxation can issue assessment on Maryland properties. Also, the property tax is assessment of the property multiplied by the applicable rate. The applicable tax rate for P.G. County is 1.19%. For example, the subject property assessment was \$53200 times tax rate $1.19\% = \$633.08$. Also, the tax should be calculated according to the damaged property which was 33% of the property tax \$211.02. Petitioner complained to the Maryland Department of Assessment & Taxation Director regarding fraudulent lien \$11256 plus 20% interest. The Director

responded that the assessment was \$53200. The lien \$11256 plus 20% interest was demolition expenses ordered by DPIE staff.

In February 2016 petitioner physically went to P.G. county tax collector's office to pay taxes. Due to the wrong amount given by tax collector, petitioner questioned the tax collector because of demolition caused damages and reduction of the taxes to the property. A security officer named Lewis forced petitioner to leave the building. In May 2017, P.G county illegally started tax sale process against the petitioner's property in Accokeek. Petitioner sent two checks \$731 and \$788.78 for tax year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 via certified mail (received by P.G. County) to the Office of the Finance Director. However, P.G. county tax collector returned petitioner's two checks by mail. According to the tax collector's letter, \$18500 certified funds must be paid in order to avoid tax sale. Petitioner filed the copies of the two checks to the PG county court as proof of record. Petitioner has filed multiple lawsuits against FNA Maryland LLC and P.G. county at both state and federal court Due to failure to answer lawsuit, petitioner requested default judgment against FNA Maryland LLC and P.G. county: criminal prosecution and penalties \$1050000000 USD plus 20% interest. In December 2018 P.G. County Office of Finance Director illegally transferred the petitioner's property title to FNA Maryland LLC Benjamin Decker. In late 2018 petitioner moved to the District of Columbia due to unlawful demolition and tax sale. Petitioner experienced long-term homeless, financial abuse, housing discrimination, safety & health hazard, humiliation, irreparable irritation, anxiety, distress, trauma, pain suffering, loss of earnings, loss of family etc. Appellant demand compensation of damages \$2500000 per year.

B. District of Columbia

1. 44 Wrongful Parking Tickets & Towing Vehicle

Due to illegal demolition, illegal tax sale, financial abuse, forced homeless, without housing assistance \$7200/year from both PG county and DC housing authorities, failure to pay default debt etc., petitioner's vehicle was wrongfully assessed 44 parking tickets by Bryant, A (MPD) and Cobb, C (#00364 Dept 15), Ziazi, Z et.al. from 2017 to 2025.

#7021090926; #7901738913; #8243563020; #8251877745; #8264853273; #8270094195;
#8272648871; #8273394710; #8273394706; #8274637910; #8274637906; #8274981433;
#8274981422; #8274981411; #8275228592; #8275228581; #8275538961; #8275538972;
#8275538983; #8275705955; #8275705944; #8275705933; #8279510514; #8279510525;
#8280433630; #8280560875; #8280746180; #8280746191; #8280537526

Pursuant to DC Code 50-2303.11(g) "Failure by a hearing examiner to issue a decision within 180 calendar days after receipt of an application for reconsideration shall be deemed a decision in favor of the applicant' and 50-2303.11 (b) "Probable error committed by the hearing examiner in the proceeding, including failure to judicially notice a fact', the initial two parking tickets #7021090926 was issued on June 6, 2017 and the hearing decision was made on March 13, 2018. Another ticket #7901738913 was issued on May 16, 2018 and the hearing decision was made on February 8, 2019. Further, DC Code 50-2303.05(a)(2)(E) "That the facts alleged on the parking

