

25-6784
No.

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

OCT 11 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Albert Anderson — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Novant Health — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Albert Anderson
(Your Name)

Central Regional Hospital
(Address)

Raleigh NC 27609
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1 IF THE INSTANT MOTION 60(b)(6) AT ONE POINT ALLUDES THE MISTAKE AS GROUNDS FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT INCLUDING LEGAL ERROR, WHY WAS RULE 60(b)(1) MOTION INEFFECTIVE AS THE MISTAKE CLEARLY IDENTIFY'S ITSELF IF THE JUDGE MADE A MISTAKE?
- 2 WHY WAS I THE PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT CLARIFIED AS ASSERTING LEGALLY DEFECTIVE CLAIMS ON ONE'S OWN AND ADOPTED BY THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE IF IT COULD BE DETERMINED THAT THERE WAS IRREGULARITY IN THE JUDGMENT?
- 3 IF THE CASES "FILING NUMBER" WAS NOTARIZED AND MARKED AS HAZARDOUS FOR AN ALTER EGO PROCEEDING, WHY DIDNT THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPOINT A DIFFERENT JUDGE TO TAKE THE CASE THEREAFTER MODIFYING THE DISPOSITION?
- 4 IF ANY GROUNDS FOR RELIEF APPEARED VIVIDLY ON THE MERITS WHY WAS I THE PLAINTIFF'S BASIS OF THE CLAIM DISREGARDED IN A METHOD OF PIECEMEALING WHAT COULD AND COULDN'T BE REGARDED OF THE LAW AND RULE OF LAW?
- 5 IF EXHAUSTION OF REMEDY'S WAS NOT AVAILABLE WHY AM I THE PLAINTIFF FORCED TO RECOGNIZE SUCH PROVISION AND COMPELLED TO PRESENT WHAT WAS NOT PROVIDED DURING THE COURSE OF BEING DEPRIVED?
- 6 WHY DID THE DISTRICT JUDGE IDENTIFY I THE PLAINTIFF AS THE DEFENDANT DURING FINAL JUDGEMENT BUT FAILED TO JUSTIFY RELIEF FROM THE OPERATION OF THE JUDGEMENT?
- 7 IF THE RECORD REFLECTS AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF ERROR LISTED IN THE MEMORANDUM PERTAINING TO THE JUDGMENT, WHY DID THOSE MATTERS GO UNADORNED TO ALLOW ONGOING PAIN AND SUFFERING PREMISED ON THE BASIS OF PHYSICAL ABILITY?
- 8 IF THE FILING NUMBER WAS CONSIDERED TO BE GANG RELATED AND RENEWED WHY WASNT THE LANGAUGE OF INSTRUMENT REMUNERATED AFTER IT WAS DETERMINED TO BE IDENTIFYING A SECURITY RISK GROUP IN THE PROCEEDING BELIEVED TO BE 974?

LIST OF PARTIES

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

[✓] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

NOVANT HEALTH, DAVIE COUNTY, DAVIE COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT
DETENTION CENTER, JAIL, CITY OF MOCKSVILLE, MEDICAL PROVIDER,
JANE DOE, SHERIFFS OFFICE, JOHN DOE, JONES, MCMILLIAN, JOHN DOE 1,
JANE DOE 1, JOHN DOE 2, JANE DOE 3, JANE DOE 4, ALEXA,
JOHN DOE 3, JOHN DOE 4, NURSE JOHN DOE 5, JOHN DOE 6,
WILLIAMS PROBATION OFFICE, NURSE JOHN DOE 7, JOHN DOE 8,
MCCLERE, BEN, JANE DOE 5,

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Speaking Arguendo Rule 6D(b)(6) & 6D(b)(1) Provisions
were Violated Pro Tanto abandoned Before The Court

Thus, The Treaties, Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations
Involved are Listed within itself In which After
A scrutiny of The Case will appear Volitionally
Therebefore Justice Upholds The Law and Rule of Law.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

60 (b) (1)

1

60 (b) (6)

1

42 U.S.C. 1983

OTHER

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 A 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 B 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 _____.

