

No. 25-7043

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

ALEX MARTINEZ,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.
Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the United States Court of Appeals for the
District of Columbia Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Alex Martinez
513-269 Dufferin Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R2W 2X8

E-mail: case_am_072015@aol.com

*Self-represented and proceeding in forma pauperis

LIST OF PARTIES

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

Solicitor General of the United States,
Room 5614, Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.,
Washington, DC 20530-0001
United States of America

Telephone: (202) 514-2203
E-mail: supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov

US Customs and Border Protection
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 4.4-B
Washington, D.C., 20229
United States of America

Telephone: (202) 344-1040
E-mail: cbpserviceintake@cbp.dhs.gov

Civil Litigation Section
Department of Justice Canada
50 O'Connor Street, 5th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0H8

Telephone: + 1 (613) 670-6214
Facsimile: +1 (613) 954-1920
E-mail: agc_pgc_ottawa@justice.gc.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PETITION FOR REHEARING	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING	5
CONCLUSION	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A; Letters from the Clerk, Scott S. Harris and Case Analyst, Katie Heidrick of March 17 th , 2026 and Form Notifying Opposing Counsel that the Case was Docketed; and the Order of Denial of May 18 th , 2026.....	11
APPENDIX B; City of Winnipeg Police Report Number, E210029462-57 (Fraud).....	16
APPENDIX C; City of Winnipeg Police Report Number, E210029462-76 (Fraud)	18
APPENDIX D; City of Winnipeg Police Report Number, E210029462-115 (Fraud)	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases:

Jones v. United States,
No. 392 U.S. 299 (1968), Supreme Court of the
United States.
Judgment entered June 10, 1968. (Citation
Omitted)

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-57, (March 04th, 2025),
[https://drive.proton.me/urls/BW3A929V24#pWh0PligH
C6S](https://drive.proton.me/urls/BW3A929V24#pWh0PligHC6S)

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-76, (August 22nd, 2025),
[https://drive.proton.me/urls/ZDBDZ10QW8#eDtYHiqt
SpsF](https://drive.proton.me/urls/ZDBDZ10QW8#eDtYHiqtSpsF)

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-115, (May 20th, 2026),
[https://drive.proton.me/urls/GKMAHANHVM#om3dqa
XngsHy](https://drive.proton.me/urls/GKMAHANHVM#om3dqaXngsHy)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

This case is a Court Fraud as three (3) Police Reports were filed with the City of Winnipeg Police Service that were Approved. They cannot be Approved unless the crimes are 100 percent true. Therefore; this case cannot be dismissed; or, denied if there are no issues; or, errors in the filings; and in this case there are none. Moreover, this case and Jurisdiction was won by the Petitioner; Alex Martinez in the lower Courts and the reason for this filing is because he is entitled to Relief and Compensation; which at this point must occur automatically. Thus it is a Court Fraud and crime to deny it.

REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

For this; it is cause for a Petition for Rehearing as this circumstance requires intervention as there are substantial; or, controlling effect; or, other substantial grounds and therefore the denial of the case is not justified. This is also because the case meets the Court's Criteria; as Court Fraud and Crime has been found and ignored.

This is proven in the letter of March 17th, 2026, ¹ from the Clerk, Scott S. Harris and Case Analyst, Katie Heidrick of the Supreme Court of the United States, where they send a form to notify the opposing counsel that the case was docketed. This was not required as per the attached form, as the Solicitor General of the United States is the Respondent and does not require the form. Therefore; the letter of May 18th, 2026, which denies the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari is deemed to be a Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith, as there is nothing in the letter

¹ Appendix A; Letters; Clerk, Scott S. Harris and Case Analyst, Katie Heidrick of March 17th, 2026, Form Notifying Opposing Counsel that the Case was Docketed, Order of Denial of May 18th, 2026

that states that the case was denied on the basis that the opposing counsel was not notified that the case was docketed; or, there was an error of some kind. This is the evidence that the case meets the Courts Criteria and that is why the Police Report was filed and Approved as there is no reason to deny the case.

The Fraud in report number, E210029462-57, ² was because there was a delay in the delivery of the Notice of Appeal; which was a Court and Clerk error. Once reported; nothing was done and therefore; a Police Report was filed and Approved.

In the second report number, E210029462-76, ³ the Supreme Court of the United States did not accept a filing that was filed within the 90 days from the entry of judgment; or, the denial of a timely petition for rehearing. Thus; a Police Report was filed which was Approved as it is a confirmed Fraud to deny the filing.