violation notice are inconsistent or do not support a finding that the specified regulation was violated". Per FTC fraud complaint. Petitioner denied all 44 parking tickets based on the initial ticket #7021090926 and #7901738913 DMV hearing decision exceeded 180 days from the date of issuance. Petitioner parked at Friendship Place designated church parking lot on June 6, 2017. CVS Pharmacy never gave towing notice to petitioner as a customer on May 16, 2018. Most importantly, the subject vehicle displayed valid parking permit effective until April 19, 2026 (Permit ANC3E #DC2565121); the subject vehicle displayed current vehicle tag front and back (ED 4346) all the time. Pursuant to DC Code 50-1501.01 10(a) "The term "class F(I) historic motor vehicle" means any motor vehicle whose manufacturer's model year is at least 25 years old, not exceeding a total driving mileage under all conditions of 1,000 miles annually". As such, petitioner visited DC DMV 22 times since June 2022 by presenting all required documents: auto insurance, vehicle tags and inspection report to request Historical Vehicle Registration at DMV Georgetown branch in July 2022 before sticker expiration date. However, DMV staff Green and M Anderson et.al. repeatedly refused vehicle registration renewal by over charge at least \$550. Petitioner requested F(I) vehicle inspection report at DMV vehicle inspection station twice on May 10, 2024 and July 26, 2024. The Historical Vehicle Registration fee is \$25/year (total \$100), but Cobb, C et.al. overcharged me \$3731. Appellant hereby strongly condemn Cobb, C et.al. destruction of vehicle and predatory activities by abusing authority, misapply law, misrepresenting facts because of violation of civil rights especially housing. Bryant, A and Cobb, C et.al. also signed WAIVER to the Supreme Court in September 2023.

On August 6, 2025 Blue Plains Auto Impoundment Lot illegally towed and booted petitioner's vehicle without sending notice within five days pursuant to DC official code 50-2455. Within 28 days, petitioner sent a written demand letter to the Blue Plains Auto Impound, DC DPW, DC AG representative on August 8, 2025. On August 9, 2025 and after, petitioner filed at least three theft reports (T25006411 etc.) and FBI crime reports accusing auto theft and invade privacy. On September 25, October 26, 2025 petitioner physically demand the vehicle to be back without any damages from MPD. Because of the illegal impoundment, petitioner experienced extremely urgent non-human living conditions, safety & health hazard, trauma, pain, suffering. Except for the stolen vehicle (\$22000), Blue Plains Auto Impound also illegally possessed an anti-theft club, T-shirts, undergarment, hats, gloves (50-70 pieces), 6 new sweaters, purses, \$3500, a suitcase (documents) inside the vehicle.

On August 21, 2025 DC DMV hearing examiner sent a dismissal post card to the petitioner stating the dismissal of parking tickets due to without burden of proof pursuant to DC Code 50-2303.03 C1(4) "a notice of infraction shall include A copy of the photo or digitized image of the violation". DC Code 50-2302.06 (a) "The burden of proof shall be on the District and no infraction shall be established except by clear and convincing evidence". Petitioner hereby certify that I never received any photo or digitized image as proof as well as a notice before hearing.

2, Financial Abuse

In 2024, petitioner experienced five times closing depository accounts by the financial institutions and illegal possession of petitioner's full deposit without return. As such, it caused extra returned checks fee and late fees \$750, overdraft fee \$36, loss of promotional bonus \$800, interest rate 50%,

loss of earnings, all other related damages such as denial petitioner's family member's benefits, auto insurance payment and policy, passport fees, taxes etc.

(1) M & T Bank: according to the New York State Department of State Division of Corporations ID #3673513 Manufacturers and Traders Trust Company (M & T Bank) was INACTIVE showing "Unauthorized Foreign Business Corporation". The latest filing was May 16, 2008.

M & T Bank closed petitioner's accounts on December 2, 2024. Failed to disburse petitioner's full deposit \$29822.61. (Check No. 400995357-3 bounced on December 9, 2024 and Check No. 400995358 cleared). On March 25, 2024 petitioner opened new checking accounts at M & T Bank Chevy Chase branch with banker Tayyaba Alimuddin et.al. Deposit amount more than \$25000. Same day, petitioner experienced vehicle hit & run which caused front head light and front bumper damages. Petitioner established banking relationship over 180 days without banking violation. On October 21, 2024 I deposited several unpaid checks into checking account (returned) including Bank of America five cashier's checks \$9889.66 and the rent payment \$875 owed by a private company. I explained to M & T Bank via secured messages regarding wrongful guardianship which was cancelled by the U.S. District Court on December 12, 2013. Bank of America and Capital One Bank illegally released my deposit to Robin Weisse (unknown) after December 12, 2013. On November 6, 2024 customer advocacy representative Marci Pratt sent me a letter to close all accounts before December 3, 2024.

