

25-6806

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TERESA FAYE MORRIS, a/k/a, Individual

Teresa Faye Morris, DDS, PC

THE MORRIS-MOODY FAMILY TRUST

PETITIONER

VS

CRAWFORD AND COMPANY

BROADSPIRE, INC

RESPONDANTS

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TERESA FAYE MORRIS, PRO SE

3905 E WOODSIDE WAY

SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI 65809

417-705-8050

teresafayemorriscourt2024@gmail.com

Kevin A. Stine (GA Bar No 682588)

BAKER DONELSON

3414 Peachtree Rd, NE, Suite 1500

Atlanta, GA 30326 404-577-6000

kstine@bakerdonelson.com

J Taylor White (MO Bar No 67001)

KUTAK ROCK LLP 417-720-1410

300 S John Hammonss Pkwy, Ste 800

Springfield, MO 65806-2550

Taylor.white@kutarock.com

FILED

DEC 01 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ORIGINAL

QUESTIONS BEFORE THE COURT

#1 Does a Celebrity have more God given rights than a Mega Fan of his, both are United States citizens? I wanted a Jury Trial. I requested in writing to Judge Bough three times. The only way my side of the story would be told is by a Jury Trial. In a Jury Trial , I would prevail.

May I please have a Jury Trial?

#2 Are the IRREVOCABLE TRUST ASSETS for the purpose of the judgment in this case protected as required by Missouri State Statutes? And if so, will the Court give me the documentation to provide to the Taney Court Recorder so I can remove the lien on the Trust properties OR require Plaintiff's to remove their fraudulent lien on the properties protected by the Irrevocable Trust?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONER

TERESA FAYE MORRIS DDS PC

TERESA FAYE MORRIS

THE MOODY FAMILY TRUST

THE MORRIS-MOODY FAMILY TRUST

RESPONDANTS

Kevin A Stine (GA Bar No 682588)

BAKER DONELSON

3414 Peachtree Rd, NE, Suite 1500

Atlanta, GA 30326

kstine@bakerdonelson.com

404-577-6000

J Taylor White (MO Bar No 67001)

KUTAK ROCK LLP 417-720-1410

300 S John Hammonds Pwy

Suite 800

Springfield, MO 65806-2550

taylor.white@kutarock.com

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

TERESA FAYE MORRIS DDS PC, has no parent corporation and has no publicly trade company and owns 100% of it's stock.

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

Eight Circuit Court of Appeals-Opinion, Federal Circuit ,24-3519, Appellate Case document numbers, #5554482 & 5554080, September 4, 2025

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-Judgement in Civil case, November 25, 2024, Document 148, Document 144, 6:23-cv-03204

Eight Circuit Court of Appeals- denial of rehearing denied, APPELLATE CASE 24-3519 #5570582,October 22,2025

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-three orders for jury trial, Documents 107, August 7,2024, 116, August 21,2024, 126, September 4,2024, 6:23-CV-03204-SRB,

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-Judge Bough ordered, me to respond to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction by March 19, 2024, DOCUMENT 88, 6:23-CV-0320, March 13,2024

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION-MY RESPONSE TO JUDGE BOUGH AS REQUIRED BY MARCH 19, 2024, ON MARCH 19, 2024, WITHOUT PROPER NOTICE

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,SOUTHERN DIVISION, ENTRY OF DEFAULT BY CLERK, DOCUMENT 92, March 26,2024, 6:23-cv-03204

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS FOR THE COURT	lvrit
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS	ii
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INDEX TO APPENDICES	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
PETITION OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINION	1
JURISDICTION	2
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
CONCLUSION	9
REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION	11

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Eight Circuit Court of Appeals-Opinion, Federal Circuit ,24-3519, Appellate
Case document numbers, #5554482 & 5554080, September 4, 2025

APPENDIX A - PAGES 1 TO 5

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-Judgement in Civil case,
November 25, 2024, Document 148, Document 144, 6:23-cv-03204

APPENDIX B – PAGE 6 TO 11a

✓

Eight Circuit Court of Appeals- denial of rehearing denied, APPELLATE CASE
24-3519 #5570582, October 22, 2025

APPENDIX C – PAGE 11b

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-three orders for jury trial,
Documents 107, August 7, 2024, 116, August 21, 2024, 126, September
4, 2024, 6:23-CV-03204-SRB

APPENDIX D – PAGES 12 TO 18

Western District of Missouri, Southern Division-Judge Bough ordered, me to
respond to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction by March 19, 2024,
DOCUMENT 88, 6:23-CV-0320, March 13, 2024