In the final Police Report number, E210029462-115, ⁴ Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith was found as there was no cause for the Clerk, Scott S. Harris and Case Analyst, Katie Heidrick of the Supreme Court of the United States to deny the case, as everything was filed properly and the case violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). When this occurs and Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith is found; the case stops and the offended party is paid and

² Appendix B; Winnipeg Police Service Report, E210029462-57, (March 04th, 2025)

³ Appendix C; Winnipeg Police Service Report, E210029462-76, (August 22nd, 2025)

⁴ Appendix D; Winnipeg Police Service Report, E210029462-115, (May 20th, 2026)

given the award without an Appeal; or, further adjudication of the case. This was stipulated in the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and yet the case was ignored and denied; thus the Police Report was Approved.

As per the Supreme Court of The United States Office of The Clerk, Guidelines for the Submission of Documents to The Supreme Court's Electronic Filing System, documents may contain hyperlinks to another part of the same document, or to an external source cited in the document. Therefore; seeing as precedent has been set and this document is issued pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.7, then it was assessed that if you so choose; you may obtain a full copy of the Police Reports referenced in this case by clicking on the following links:

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-57, (March 04th, 2025),
<https://drive.proton.me/urls/BW3A929V24#pWh0PligHC6S>

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-76, (August 22nd, 2025),
<https://drive.proton.me/urls/ZDBDZ10QW8#eDtYHIqtSpsF>

Winnipeg Police Service Report,
E210029462-115, (May 20th, 2026),
<https://drive.proton.me/urls/GKMAHANHVM#om3dqaXngsHy>

This is nothing that would jeopardize the submission; or, require the Clerk to return it with a letter indicating a deficiency under Supreme Court Rule 44.6. Therefore; this feature is available for you to support the case and to make it easier for you to support the Police in their arrests. You may also use the full reports to obtain more evidence and information on the case and if there is any

doubt that this cannot be done this way; there is a letter from the Clerk, Scott S. Harris and Case Analyst, Katie Heidrick of March 17th, 2026 that has been filed, with a Form Notifying the Opposing Counsel that the Case was Docketed with a Hyperlink in it. This is the evidence that this is a practice that can be used in this court. All of this is clarified as the understanding is that the use of Hyperlinks is relatively new to this court and this is why this is stated.

CONCLUSION

In addition to the Police Reports, a Wrongful Workplace Conduct Complaint has been filed with the Judicial Integrity Officer for the Administrative Office of the United States (U.S.) Courts, The Office of Judicial Integrity; who investigates complaints against the Supreme Court of the United States, when misconduct is found in the Office of the Clerk and their employees, such as Scott S. Harris, Clerk and Katie Heidrick Case Analyst.

In addition to this, seeing as what has occurred is considered Criminal Fraud; a report was filed with the Office of Inspector General; as it is their Jurisdiction to deal with a Court Fraud such as this. They also rescind the decision and issue Relief and an Award without an Appeal; or, further adjudication, when Criminal Fraud is proven with Police Reports; which is what was requested in the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and was denied illegally.

For all of this; you are required to cooperate with them and issue the Relief of \$75,000.000.00 Million dollars that has been requested; along with Costs and Damages for any other amounts that are eligible for the Scam and Criminal Fraud that has occurred that has required complaints to their offices.

This should be very easy to do at this juncture as this case is much easier than the case of Jones v. United States, 392 U.S. 299 (1968) 392 U.S. 299,⁵ where the Petition for Rehearing was 'Granted' and there was no Court Fraud; or, Crime found. This makes this case much worse and for this you are required to 'Grant' the Petition for Rehearing and issue Relief and the Award requested now; as it is requirement under the law at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex Martinez
513-269 Dufferin Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R2W 2X8

E-mail: case_am_072015@aol.com

*Self-represented and proceeding in forma pauperis

Date: June 3rd, 2026

⁵ Jones v. United States, 392 U.S. 299 (1968) 392 U.S. 299

Party Unrepresented By Counsel

This is to certify that this Petition for Rehearing meets the terms of Rule 44 and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Alex Martinez
Alex Martinez
Self represented
513-269 Dufferin Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R2W 2X8

E-mail: case_am_072015@aol.com

Date: June 3rd, 2026

APPENDIX A

No. 25-7043

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ALEX MARTINEZ — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. — RESPONDENT(S)
PETITION FOR REHEARING

LETTER AND FORM NOTIFYING OPPOSING COUNSEL THAT THE CASE WAS
DOCKETED AND ORDER OF DENIAL OF MAY 18TH, 2026

Alex Martinez v. United States Customs and Border Protection, No. 24-5273
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Judgments entered August 19th, 2025 and November 03rd, 2025

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

March 17, 2026

Mr. Alex Martinez
513-269 Dufferin Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R2W 2X8

Re: Alex Martinez

v. United States Customs and Border Protection, et al.
No. 25-7043

Dear Mr. Martinez:

The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case was filed on November 11, 2025 and placed on the docket March 17, 2026 as No. 25-7043.