I requested money back 4 times in person from M & T bank on the following date: November 27, 2024; December 2, 2024; February 13, 2025 and April 10, 2025. On December 2, 2025 Woodley Park branch cashier Subrena Dukharan issued two cashier's checks and closed my accounts. On December 9, 2025 one of the cashier's checks in the amount of \$29692.48 (check #400995357-3) was bounced. I have emailed Subrena Dukharan and her supervisor to provide a copy of cashed check (#400995357-3) to find out who cashed my money. However, they never provided. On April 10, 2025 I called MPD police officers at M & T bank chevy chase branch to collect stolen funds. On December 30, 2024 I filed civil action at U.S. District Court. Until now, M & T Bank, Capital One Bank, Bank of America never returned my money.

(2) Fidelity Investment: illegally closed Appellant's account on December 4, 2024 over the phone without 30 days notification for retaliation purpose. On December 4, 2024 I called Fidelity customer service at 19:20pm. Two representatives "Anthony" and another Hispanic male staff told me that my account was closed by Fidelity. I argued with them about the closing account. I also verified with them if Fidelity received the cashier's check issued by M & T Bank on December 2, 2024. The representatives told me that Fidelity never received the subject check. As such, I verbally notified Fidelity representative to return the deposit immediately if they received. The phone conversation was cut off I was unable to login since then. From December 4, 2024 until current, I never received the subject cashier's check and remaining balance. On December 7, 2025 I filed formal complaint to Security Exchange Commission (SEC). I made several calls to the SEC chair's office to collect the subject deposit and remaining balance. On May 12, 2025 I sent another follow up message to the SEC chair's office concerning the check deposit if cashed by Fidelity. I recalled Fidelity attempted to possess another \$10000 from me in October 2024.

(3) Truist Bank: closed Appellant's accounts on December 23, 2024. Failed to disburse the previous unpaid \$21265 (Paycheck Protection Program forgiveness loan \$20000, previous promo

bonus \$700 and current bonus \$400, overdraft fee \$36). On December 5, 2024 I opened two new accounts at Truist Bank Adam Morgan branch with promotional bonus \$400. After the completion of new accounts opening, I deposited two M & T bank cashier checks \$29692.48 and \$130.13 via Truist Bank branch representative Darling Elberry. She gave me two receipts issued by the teller showing funds availability date. Due to cashier's checks were cash equivalent and guaranteed to pay, therefore on December 5, 2024 I sent payments to payees by mail (taxes). Also, it was my personal funds. On December 9, 2024 I received a Returned Check Notification and overdraft fee \$36 from the Truist Bank regarding bounced check: M & T Bank official check #400995357 amount \$29692.48. On January 2, 2025 I was informed by Truist Bank team leader at branch that Truist Bank closed all my accounts based on insufficient funds. Truist Bank disbursed remaining balance \$94.13 and closing statement by mail. Subsequently, payees (tax authority) charged me returned checks fees, late fees \$750.

(4) Wells Fargo Bank: closed Appellant accounts about 10 days on January 31, 2024. Failed to disburse unpaid \$1975 promo bonus: \$825 promo bonus was unpaid by Adam Morgan branch representative due to refuse to accept Appellant's check deposit (more than bonus requirement) at teller's window after verification. Another \$1150 promo bonus was unpaid by Spring Valley branch Cynthia Rodriguez after completion of the promo bonus requirements. Accounts were also closed within 10 days by Cynthia Rodriguez.

