

No. 25-6735

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

**MAY CHEN
(PETITIONER)**

vs.

**EEOC
STATE OF MARYLAND
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE OF TEXAS
(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 REHEARING
(Supreme Court Rule 44)
April 14, 2026**



IOM48256529

United States Supreme Court

Recipient:

Clerks Office

Sender:

Chen May

Processed:

4/14/2026 6:45:11 AM | 602



May Chen (Petitioner)
Address: Illegally Demolished and Sold
Mailing Add: 4713 Wisconsin Ave NW DC 20016
ECF Noticing: nationalhealthcarefdn@gmail.com




TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	P.2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	P.3
LEGAL GROUNDS	P.5
ARGUMENT	p.14
I. Failure to file cross-petition (Supreme Court Rule 12.5)	
II. WAIVER filed on March 5, 2026	
III. Failure to implement the law according to Docket Sheet (F.R.C. P. Rule 55; F. R. App. P. Rule 31; F. R. App. P. Rule 27)	
IV. Misapply Law (F. R. App. P. Rule 34(a)(2), 34(j))	
V. Failure to resolve default issues; Failure to correct errors (Supreme Court Rule 10)	
VI. Mandate should not be issued (F. R. App. P. Rule 41)	
VII. Reverse Justice (Supreme Court Rule 20)	
CONCLUSION	P.17
CERTIFICATE OF UNREPRESENTED COUNSEL	P.18
PROOF OF SERVICE	P.19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Supreme Court Rule 10
Supreme Court Rule 12
Supreme Court Rule 20
Supreme Court Rule 21
Supreme Court Rule 22
Supreme Court Rule 29
Supreme Court Rule 33.2
Supreme Court Rule 34.7
Supreme Court Rule 39
Supreme Court Rule 44
F. R. App. P. Rule 41
F. R. App. P. Rule 31
F. R. App. P. Rule 27
F. R. App. P. 34 (a)(2), 34(j)
F. R. C. P. Rule 55 (Default Judgment)
F. R. C. P. Rule 12 (Failure to Answer Complaint)
28 U.S.C. 1331/1332
28 U.S.C. 1407
42 U.S. C.
29 C. F. R. 1614.501 (Remedies & Relief)
5 U.S.C 3115 (Expedited Hiring Authority for College Graduates)
5 U.S.C. 2302 (Prohibited Personnel Practices)
38 U.S.C. 4214
8 U.S.C. 1231
12 C.F.R. 1024 (Consumer Financial Protection Complaints)
15 U.S.C. 1681 (Fair Credit Reporting)
Equal Pay Act 1963
Age Discrimination in Employment Act 1967
Title VII Civil Rights Act 1964 (race, color, national origin, sex etc.)
California Penal Code 148.5
California Corporation Code 2203
California Evidence Code 520
California Penal Code 261
California Revenue & Taxation Code 155.20 & County Adopted Resolution 2005-524 2009-061
California Revenue & Taxation Code 19705/19706
California Civil Code 1689.7 (Notice of Cancellation) and Code 1057.3 (Release Deposit)
California Business Professional Code 6147/6148 6200/6206
Maryland Code 6-403 (Trespassing)
Maryland Code 6-202 (Burglary)
Maryland Code 7-104 (Theft)
Maryland Code 6-301 (Malicious Destruction of Property)
Maryland Tax Code 4-202 (Depositing & Reporting Collections)
Maryland Tax Code 6-401 (Determining Amount of Property Tax)
Maryland Tax Code 10-304 (Damaged Property Tax)