APPENDIX E – PAGE 19

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION-MY RESPONSE TO
JUDGE BOUGH AS REQUIRED BY MARCH 19, 2024, ON MARCH 19, 2024,
WITHOUT PROPER NOTICE

APPENDIX F – PAGES 20 TO 24

MY SUMMARY JUDGEMENT, WAS SEALED, UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

APPENDIX G – PAGES 25 TO 54

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION, ENTRY OF DEFAULT
BY CLERK, DOCUMENT 92, March 26, 2024, 6:23-cv-03204

APPENDIX H – PAGE 55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

- Anderson v Liberty Lobby, Inc 477 U S 242,250 (1986)
- United States v Lichtenstein, 1:23-cr-00239
- United States v Hopkins, 427 123 (1976)
- United States v Lange, 312 F 3d 263 (2002)
- White v Mulvania, 575 SW 2d 184, 188 (Mo Banc 1978)
- WILSON V MURCH, 354 B S W ED 332, 338-39 (Mo App 1962)
- Renaissance, 322 SW 3d at 133
- Herron v Barard, 390 S W 3d 901, 908 (Mo App W D 2013)
- Investors Title Company Inc v Hammonds (2007)
- Donavan v Kansas City, 352 Mo 430, 175 SW 2d 874 (1943)
- Hoffmeiser v Kranawetter, 407 S W 3d 59,61 9Mo App 2013
- Nationwide Transfer LLC v Nealy Law LLC, 674 S W 3d 488,491
- Collett v American National Stores. Inc 708 S W 223 (1986)
- May Department Stores v Union Electric, 341 Mo 299, 107 SW 2d 41 (1937)
- Walls by Walls v Allen ab Co 903 S W 2d 937, 9443 (Mo App 1995)
- K C Roofing, Inc 807 SW 2d 545, 549 (Mo App1991)
- Revised statute of Missouri, RSMo Section 456.8-909-Mo. Gov
- Oss v Rail Car Am Group Disability Income /plan 285 F 3d 735. 737 (8th Cir 2001)
- Celotex Corp v Catrett 477 US 317,325(1986)
- Fed R Civ P 56 p h v Sch Dist of Kan City, Mo 265 F 3d 653, 656-57 (8th Cir 1994)
- Harlston v Mc Donnell Douglas Corp, 37 F 3d 379, 382 (8th Cir 1994)

Anderson v Liberty Lobby, Inc 47 U S 242, 255 (1986)

Torgerson v City of Rochester, 605 F 3d 584, 594 (8th Cir 2010)

First Nat'l Bank of Omaha v Three Dimension Systems Products, Inc 289 F 3d 542, 54 98th Cir (2002)

Smith v City of St Louis, 409 S W 3d 404,419 (Mo ed 3013)

STATUTES ANS RULES

RSMo 456.5-505

Bill of Rights

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioners, Teresa Faye Morris DDS PC, Teresa Faye Morris, The Moody Family Trust, And The Morris-Moody Family Trust respectfully petition or a writ of certiorari to review the judgement of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in the case.

OPINION BELOW

FIRST - The LACK OF OPINION ON THE ORDER BY THE- United Sates District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division, BY THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHT CIRCUIT on Document 144, Filed 11/20/2024, Case 6:23-cv-03204-SRB, by Judge Stephen R. Bough. IN FACT, I DID respond on the required date, March 19, 2024, I AM THE PERSON REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO THE JUDGE ACCORDING TO STATUTES OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI FOR THE TRUST. I DID NOT AGREE TO INCLUDE THE IRREVOCABLE TRUST AS A PARTY TO THIS LAWSUIT. The TRUST is NOT, nor never was a party to this lawsuit. The TRUST is VALID under applicable law. A default judgement was unlawful according to STATE STATUTES. A Court Clerk filed my document under the wrong date deliberately. Judge made an order without the benefit of seeing my response. THE APPEALS COURT REFUSED TO ADDRESS! This is one of the two reasons why I am requesting a writ of certiorari.

SECOND – The United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit, failed to issue an opinion on the three denials for my request for a jury trial. When this lawsuit was filed, I had had a confirmation that I had had a stroke just two months prior. A week before being served, a neuropsych test had been scheduled to determine my cognitive abilities. The results were available about 5 weeks after I was served. I reached out to 7 attorneys in the state of Missouri, only one would take my case, however \$40,000 retainer was required in 3 to 5 days. I had been living on social security for six years and had no savings. I was not in any position to make any decisions regarding this case until I regained some of my ability to think. Started to understand and connect the dots, late August 2024. I was better by January 2025. I continue to improve. However, I am not were I was. I have had NO HELP! To win my case I NEED A JURY TRIAL. I did not learn this early enough. CASE 6:23-cv-03204-SRB, Document 107, 08/07/2024: Document 116, 08/21/2024, Document 126 09/04/2024.