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

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: JULY 26, 2026, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE COMES BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON THE PARTICULAR ISSUES PRESENTED IN THIS ACTION, TO RESOLVE THE DISAGREEMENTS SOUGHT BUT NOT ESTABLISHED SPECIFICALLY UNDER FOURTH CIRCUIT LAW COMPELLING THE PLAINTIFF TO SEEK FURTHER REVIEW FOR THE REASONS THAT FOLLOW. A CLEAR INDICATION OF UNTRUSTWORTHY INTERPRETATION HAS COMMENCED IDENTIFYING THE JUDGMENT AS BEING CLEARLY CONTRARY TO LAW PURPORTING THE ABUSE OF DISCRETION, LACK OF CLEAR REASONING AND IMPLIED UNCOMPREHENSIVE ORDER. THE PLAINTIFF COMMENCED THIS ACTION BY DISCLOSING A PRO-SE 48-PAGE COMPLAINT AGAINST 28 DEFENDANTS UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 ALONG WITH AN AMPLE AMOUNT OF MOTIONS LEFT PENDING EXCEEDING THE DEADLINE FOR REPLY, IN SUPPORT THE PLAINTIFF HAVE SUBMITTED MATERIAL DEEMED AS EVIDENCE DATED AUGUST 19, 2024 EXEMPLIFYING THAT THE MOTIONS WERE FILED ON 04-11-24, 08-01-24 AND 08-19-24 BUT WEREN'T RULED UPON UNTIL 01-30-25 TO INCLUDE THE FULL OVERVIEW OF THE CASE WAS REVISED FROM 1:23 CV 974 TO 1:24 CV 22 DUE DILIGENTLY, THEREAFTER DEFECTS WERE CITED AND CORRECTED MOVING THE CASE FORWARD DESPITE THE FORUMS DISPOSITION TO SO MUCH AS DECLARE THE PLAINTIFF AS THE DEFENDANT IN THE ACTION LET ALONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(b)(6) THERE WAS A MOTION FILED BASED ON AN INAPPROPRIATE JUDGMENT THAT THE COURT OF APPEALS OVERLOOKED DUE TO THE JUDGMENT BEING ENTERED CONTRARY TO COURSE AND PRACTICE OF THE COURT UPON PROPER SHOWING OF IRREGULARITY AND MERIT IN WHICH IT ERRED DUE TO THE COURTS OBLIGATION TO ADDRESS JURISDICTION AND HERE THE INSTANT MOTION, LET ALONE DEPICT GANG AFFILIATION, DUE TO THE IMPORTANCE TO THE PUBLIC OF THE ISSUE INVOKES THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT.

RECEIVED

DEC 29 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

THIS ACTION COMMENCED THEREAFTER A PHYSICAL BREAKDOWN
RELATED TO DEFENDANT'S LIVING CONDITIONS DUE BY UNDER
FUNDED WAGES OF DEFENDANT'S MOCKSVILLE CAUSATING A
DELUSIONAL STATE OF AUTOMATISM MAKING IT IMPOSSIBLE TO
FULLY EXHAUST ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY'S OF SUPPORTED
FACTS SET OUT IDEM TO THE COMPLAINT.

DUE TO THE ALLEGATION OF INSANITY | THE PLAINTIFF MANAGED
TO TIMELY OBJECT BUT THE FORUM ADOPTED THE DISMISSAL
RECOMMENDATION DESPITE THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH FORTH,
RENEWING THE DISPOSITION OF THE FILING NUMBER IN LIMINE,
SUCH CONFLICT CAUSE DELAY IN THE CASE, | THE PLAINTIFF
FILED FOR REHEARING WHICH SENIOR JUDGE BIGGS DENIED
PROMPTING | THE PLAINTIFF TO APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS AT THAT TIME | THE PLAINTIFF BROUGHT
THE INSTANT MOTION 60(b)(6) BASED ON AN INAPPROPRIATE
DISPOSITION IN THE JUDGMENT SEEKING RELIEF FROM THE
JUDGMENT, SUMMONS FORMS, AND REMUNERATION DUE TO
THE JUDGMENT BEING ENTERED CONTRARY TO COURSE AND
PRACTICE OF THE COURT UPON PROPER SHOWING OF
IRREGULARITY AND MERIT. THE FOURTH CIRCUIT OVERLOOKED
THE CONCEPT OF GANG ACTIVITY IN THE FILING
NUMBER WHICH IS INFECT CLARIFIED IN THE CASE, WHICH
SHOWS THAT THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAS DEPARTED
FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL
PROCEEDINGS.

RECEIVED

DEC 29 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT U.S.

THE COURT FAILED TO ADDRESS WHETHER IT POSSESSED JURISDICTION TO HEAR THE INSTANT MOTION FOR NEARLY A YEAR AFTER FILING THE MOTION IN REFERENCE TO SUCH REFUSAL THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT RETAIN JURISDICTION OVER THOSE ASPECTS OF THE CASE UNTIL THE DEADLINE FOR REPLY WAS OVER WITHOUT EXCEPTION FOR THE MORALS, SAFETY, AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE PLAINTIFF.