Maryland Tax Code 3-808 (Fraudulent Lien)
Maryland Tax 14-817 (Tax Sale)
Maryland Code 10-708 (g) (Forced Medication)
DC Code 21-521
DC Code 50-2201.04 / 50-2201.05 (Hit & Run / Reckless Endangerment)
DC Code 31-2231.17 (Unfair Settlement of Auto Claims)
DC Code 50-2303.11(g)(b) (Hearing Decision Exceed 180 days)
DC Code 50-2302.06 (Hearing)
DC Code 50-2303.05(a)(2)(E) (Reconsideration)
DC Code 50-2303.03 (C-1)(4) (Notice of Infraction without Photo Copy of the Violation))
DC Code 50-1501 (Emission Exemption)
DC Code 50-2455 (Towing without 5 days - Notice)
DC Code 28-3152 (Merchant's Civil Recovery for Dishonored Checks)
DC Code 22-3211 / 3212 (Theft / Penalties)
DC Code 22-404 / 404.01 (Assault / Aggravated Assault)
Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1, Rule 1.2; Rule 2.2, Rule 2.3
Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 3.3; 3.8; 1.5; 8.4
*All other applicable law please reference to the original Petition for a Writ of Certiorari Table of Authorities
**Evidence (filed 1517 pages)

LEGAL GROUNDS

Petitioner hereby demands the Supreme Court to attach the original 40 pages Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, Forma Pauperis etc. along with the Petition for Rehearing. Due to miscarry justice, wrongful judgment, failure to implement the law, failure to resolve default issues, failure to correct errors etc., petitioner demands the Supreme Court to reverse justice and approve the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44 Rehearing,

2.”Any petition for the rehearing of an order denying a petition for a writ of certiorari or extraordinary writ shall be filed within 25 days after the date of the order of denial and shall comply with all the form and filing requirements of paragraph 1 of this Rule, including the payment of the filing fee under Rule 38(b) in any case in which the filer paid the filing fee under Rule 38(a), but its grounds shall be limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented. The time for filing a petition for the rehearing of an order denying a petition for a writ of certiorari or extraordinary writ will not be extended. The petition shall be presented together with certification of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel) that it is restricted to the grounds specified in this paragraph and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay; one copy of the certificate shall bear the signature of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel). The certificate shall be bound with each copy of the petition. The Clerk will not file a petition without a certificate. The petition is not subject to oral argument”. 3. The Clerk will not file any response to a petition for rehearing unless the Court requests a response. In the absence of extraordinary circumstances, the Court will not grant a petition for rehearing without first requesting a response”. 4. The Clerk will not file consecutive petitions and petitions that are out of time under this Rule”.

Pursuant to 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) in the form prescribed by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Form 4. See 28 U. S. C. §1915 . The motion shall state whether leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* was sought in any other court and, if so, whether leave was granted.

Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis and Affidavit filed on December 3, 2025. And it was granted by several U.S. District Court Judges.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 20 Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ.

1. “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”.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 12.5

“No more than 30 days after a case has been placed on the docket, a respondent seeking to file a conditional cross petition (i.e., a cross-petition that otherwise would be untimely) shall file, with proof of service as required by Rule 29, It is the cross-petitioner’s duty to notify all cross-respondents promptly, on a form supplied by the Clerk, of the date of filing, the date the cross-petition was placed on the docket, and the docket number of the cross-petition. The notice shall be served as required by Rule 29. A cross-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. The time to file a conditional cross-petition will not be extended”.

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”.

WAIVER. A Waiver occurs when an individual or party knowingly and voluntarily relinquishes a legal right they are entitled to enforce whether constitutional, statutory, or contractual in nature.

F. R. C. P. Rule 55. (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. C. P. Rule 12. (a) Time to Serve a Responsive Pleading. Unless another time is specified by a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows: (1) *In General.* (A) A defendant must serve an answer: (i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint; or

F. App. R. P. Rule 31 The appellee must serve and file a brief within 30 days after the appellant's brief is served.

29 C. F. R. 1614.501 (remedies & relief) 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.

(b) Relief for an applicant. 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. 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.

On December 3, 2025 within 90 days of the Judgment issued by the U.S. Court of Appeal for DC circuit, petitioner filed a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (40 pages) along with Motion for Leave to Proceed Forma Pauperis, Appendix (including current U.S. District Court and U.S. Court of Appeals docket sheet), Proof of Service. One original plus two copies. Respondents and U.S. Court of Appeals for DC were timely served.