JURISDICTION

The judgement of the court of appeals was entered on September 04, 2025, Appealla Case 24-3519, ID 5554482. An order denying en banc rehearing was denied and entered 10/22/2025, ID 5570582.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

When this case was filed, I had recently been diagnosed with an Ischemic Cerebrovascular Event, which affects cognitive abilities. At the time the case was filed, I had had a test at the neurologist office to determine the extent of my cognitive impairment. Six weeks after case was filed it was determined that I had mild dementia. I had been living from one social security check until the next with no savings for about two years. I was unable to make good decisions. I could not afford an attorney. I had no counsel. My case required a jury trial to have a good outcome for me. I did not learn the implications of this until 18 months into this case. Since May 2020, I had had a texter claiming to be Dennis Wiliam Quaid. I never had any proof and to this day do not have any proof. Since seeing Dennis Quaid and the Sharks in Branson the summer of 2018. That night God told me to be there for him, emotionally, to be his ROCK. I made an agreement with God to be DWQ's ROCK.

I had a carjacking, Nov 2016, in which two disc were herniated in my neck and a Traumatic Brain Injury. I did not find the right help until March 2019 which covered 3 years. At the time I saw DWQ and the Sharks, I had personality changes that influenced things I did. After the show in Branson, I started following DWQ. To date I have gone to more than 70 events open to the public. I AM A MEGA FAN. I have never even had a cup of coffee with him personally.

I REMAIN A FAN!

As a citizen of the United States of America, I have the benefits of the BILL OF RIGHTS, which AMENDMENT 6 and 7, were violated.

Also, I have an IRREVOCABLE TRUST which is protected by State of Missouri Statutes, RSMo Section 4565-505.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Does a Celebrity have more God given rights than a Mega Fan of his, both are United States citizens. I wanted a Jury Trial of my peers. I was denied three times after requesting in writing to Judge Bough. With a Jury Trial, I would have prevailed. May I please have a Jury Trial?

BILL OF RIGHTS-

AMENDMENT 6- UNITED STATES CITIZENS have the right to a fair and Speedy trial.

AMENDMENT 7- United States Citizens have a right to a Jury Trial.

According to the Bill of Rights of the United States of America which provide certain privileges to citizens, my rights have been denied.

I found out a few weeks ago, through a reliable source, as of today I am unable to Disclose who that person is, that due to the Celebrities divorce, which was final after the waiting period, on August 28, 2025. I was sued because the wife in the Divorce wanted to prove I had a romantic relationship with her Celebrity husband, even though theirs was a "Hollywood Contract", which means publicly she was to present herself as a wife and was paid for her time. Essentially, she was a nanny for the Celebrities children and a token wife. Theirs was not a sacramental marriage. The divorce decree being drawn up before the marriage took place with the circumstances that would present an easy divorce when convenient. In fact, the lawsuit was created and fabricated and put into place by the management of the Celebrity. Management of the Celebrity created the \$900k check and sent and set up the whole circumstances surrounding the check coming to me. For the sole purpose of ruining my reputation and tying up my assets and finances and setting me up to be out of the way. The Celebrity's managements need for Privacy

was more important than my civil liberties. I asked for and was denied a jury trial three times due to Plaintiff's need for the Celebrity's privacy. In fact, the whole situation being set up by the Celebrities management, management's attorneys knew if the case was denied a jury trial and had to be settled by Summary Judgement, Plaintiff's knew it only had to prove that the check came to me and I had cashed it and dispersed it as director by texter. This is only one fifth of the story. Basically, a Summary Judgement does not allow me to tell my side of the story," How did this all come about?"