3. Failure to Prosecute Crimes & Compensate damages, loss etc.

Petitioner as a victim of crimes has not received any proof of criminal prosecution and Crime of Victim of Compensation (CVCP) funds (8 CVCP applications submitted) based on the following police reports issued by MPD.

- Crime Report #20058472 Theft of Phone April 13, 2020;
- Crime Report #20091995 Theft of 115 clothing items June 23, 2020;
- Crime Report #20097816 Simple Assault July 6, 2020 (face swollen, eye injury etc.);
- Crime Report #20114588 Damages to the Property August 11, 2020 (vehicle damages)
- Crime Report #22017199 Aggravated Assault and Robbery February 6, 2022 (head injury, eyes injury, cheek bone injury, purse and ID were robbed)
- Crime Report #22058505 Stolen ID April 27, 2022 (Driver's License)
- Crime Report #24424106 Destruction of Property September 21, 2024
- Three FBI Crime Reports & three MPD Theft Reports against M & T Bank et.al from December 17, 2024 to April 19, 2025.
- All other rejected theft reports and Damages to the Vehicle reports.

In particular case #20091995, on July 6, 2020 and Feb 6, 2022 simple assault and aggravated assault committed by two unknown black males brought me irreparable injuries such as eye injuries: bruise, swollen, reduced vision, dark spots; head injuries: bleeding, swollen, soft tissue

damage; cheek bone injuries: swollen, bump, unbalanced etc. MPD investigator and ambulance sent me to the hospital for medical treatment from the scene. MPD investigator took injuries photos at the hospital. Injuries photos were filed to the both state and federal court as proof of injuries. According to the research, the average of eye injury is \$850000; the average of traumatic brain injury ranges from \$100000 to \$5000000.

Another particular case #22017199, on February 6, 2022 about 6:30am, an unknown black male pointed a hand gun toward me to conduct carjacking, aggravated robbery, aggravated assault. On August 6, 2025 Blue Plains Auto Impound Lot illegally towed and booted my car without any notifications during the court proceedings to contest 44 wrongful parking tickets issued by Bryant, A; Cobb, C et.al. Repeated vehicle hit & run, 24/7 reckless endangerment from local people. Auto insurance companies denied all auto claims, cancellation of auto policy, damage to the driving record etc. I never received so many parking tickets in any other state but the District of Columbia.

4. Misapply law and intentional harm.

On October 8, 2021 MPD 5 police officers Stephen Franchak, Suzie Stears, English, Homere Whyte, P202 and another two DC DBH staffs used excessive force to conduct illegal confinement at PIW for 21 days by misapply DC code 21-521 and 7-1231.08. At the time of the MPD arrival, I was sitting inside of my car because of violation of civil rights (illegal demolition). In September 2021 I notified Tilden Garden Inc Apartment building security that all residents were prohibited to access my car due to repeated hit & run, reckless endangerment. My car was severely damaged multiple times: front and back bumper, front head light, damages to the both sides, tire, battery, 40-50 dents, scratches, cracks, pressure, mold etc. The insurance companies denied all of the claims. MPD officer Stephen Franchak, Suzie Stears et.al. and DC DBH did not show me any report that I have illness which could bring the harm to the others. Upon my rejection to the PIW for three hours, MPD police officer Stephen Franchak et.al. used excessive force to physically dragged me out of my car to the PIW for 21 days. At PIW, I was given forced medication without my consent. I was implied by the Black nurse that they were going to send my body to my home country before my birthday. On March 18, 2025 another MPD police officer did same thing.

5. Repeatedly deprive rights and bullying.

From 2018 to 2025, DC MPD, DPR, DC Tenley town library, UDC and CVS Pharmacy, Safeway, Giant, Targe, Wegmans et.al. issued 15 Barring Notice to me both in writing and verbally to restrict me to access building because of bullying and humiliation. All these Barring Notice were issued by Black people. For example: Restrict me to use shower on January 23, 2025, April 23, 2025 and May 5, 2025 at DC DPR. From September 8, 2025 to October 26, 2025 Garda World Security and MPD restrict me 12 times because of illegal impoundment caused housing matter.