On January 3, 2026 petitioner never received a cross-petition from the Respondents (District of Columbia et.al.) within 30 days. The time to file a conditional cross-petitioner will not be extended (Rule 12.5). Mandate issued on January 8, 2026 was wrong due to the timely filing and serving of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court (F. R. App. P. Rule 41).

On April 4, 2023, petitioner filed 1475 pages of essential evidence to the U.S. Court of Appeals for DC. The current District Court & Appellate Court docket sheets were amended. Additional 110 pages evidence accusing Theft of Money etc. filed in May 2025. Petitioner filed an Order to Subpoena the 1517 pages Evidence as supporting documents.

On March 30, 2026 the Supreme Court Clerk Scott Harris denied the original Petition for a Writ of Certiorari without convincing applicable law, facts, and evidence to support the wrongful decision. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44, petitioner hereby files the Petition for Rehearing within 25 days from the date of the denial along with a signed Certificate of Unrepresented Counsel. The petition is not subject to oral argument.

The clerk will not file any response to a Petition for Rehearing unless the court requests a response (Extraordinary Writ was filed in the original Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Petition for Rehearing). The Clerk will not file consecutive petitions and petitions that are out of time under this Rule.

According to the original petition under the section Statement of the Facts, the Court Clerk Scott Harris illegally denied the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari without stating applicable law and clear & convincing facts, evidence as proof. Accordingly, petitioner hereby deny the wrongful charges from the Respondents without cross- petition, cross – appeal, cross- complaints, without burden of proof. Instead, petitioner accused Respondents who repeatedly conducted violation of civil rights / civil liberties (employment & housing); loss of wage / benefits /investments, sexual assault; repeated predatory activities (robbery, theft), aging, injuries, repeated denial / close cases against petitioner.

1.Violation of Civil Liberties. State agencies repeatedly ruin petitioner’s clearance state by state. The root cause was primarily discrimination. Police officers failed to identify civil or criminal matters. The petitioner especially accused State of California formal judge Carol William Elswick et.al. For example, Carol W. Elswick failed to prosecute a bankrupted department store Robinsons-May Inc. who illegally operated business at least 10 years after merged out and termination on 1/22/1993 and 6/23/2003 (California Secretary of State document #1850572; #2541030). In 2004, Robinsons-May Inc. generated \$1.4 billion in annual sales. Robinsons-May Inc. failed to pay penalty \$20 / day plus prosecution pursuant to California Corporation Code 2203. Also, she failed to prosecute sexual assault offenders Steven C. Thompson et.al. who brought irreparable injuries, irreparable harm, irreparable damages to me as a victim of sexual crimes (Penal Code 261, 42 U.S.C., 8 U.S.C 1231, 5 U.S.C. 2302). Pursuant to California Penal Code 261, the sexual assault offender should be prosecuted to 4-8 prison plus \$25000 fine as well as civil penalties. California sexual assault offenders treated me terribly not only physical harm, but also discrimination, intentional harm, retaliation, bullying, blocking way, grievances, damage to the reputation.

For example, Los Angeles County DA intentionally discriminated against me as a victim of the sexual crimes, intentionally took my advantage, failure to compensate damages, repeatedly file police report as retaliation, intentionally ruined my clearance and reputation, repeated sexual harassment and threat from November 2025 to April 2026, intentionally spread his personal problems to me as victim.

Accordingly, I deny the false police (CA PC 148.5) without burden of proof, without cross-petition, miscarry justice, unfairness, discrimination, state government disability. Another issue was out of the Robinsons-May Inc. jurisdiction without witness.

Carol W. Elswick as a formal judge failed to comply with the law, perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially, without bias or prejudice, uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Except for intentional harm, the State of California refused to return overcharged attorney fees \$17450 (Client Security Funds Claims) and out-of-pocket \$6000 plus 50% interest from the date of wrongful judgment. Default Lease, insufficient rent \$13000 and understated payment \$5000000. Refund of overpaid taxes \$2500 plus 20% interest from

2. Employment Discrimination. Petitioner applied for more than 200 federal employment vacancies based on the eligibility and qualifications submitted before closing date. Of which, at least 38 positions were on the best qualified list according to EEOC (see evidence): (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; (38) DE-11243215-21-VG Program& Management Analyst GS-9/11; (39) DE-11276846-AS Executive Staff Assistant GS13.