I am a MEGA Fan and have attended over 70 events by the Celebrity since 2108. I paid for every Meet & Greet, my ticket, travel expenses, and a few backstage photo ops at additional expense. I never crossed the line from FAN. Nor did the Celebrity. The ex-wife, Laura Savoie with cooperation of previous Ex-Wife Kimberly Buffington, colluded, the Court has allowed Laura to adopt the Celebrities Twins, 17years old. It is my understanding the two ex-wives share custody. Kim getting Zoe and Laura getting Thomas, 17years old, who also happens to be a minor until 21 years of age, is the Father of Laura's child, she is about 3 to 4 months along. I believe she became pregnant before the divorce 30 day waiting period. Plus, Court awarded Laura all the Celebritie's assets he worked his whole life. I believe someone is planning his death. His rightful Father rights have been denied. His human rights under the constitution have been denied. When he came to Hollywood, he was encouraged to use cocaine. Cocaine being available on sets and at manager's parties. Cocaine is in film budgets. A business expense, imagine the tax right off. Due to the Celebrity going public with his rehabilitation, his earnings have been in a conservatorship. Now the Conservatorship is under the control of his ex-wife, Laura. Since July. 2025, the

Celebrity has no access to shelter, food, water. I fear for his life. Can this really happen in America? Yes, it did. I know my civil rights have been abused. I have not suffered the extent this Celebrity has.

This is the reason this case being sealed. The Celebrities management had hoped to expose that I and the Celebrity compromised his marriage. There was no proof because we did not! We have not even shared a coffee date, a drink at any time, a dinner date, nothing! The case was planned from the beginning from the check being sent, how the case would proceed, by Summary Judgement. Yes, I did receive the check, a texter told me what to do, I cashed, I dispersed, I was not paid, I have no knowledge of how check came to me, I was only aware of it when texter told me to get it out of my mailbox. I am a victim. The Celebrity is a victim, too.

My side of the story is important. April, 2023 I was diagnosed with an Ischemic Cerebral Vascular Event which impacted me cognitively (stroke, one fourth of blood supply to my brain gone, within 6 weeks a heart attack, by August a diagnosis of Mild Dementia (neuropsychic test July 5, 2023). The check arrived in my mailbox April 10, 2023, during these medical issues. I had been texting an Imposter, I never had proof I was texting the Celebrity, A texter from Nigeria confessed to interrupting my text from Celebrity in July 2025. I call him Zangi because that is the platform he wanted to text me. He confessed to breaching Crawford & Company, supposedly he did the transactions. He knew when the other texter was texting and was not texting???????

I REQUESTED A JURY TRIAL THREE TIMES! JUDGE BOUGH DENIED ME THREE TIMES, THE PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY REQUESTED SUMMARY JUDGEMENT. PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY HAD STATED CELEBRITIES OR PLAINTIFF'S IDENTITY BE

PROTECTED. IF A JURY HAD HEARD THE WHOLE STORY I WOULD HAVE WON.

I have no idea how it came to be that I was denied a JURY TRIAL.

I was never told nor did anyone explain how a Summary Judgement would impact my outcome or How that would impact my case. When I first learned Judge helped Plaintiff's attorney with his filing and there were unofficial emails between the two all through the case, I requested a jury trial. In fact, the third conference call I was not allowed to hear 90% of the call. It is ok for a Judge to help the Plaintiff's attorney and not give me any help??? Nor "Court Clerks", One got fired for helping Plaintiff's, by NOT recording my response on the day I responded, The file was deliberately filed 10 days later, seriously impacting my case.

I requested a JURY TRIAL three times. All three denials by Judge Bough are as follows:

File date 08/07/2024- Document 107 *Appendix D pages 1-3*
 File date 0821/2024- Document 116 *Appendix D pages 4-5*
 File date 09/04/2024- Document 126 *Appendix D page 6-7*

The question is:

Are the IRREVOCABLE TRUST ASSETS for the purposes of this judgement protected as required by Missouri State Statutes? And if so, will the Court give me the documentation to provide to the Taney Count Recorder so I can remove the lien, or require Plaintiffs to remove their fraudulent lien on property protected by the Irrevocable Trust in Taney County?

Actually, this whole case needs to be thrown out and the Judgment!

Missouri Statutes with regards to Irrevocable Trust – REQUIRE CONSENT by “Trustor”, in this case the attorney who created the trust and ALL beneficiaries. A COURT of LAW cannot alter a TRUST. A Court MUST protect interest even of nonconsenting beneficiaries. RSMo Section 456.5-505. The Morris-Moody Family Trust had a Spendthrift Provision, which prevents both the beneficiary and their creditors from transferring or seizing the trust’s assets. No transfers of property were done fraudulently or during the lawsuit. An Estate Attorney, Trustor, created the Irrevocable Trust, with Spendthrift provision, for the benefit of Trustee, Teresa Faye Morris. The Trust was formed in August 22, 2017, and all property owned before that date, the date Trust was created, and after Trust was created transferred into Trust that day. The lawsuit in question was filed July 10, 2023. The Irrevocable Trust was set up in 2017 when Teresa Faye Morris and her husband, John Frank Moody were current with all their financial obligations. Teresa Faye Morris continued to keep up with all financial obligations until the Pandemic, 2020. All real estate in the trust was transferred by Quick Claim Deed by Trustor, Attorney, Jennifer Triplet.