6. Failure to pay public benefits.

Failure to provide section 8 housing choice vouch and public housing assistance (\$7200 / year) upon three applications in 2023, 2024, 2025. Cancellation of public benefits SNAP unpaid \$2292 from May 2025 and remaining 5 years term.

D. State of California

On January 23, 2002 a West Covina, California police officer Meyers (#349) and a West Covina Court judge Carol W. Elswick issued a false police report and wrongful judgment without burden of proof. Because of failure to comply with the law (California Evidence Code 520 - Burden of Proof, California Corporation Code 2203, Penal Code 261, California PC code 487, 15 U.S.C. 1631, Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1, Rule 2.2, Rule 2.3; Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 3.3, Rule 3.8, Rule 8.4 etc.). She treated me extremely unfair with bias and discrimination which against Violence Against Woman Act (VAWA). Petitioner never possessed a merchandise priced as \$280 and never brought any damages and losses to the State of California People especially Robinson's May - a bankrupted & dissolved department store. According to the California Secretary State Business Entity records, Robinsons-May Inc. was merged out on January 22, 1993 file #1850572; Robinsons-May Inc was terminated on June 23, 2003 as an out of state stock corporation file #2541030. However, Robinsons-May Inc. illegally operate business after June 2003 (at least to 2010) which was in violation of California Corporation Code 2203. According to the CA Corporation Code 2203, Robinsons-May Inc. should be fined \$20 per day (at least \$51100) plus prosecution.

California Evidence Code 520 stated "The party claiming that a person is guilty of crime or wrongdoing has the burden of proof on that issue". Petitioner served multiple legal document, Summons & Complaints to the State of California from 2010 to 2025, however the State of California never answered the subject issue nor provide any proof. Before this incident, petitioner was a cleared person without any record. It can be resolved through probation. Rules of Professional conduct 3.8 (a) "refrain from prosecuting a charge that the prosecutor knows is not supported by probable cause".

Because of the subject matter, it brought extra expenses \$5750, attorney fee \$2000, lost of home at 1493 Outrigger (\$850000), additional personal belongings as well as irreparable damages including credit damages \$25000 per year (retaliation from the Dept of Treasury regarding a refunded \$10000 Savings Bond within 90 days of the cancellation), irreparable injuries, irreparable loss of time, irreparable damage to the reputation to the petitioner.

A State of California employee Steven C. Thompson conducted sexual assault a day before the subject matter without any legal responsibilities. He told petitioner to prepare candle light dinner to start relationship. Pursuant to California Penal Code 261, 42 U.S.C. etc, sex crime is punishable by 4-8 years prison and \$10000 fine. Based on the severity of the sexual crime such as lack of responsibilities and support, long-term and extent physical, emotional, psychological harm, invasion of privacy, damage to the health, negative impact of relations, damage to the reputation. According to the research, sexual crime civil penalty ranges from \$200000 to 20000000 per case.

For privacy and safety purposes, all other sexual crimes shall apply to CA PC 261 and penalties.

On April 9, 2001 Monrovia court commissioner Michael Durfee made another wrongful judgment because of defrauding consumer matter. A local real estate agent issued an invalid purchase contract to petitioner according the Deed record: one owner signed contract; the other two owners never signed. Petitioner also physically inspected the vacant lot which was not buildable. Within applicable time, petitioner canceled the invalid contract by asking \$3000 deposit back from the

escrow pursuant to invalid purchase contract part 15(A); "Buyer has 21 days from acceptance to complete all inspections, investigations, and review of documents... AND 15 (C) "If Buyer or Seller gives written Notice of Cancellation pursuant to rights duly exercised, the deposits less costs and fees applicable shall be returned to Buyer". As such, commissioner Durfee made wrongful judgment which brought attorney fees \$13400 plus extra 10% interest to petitioner. Petitioner never brought any property damages to the Seller instead of virtual inspection. Pursuant to California Professional Code 6200-6206 and the Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.5 (fees), the State Bar of California Client Security Fund (CSF #15-F-13183; #15-F-13184; #15-F-13185) should return overpaid attorney fees \$17400 plus extra 10% interest. Except the above referenced, the other fees Lynn Chao \$2000 (restore housing), Daniel Deng \$1000, immigration case \$1000 also need to be returned: For instance, petitioner did not sign Attorney /Client fee agreement with Lynn Chao; immigration attorney withdrawal the case; the fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services in the small claims court; the amount involved and the results obtained.