However, the hiring officials such as the Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, U.S. Department of Justice treated the petitioner unfairly and discriminated against. Petitioner was not selected from any of the qualified positions. Within 45 days after non-selection, petitioner started four EEOC hearings (Agency Case # HHS-OS-0046- 2011 / Appeal 0120113914; HHS-CMS-2015-0267; #EOI-2022-000320 / Appeal #20230003157; EEOC Hearing Case #530-2013-00032X; 530-2014-0004X; 530-2017-00081X; #570-2022-01117X) with Jim Beck (SSA); Cathrine Smith (HHS); Alita Taylor (DOJ EOIR) et.al., appeals, civil actions pursuant to Age Discrimination in Employment Act 1967, Equal Pay Act 1963, Title VII Civil Rights Act 1964. The Report of Investigation demonstrated that hiring officials failed to comply with 5 U.S.C. 3115 – Expedited Hiring Authorities for College Graduates. Instead, the DOJ ROIR HR specialist

misrepresented the facts by using veteran priority as excuse to hire illegal immigrant and disabled people in violation of 5 U.S.C. 2302 and 38 U.S.C. 4214 without proof of U.S. citizenship, proof of veteran status, proof of prior federal working experience or accredited graduate degree transcript etc. As such, EEOC et.al. failed to comply with F. R. C. P. Rule 55 and 29 C.F.R. 1614.501 (remedies & relief) based on employment discrimination. Petitioner experienced loss of wage / housing / benefits / investments/family support / career development. According to the statistics, MBA & MAS plus license, certificate was paid \$212000 per person per year. Approximately \$6360000 plus citizenship, aging, additional benefits, interest, investments, punitive damage \$300000, liquidated damage, long term unfair hiring practices caused loss of 30 years working experience, promotion, grade, housing, family, irritation, anxiety, distress, trauma, depression, mental anguish. I lost two properties in California and Maryland. Most Recently, I lost another two first time home buyers, IZ properties in Washington DC because of income requirements. I experienced self – esteem, insult, humiliation as low-income category people such as homeless shelter, bridge housing, Medicaid, SNAP, housing voucher program. Further, my family members such as my mother experienced extremely cruel mistreatment and irreparable injuries in the State of Maryland because I cannot stand up in this society. In the mean - time, my citizenship was severely affected because of employment. The Embassy did not issue a VISA due to dignity and employment. I experienced aging and lost generations as irreparable life damages.

To "discriminate" against someone means to treat that job applicant differently, or less favorably, for some reason. The EEOC is responsible for protecting you from one type of discrimination - employment discrimination because of your race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy, transgender status, and sexual orientation), national origin, disability, age (age 40 or older), or genetic information. The laws enforced by EEOC protect you from employment discrimination when it involves: unfair treatment in hiring, firing, promotions, pay, benefits, training, harassment, retaliation etc.

Because of the employment discrimination, unfair hiring practices, prohibited personnel practices, petitioner hereby request EEOC et.al. to provide expedited remedies and relief according to 29 C.F. R. 1614.501.

3.Housing Discrimination. State of California home 1493 Outrigger (\$855000) caused by employment discrimination and predatory lending. After I lost California home and personal belongings, I and my mother traveled 3000 miles to the United States Capital area to continue federal employment matter with U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS).