I want to refer to Judge Bough’s reason for making the assets of the Irrevocable Trust available to the PLAINTIFF’S in this lawsuit, Crawford & Company. Judge Bough filed an order on March 13, 2024, the order dated March 8, 2024. For me to respond as Trustee, with regards to The Morris-Moody Family Trust, on or before March 19, 2024 with regards to my consent to allow the Trust assets to be used to satisfy debts created by this lawsuit. SEE DOCUMENT 88, Filed 03/13/2024, my response was to be filed on or before March 19, 2024. Actually, I did not receive the Judge’s order until the afternoon

of March 18, 2024. HOWEVER, I did file a response with the Court on March 19, 2024, as required by Missouri Statutes, as Trustee and the Judge's request. I did NOT GIVE CONSENT for the Court to include assets of the Trust in this lawsuit. *Appendix E*
See Document 144, filed 11/20/2024, page 2 of 4, "The Trustee Defendant failed to timely file or serve an answer or other responsive pleadings for the Trust on March 19, 2024, as requested by the Court on March 8, 2024 (which is not the proper time allowed, 14 days are proper, 11 days were given). In my file, dated March 19, 2024, Document 89, I ABSOLUTELY DID NOT GIVE CONSENT TO INCLUDE THE TRUST WHICH WAS NOT A PART OF THIS LAWSUIT.

Furthermore, the Acknowledgement of Service, by Trustee Defendant acknowledging service of process on Trust's behalf – was fraudulently obtained by Plaintiff's counsel, Kevin Stine. The document was not attached or disclosed to Defendant that Defendant was signing to have received. His email did not contain the document Defendant was acknowledging and the email has been deleted from their files. Then, Judge Bough's order states I was to response to a pending motion on or before November 18, 2024, that

I am clueless was even filed since no notice was given. A Court Clerk filed my Response on March 26, 2024. Check History/Document, my filed Document is listed Under the date of March 26, 2024, however, if you look at Court stamped date, upper right corner of document, it clearly shows this document was filed on March 19, 2024, TIMELY, as required by the Court.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, please respond to my questions, no attorney in Missouri will address my concerns of my civil liberties being violated.

No Available Legal Remedy

SIXTH reason for granting my PETITION, is that there is no legal remedy available in this situation, nor was there ever one from the outset.

The Impact of Cognitive Abilities and the Absence of a Jury Trial

Seventh reason for granting my PETITION, If I had been granted a jury trial, I believe I would have prevailed. Unfortunately, due to my cognitive abilities at the time, I was unable to effectively participate in my own defense. I was experiencing severe delusional disorder related to a celebrity until July 19, 2024. On that date, during a Meet & Greet in Chicago, Illinois, Dennis Quaid personally confirmed in front of other fans that he had never texted me. In hindsight, I wish I could have simply had a cup of coffee with him.

Reasons for Granting Petition

Restoration of Faith in the Legal System

The first reason for granting this petition is to restore my faith in the legal system of the United States of America. I believe that granting my petition will reaffirm my trust in the principles of justice that this nation stands for.

Ensuring a Fair Voice in Court

The second reason is to allow my voice to be heard, regardless of my financial situation. It is important that fairness in the courts of the United States is not determined by one's economic status, and that every individual, including myself, is given an equal opportunity to present their case.

Judgment Is Moot Due to Financial Circumstances

The third reason for granting this petition is that any judgment against me as an individual is irrelevant, whether the amount is \$90 or \$900,000. My only source of income has been social security since 2017, which is more than six years before this lawsuit. As such, the issue of a financial judgment is a moot point. It was not until seven months into this case that the Plaintiff's attorney became fully aware of this fact.

Unanswered Legal Questions Regarding the Trust

The fourth reason is the presence of unresolved questions in this case, specifically concerning the interpretation of the Appeals Court's opinion regarding the Trust. No attorney in Missouri is willing to interpret this opinion, leaving critical legal issues unanswered.


Life in Limbo and Financial Hardship

The fifth reason is that my life remains in limbo. I have no savings, and properties held in trust are burdened by liens. My financial circumstances prevent me from resolving these issues. If I were to work a job earning \$16.00 per hour, my wages could be garnished, and at 73 years old, it is unlikely that I would be able to repay the debt. The jobs available to me at this age would likely shorten my life. The ongoing case has deeply affected my life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Teresa Faye Morris".

Teresa Faye Morris

November 30, 2025