California R&T Code 155.20 (Low Value Ordinance Tax Exemption) stated "The board of supervisors shall have authority to exempt property with a total base year value, as adjusted by an annual inflation factor pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 110.1, or full value of less than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B). The county adopted Resolution 2005-524 & 2009-061 Specifically, Resolution 2005-524 involved the exemption of certain real and personal property with low values from property tax assessment less than \$10000". From December 2005 to current, the County Tax Collector over charged taxes \$2300 plus 20% interest as economic loss and possible tax sale.

Dominion Energy Services Inc /co. EDF Renewables failed to pay sufficient rent at least \$500000 in the past 10 years based on the lease part 4.3 "understated payment" and two comparable market analysis after receiving multiple 30 days notices. By today. Dominion Energy still miss three payments; \$750 in 2014, \$875 in December 2022, \$875 in March 2023 plus extra \$1000 increase every 10 years from 2022 to current. 10% interest. Total \$13360 was unpaid before increased rent.

Petition hereby certify that the above statement is true, correct and based on her best personal knowledge. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 5, all information contained herein shall be confidential. It shall be prohibited to reveal or disclose without petitioner's consent.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Pursuant to U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10.

A petition for a writ of certiorari will be granted only for compelling reasons. A petition for a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law. The following, although neither controlling nor hilly measuring the Court's discretion, indicate the character of the reasons the Court considers: (b)a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals. For example, Petitioner was completely case free and completely clear in her home country. However, Petitioner was repeatedly damaged in the United States by experiencing extremely unfair and wrongful judgments with all listed cases above.

Example: (1) U.S. District Court for Maryland Case No. 13-PWG-02564 / 02565 (Judge Paul Gramm) and U.S. District Court to the District of Columbia 22-CV-00693 (Judge McFadden et.al.) Pursuant to F. R. C. P. Rule 24, the Motion to Leave to Proceed Forma Pauperis was grant in the District Court for D.C.. However, it was denied in the District Court for Maryland.

(2). Employment Discrimination. In regards to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari filed on August 6, 2024 to the Supreme Court (U.S. Court of Appeals Case #23-5287/5292, U.S. District Court Case #23-01493/01496), EEOC et.al. treated petitioner differently without hiring although petition made at least 38 Best Qualified Certificate. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3115 (Expedited Hiring Authority for College Graduate) and 5. U.S.C. 2302 (Prohibited Personnel Practice); 38 U.S.C. 4214 etc., the U.S. Dept of Justice would rather hire ineligible applicant instead of hire petitioner based on failure to provide: proof of U.S. citizenship, proof of prior federal working experience or Graduate degree, proof of veteran from selectees. Failure to provide EQUAL employment opportunity according to fair, transparent hiring policy. The annual salary for the GS9/11 position was \$65000. Pursuant to 29 C. F. R. 1614.501 "When an agency, or the Commission, in an individual case of discrimination, finds that an applicant or an employee has been discriminated against, the agency shall provide full relief". Pursuant to ADEA 1967 and EPA 1963, EEOC et.al. treated petitioner differently which caused irreparable loss of time (AGE) and failure to pay (MBA salary \$187300 per year). Petitioner experienced wage loss about \$6000000 plus bonus, benefits, interest.