BECAUSE OF THE COURTS MISTAKE AND ABUSE OF DISCRETION TRANSPIRED UPON A DE NOVO DETERMINATION OF INSANITY HAD OCCURRED THE DISTRICT COURTS RULING WAS INFECT IN AID OF THE APPEAL IN WHICH THE PLAINTIFF HAD PROVE THAT THE MOTION IS TIMELY, THAT THE CLAIM IS MERITORIOUS, AND THAT THE OTHER PARTY WILL NOT SUFFER UNFAIR PREJUDICE IF THE JUDGMENT IS SET ASIDE. IN ANNEX, THE GROUND OF MISTAKE AND SURPRISE WAS SATISFIED FOR RELIEF TO INCLUDE VOID JUDGMENT WHERE THE PLAINTIFF WAS DETERMINED TO BE THE DEFENDANT IN THE ACTION DURING FINAL JUDGMENT BY DISTRICT JUDGE BIGGS WITHOUT GRANTING THE REOPENING OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT MAKING TRIAL FAIR AND IMPARTIAL. JUST THE THOUGHT OF GANG ACTIVITY HONESTLY SHOULD HAVE REVERSED THE CASE DUE TO THE INITIAL FILING NUMBER REMUNERATION WAS SOUGHT FROM FOURTH CIRCUIT REVIEW, BUT DENIED AT THE VOLITION OF THE PANDOMINIUM'S RIVAL GANG MEMBERS DILEMMA

1 THE PLAINTIFF NAMED STATE ACTORS IN THE SAME SUIT
OR ACTION ACTING AT THE SAME TIME CAUSATING A
DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE RELATING TO THE HOSPITAL
AND DEFENDANT'S AS A GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IN WHICH
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST REFUSING TO
ANSWER 1 THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL RULES VIOLATION WHICH
TOOK ALSO NEARLY A YEAR AGAINST POLICY AND PROCEDURE'S
IDENTIFYING A DUO OF ERRED DECISIONISM.

THIS CERTIORARI PRESENTS RAW DISCRPTIONS OF
ERRONEOUS RULINGS BEFORE THE FORUM AND SHOULD
BE GRANTED PRO FORMA.

THIS THE 9th DAY OF DECEMBER 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
Albert Anderson

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THIS CERTIORARI PRESENTS ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE BEYOND THE PARTICULAR FACTS AND PARTIES INVOLVED AND UPON COMPELLING REASONS SUCH AS A PANDEMINIUM OF GANG MEMBERS TAKING OVER THE CASE, OTHER THEN A PASSAGE OF GANG NARRATION IN THE MEMO DATED 01/30/25 AND SIGNED BY BOTH JUDGES SUPRA THE COURSE OF ORDERED LIBERTY; THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS FOR SCRUTINY EXEMPLIFIES THE FORUM DEPARTING FROM THE ACCEPTED COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, TO SO MUCH AS ENTER A DECISION CLEARLY DISCRIMINATING UPON ADOPTED MEASURES REPLICAS OF CONFLICT WHICH WARRANTS THIS APPLICATION FOR REVIEW IN SEVERAL WAYS, PLURIBUS REASONS ARE ARTICULATED BEFORE THE FORUM PRESENTED IN THE DOCUMENT AND DIVULGED FOR THE GRANTING OF THE CERTIORARI, SO MUCH DEPENDS ON THIS COURT EXERCIZING ITS JURISDICTION FOR LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR THE EQUAL RIGHTS OF HUMANITY THE REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS CERTIORARI ARE PROFESSED BEFORE THE EYES OF THE TRIBUNAL.

THIS COMPLAINT IS FORESEEABLY EXCEPTIONAL DESPITE DEFENDANTS
(QUID PRO QUO) ACTIVITY AND THEREAFTER INVESTIGATION OF SAID
MISTAKE, SURPRISE, AND VOID JUDGMENT MORE MATERIAL WILL BE
UNVEILED BEFORE THE PROVIDENCE, THIS CERTIORARI IS EXCLUSIVE
RECOGNITION OF EVERY ELEMENT DESCRIBING AN ERRED
JUDGMENT WITH ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SUCH DISPOSITION GIVES
RISE GOVERNING THE REQUIRED OPERATION LEADING UP TO GRANTING
THIS CERTIORARI FOR ALL THESE REASONS RELIEF IS JUSTIFIED,
SOUGHT, AND RECOGNIZED, UPON AUTHORIZED PROVISIONS OF
THE SUPREME COURT

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Anderson

Date: December 9, 2025