Illegal Demolition and Illegal Tax Sale: 16402 Newasa Ln, Accokeek MD 20607 (\$550000 in 2012) AND 1493 Outrigger, West Covina CA 91790 (predatory lending \$855000). In 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026 petitioner submitted multiple Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher and Emergency Housing Voucher Applications to 10 County / City Housing Authorities

based on the eligibility, tax payments, and homeless caused by the City of West Covina and Prince George's County. For example, Prince George's County failed to provide first time home buyer assistance and Single- Family Home Rehabilitation assistance based on the completed first time home buyer certificate and rehabilitation applications. Instead, PG county illegally demolished petitioner's primary residence (16402 Newasa Ln) in October 2005 after EEOC hearing without petitioner's consent. The Home Ownership Preservation Program (HOPP) provides up to \$50,000 to homeowners for health, safety, energy efficiency and accessibility repairs in qualified, owner-occupied homes. Rehabilitation Assistance Program (HRAP) is a home improvement program to assist eligible Prince George's County homeowners with health and safety home repairs. Home owners may qualify for HRAP home loans for up to \$60,000 to repair lead, mold and asbestos abatement roof, electrical systems, plumbing, and flooring, windows, insulation, air sealing, siding, ramps, grab bars, railings, and other improvements considered. The Maryland Whole Home Program can help home owners make valuable repairs and enhancements that can lower family's monthly utility bills and improve quality of life. PG county never provided any assistance but illegal demolition and vandalism. In February 2006, a fraudulent tax lien \$12560 (demolition expenses ordered by PG county) plus 20% interest was assessed on the subject property (please note that the subject property has no any lien before January 2006). As such, petitioner argued the property tax payment pursuant to Maryland Tax Code 6-401: assessment \$53200 divided by 100 times tax rate (0.96) equal to \$510.72. Marland is the only state where the state decides assessment. Also, pursuant to Maryland Tax Code 10-304 the property tax should be reduced (33%) to \$168.54 due to demolition. Petitioner sent two property tax payments by using certified mail with return receipt to the PG county tax collector, however it was returned by PG tax collector by asking approximately \$18500. Petitioner also handed in the two tax payments to Judge Ingrid Turner on the hearing date ("FNA Maryland LLC v. May Chen"), it was also rejected. Judge Turner was extremely unfair by issuing an order in favor of the FNA Maryland LLC / Benjamin Decker (failure to appear on 2nd hearing). In December 2018, PG County Tax Collector illegally conveyed the property title to Benjamin Decker. Since then, the petitioner was forced to be homeless and experienced 8 years of homeless life in the District of Columbia. Without any housing assistance, the petitioner's car stored all personal belongings under extremely cold / hot weather plus repeated wrongful parking tickets against the law, repeated hit & run, reckless endangerment.

After I moved to the District of Columbia due to illegal demolition and illegal tax sale of the 16402 Newasa Ln, DC MPD, DPW intentionally issued 44 wrongful parking tickets against the law. I cannot convince myself that I not only experienced wrongful housing demolition and tax sale, destruction of vehicle, theft of bank deposit, burglarized personal belongings, all other predatory activities, but also mistreated me to be fined per repeated Notice of Infraction without any proof of violation. I hereby strongly condemn the Maryland, DC abusing authority and financial abuse to transform me from an independent, stable, without lien individual to an unstable, poor, irritated, traumatized, isolated, depressed dependent. Both I and my mother's whole life have been destroyed.

ARGUMENT

I. Failure to file cross-petition (Rule 12.5)

On January 3, 2026 petitioner never received a cross-petition from the Respondents (District of Columbia et.al.) within 30 days from the initial filing date December 3, 2025. The time to file a conditional cross-petitioner will not be extended (Rule 12.5). The Court should not consider any claim from the Respondents due to no cross-petition.

II. WAIVER filed by Respondents

On March 5, 2026 a WAIVER filed by the District of Columbia representative Office of Attorney General - Ms. Marcella Elizabeth Coburn (see Waiver).