(3). Pursuant to DC Code 22-3211; 22-3212; 28-3152; 12 U.S. C. 1831; F. R. C. P. Rule 55 etc., U.S. Court of Appeals failed to take - action against M & T bank, Bank of America, Capital One Bank, State of Maryland et.al. based on the fact: illegally operating business and theft of money. Evidence: copies of returned / bounced checks in the amount of \$29822.61 (M & T Bank); \$9889.67 (Bank of America); \$58938.55 (Capital One Bank); \$750 (total \$13360 rent before increase). No cross complaints and No cross appeals filed by the Defendants. Penalties for theft. (a)(1) Theft in the first degree. – Any person convicted of theft in the first degree shall be fined no more than the amount set forth in § 22-3571.01, or incarcerated for no more than 10 years, or both, if: (A) The value of the property obtained or used is \$1000 or more.

(4). In August 2018 and May 2017, May Chen v. FNA Maryland LLC (#CAL 18-27463) and FNA Maryland LLC v. May Chen (CAE 17-39047) had contradictory judgment. On one hand, Petitioner win default judgment \$1050 million plus 20% interest plus criminal prosecution against FNA

Maryland LLC and Prince George's County Maryland. On another hand, Prince George's County judge Ingrid Turner ruled in favor of FNA Maryland LLC although Benjamin Decker failed to appear on the court hearing.

(5) State of California Pomona Superior Court issued a restraining order against Petitioner because EOIR immigration judge initiated his personal matter (#KS0114391) toward Petitioner without any proof showing his mental anguish. However, another Judge in Pomona Superior Court refused to issue a restraining order against crime offender Cristimar Macatangay (#KS0F3553). Example

(6) Prince George's County Maryland Circuit Court "Teresa / Stephen Micky" v. May Chen (Case 0502SP098652012) and Cross-Complaint "May Chen v. Teresa/Stephen Micky" (Case 0502SPXXXXXXXXXX) were decided extremely unfair.

2. Pursuant to U.S. Supreme Court Rule 20.

Petition for an Extraordinary Writ, to justify the granting of any such writ, the petition must show that the writ will be in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court. From September 2013 to 2025, Petitioner has repeatedly filed multiple lawsuits to both state and federal courts to seek justice. Due to failure to implement the law, misapply law, miscarry justice, unfairness, obstruction of justice, discrimination etc., all petitioner's court cases, complaints, claims to seek adequate relief were denied, closed and dismissed regardless petitioner's objection. Pursuant to the supreme court rule 20, the court cannot dismiss the case without petitioner's consent. Accordingly, petitioner continue to seek grant of petition to obtain adequate relief from the Supreme Court of the United States.

3. Failure to implement the law. Pursuant to the F.R.C. P. Rule 55; F. R. C. P. Rule 12; F. R. App. P. Rule 31, F. R. App. P. Rule 27.

Petitioner filed an "Request to Ender Default Judgment" for each case against Respondents. Pursuant to F. R. C. P. Rule 12 (1)(A) "A defendant must serve an answer: (i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint," Pursuant to F. R. C. P. Rule 55. Default / Default Judgment (a) ENTERING A DEFAULT. When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk **must** enter the party's default. (b) ENTERING A DEFAULT JUDGMENT. (1) By the Clerk. If the plaintiff's claim is for a sum certain or a sum that can be made certain by computation, the clerk— on the plaintiff's request, with an affidavit showing the amount due— **must** enter judgment for that amount and costs against a defendant who has been defaulted for not appearing and who is neither a minor nor an incompetent person.

F. R. App. P. Rule 31 "Appellees must file Reply Brief within 30 days after serving Appellant's Brief". No Reply Brief filed by Appellees. No Cross-Complaint, No-Cross Appeals filed by Appellees.

F. R. App. P. Rule 27 Emergency Motion. Under life threatening and multiple irreparable damages and irreparable losses circumstance, petitioner filed multiple emergency motions by using facts to establish irreparable damages, irreparable economic losses, irreparable injuries, irreparable loss of time, irreparable damage to the reputation caused by the Defendants. For example, irreparable

CONCLUSION

The Petition for A Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'MC' in a stylized, cursive font.

MAY CHEN (signature on file)

November 12, 2025