On September 28, 2023, another WAIVER (Supreme Court Case 23-5501) was filed by the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia by representing the MPD, District of Columbia, Judges, Officer Bryant, A; Cobb, C; Stephen Franchak, Suzie Stears, English, Homere Whyte. However, Cobb, C et.al. continue to issue wrongful parking tickets against the law without any proof in 2023, 2024, 2025. As such, my car was wrongfully towed & impounded on August 6, 2025 when I was filing Appellant's Brief in the U.S. Court of Appeals for DC circuit. Since then, I became homeless due to illegal demolition and illegal impoundment. Subsequently, I notified the Supreme Court, MPD, OPC that my life was under immediate danger. I requested MPD to return my car 10 times. I was asked to leave 10 times by the local business entities (Wegmans et.al.).

III. Failure to implement the law according to the court docket sheet (F. R. C. P. Rule 55 etc.)

Pursuant to F. R. C. P. Rule 55 (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.

According to the Court docket sheet, the Summons & Complaint filed July 24, 2025. Respondents never answered the Summons & Complaints within 21 days pursuant to F. R. C. P. rule 12 “A defendant must serve an answer:(i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint”. As such, Petitioner filed a “Request to Enter Default Judgment” on August 18, 2025 to request the Court to enter Default Judgment.

Housing discrimination: Not only loss of out-of-pocket expenses and market appreciation \$560000 (Newasa Ln) and \$850000 (Outrigger), but also continually experienced loss of \$13000/year housing voucher assistance, homeless \$2500000/year, family support, racial retaliation, abuse, humiliation, further intentional harm from police and local entities.

Out-of-pocket expenses, potential, future expenses.

VI. Mandates should not be issued (F. R. App. P. Rule 41)

(d) STAYING THE MANDATE PENDING A PETITION FOR CERTIORARI. (1) Motion to Stay. A party may move to stay the mandate pending the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court. The motion must be served on all parties and must show that the petition would present a substantial question and that there is good cause for a stay.

Petitioner timely filed a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari on December 3, 2025 and served the U.S. Court of Appeals for DC circuit and Respondents as well as the good cause for stay. Therefore, the Mandate should not be issued on January 8, 2026.

VII. Reverse Justice.

Pursuant to the Supreme Court Rule 20, petitioner hereby strongly requests the reversal of the denial decision issued on March 30, 2026 by the Clerk of the Court Scott Harris without any applicable law, facts, evidence to support the wrongful decision. Accordingly, petitioner strongly demands the Supreme Court to approve the original Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (40 pages).

CONCLUSION

The court should **grant** the Petition for Rehearing, consider this petition together with original Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (40 pages), Motion to Leave for Forma, Pauperis et.al, evidence, court docket sheets, Request to Enter Default Judgment, Brief, Motions, Emergency Motion filed in a timely manner and in correct court procedures.

Respectfully Submitted,

MC
//S// (Signature on File)
May Chen (petitioner)

CERTIFICATE OF UNREPRESENTED COUNSEL (Rule 44.2)

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2, I (petitioner) as an unrepresented counsel certifies that the petition is restricted to the grounds specified in the rule with substantial grounds not previously presented briefly and distinctly. Counsel certifies that this petition is presented in good faith and not for delay.

SIGNATURE: MC *MC*

No. 25-6735

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

**MAY CHEN
(PETITIONER)**

vs.

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

PROOF OF SERVICE

On April 14, 2026 as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, the enclosed "PETITION FOR REHEARING" on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel required to be served, by electronically transmitting the subject document to the following parties during COVID-19 pandemic. The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street NE, Washington DC 20543
via: personal delivery and efilingsupport@supremecourt.gov

U.S. Court of Appeals for DC
333 Constitution Ave NW Washington DC 20001
via: ECFNoticing@cadc.uscourts.gov

EEOC
131 M St NE Washington DC 20507
via: ofo.eeoc@eeoc.gov

State of California
1300 I St, Sacramento California 95814
via: stateinfo@state.ca.gov

State of Maryland
200 St Paul Place, Baltimore MD 21202
via: civilrights@oag.state.md.us

District of Columbia
441 4th St NW Washington DC 20001
via: chad.copeland@dc.gov stephanie.litos@dc.gov tonia.robinson@dc.gov

State of Texas
300 W. 15th St, Austin Texas
via: disaster-counsel@oag.texas.gov