A form is enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.
No Opposing Counsel! Solicitor General of the United States Represents Client.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

by 

Katie Heidrick
Case Analyst

Enclosures

Supreme Court of the United States

Alex Martinez
(Petitioner)

v.

No. 25-7043

United States Customs and Border Protection, et al.
(Respondents)

To _____ Counsel for Respondent:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to Rule 12.3 that a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States on November 11, 2025, and placed on the docket March 17, 2026. Pursuant to Rule 15.3, the due date for a brief in opposition is Thursday, April 16, 2026. If the due date is a Saturday, Sunday, or federal legal holiday, the brief is due on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or federal legal holiday.

If a respondent determines that no brief in opposition or support will be filed, it is encouraged to file a waiver of the right to file. Where a respondent is a nongovernmental corporation and it has a parent corporation or a publicly held company owns 10% or more of the corporation's stock, it is required to either file a brief in opposition or a waiver, and the filing must include the information required by Rule 29.6. Rule 15.9. Unless the Solicitor General of the United States represents the respondent, a waiver form is enclosed and should be sent to the Clerk only in the event you do not intend to file a response to the petition.

Parties represented by counsel must submit filings through the Supreme Court's electronic filing system. Electronic filing is in addition to the existing paper filing requirements. Attorneys must register for the system in advance, and the registration process may take several days. Further information about the system can be found at <https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/electronicfiling.aspx>.

Only counsel of record will receive notification of the Court's action in this case. Counsel of record must be a member of the Bar of this Court.

Mr. Alex Martinez
513-269 Dufferin Ave.
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, XX R2W 2X8

WAIVER

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 25-7043

Alex Martinez

v.

United States Customs and Border

Protection, et al.

(Petitioner)

(Respondents)

I DO NOT INTEND TO FILE A RESPONSE to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless one is requested by the Court.

Please check the appropriate box:

- ☐ I am filing this waiver on behalf of all respondents.
- ☐ I only represent some respondents. I am filing this waiver on behalf of:

Please check the appropriate box:

- ☐ I am a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. (E-file signed waiver)
- ☐ I am not presently a member of the Bar of this Court. Should a response be requested, the response will be filed by a Bar member. (Mail signed waiver to: Supreme Court, Attn: Clerk's Office, 1 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20543).

Corporate disclosure statement required by Rule 15.9 (or write N/A):

Parties to the proceeding not identified by the petition (or write N/A):

Stock ticker symbols, if any, for parties, corporations, or companies listed above (or write N/A):

Signature _____ Date: _____

(Type or print) Name _____
☐ Mr. ☐ Ms. ☐ Mrs. ☐ Miss

Firm _____

Address _____

City & State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Email _____

A COPY OF THIS FORM MUST BE SENT TO PETITIONER. NO ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OR COVER LETTER IS REQUIRED.

cc:

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

May 18, 2026

Clerk
United States Court of Appeals for the District of
Columbia Circuit
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Alex Martinez
v. United States Customs and Border Protection Agency, et al.
No. 25-7043
(Your No. 24-5273)

Dear Clerk:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott S. Harris", written in a cursive style.

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

APPENDIX B

No. 25-7043

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ALEX MARTINEZ — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. — RESPONDENT(S)
PETITION FOR REHEARING

CITY OF WINNIPEG POLICE REPORT NUMBER, E210029462-57 (FRAUD)

Alex Martinez v. United States Customs and Border Protection, No. 24-5273
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Judgments entered August 19th, 2025 and November 03rd, 2025

WINNIPEG POLICE SERVICE SUMMARY SUPPLEMENT REPORT



REPORT NUMBER: E210029462

INCIDENT INFORMATION

INCIDENT SR	INCIDENT TYPE Supplemental Report	INITIA SUPP ☒	DATE/TIME STARTED 2025-03-03 02:00 PM	DATE/TIME ENDED 2025-03-03 03:00 PM	DATE/TIME 2025-03-03 05:13 PM
REPORT FILED FROM ***	TRACKING NUMBER T25007646	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE 269 Dufferin AVENUE, 513, Winnipeg, MB			APPROVED BY: ***
LOCATION TYPE	THEFT TYPE	METHOD OF	METHOD OF EXIT	PT OF	PT OF EXIT ENTRY LOC

PERSON LISTINGS

1	TYPE REP	LAST NAME Martinez	FIRST NAME Alex	MIDDLE NAME	DOB ***	RACE	SEX *	DRIVER LIC NO	LIC
	SSN	ETHNICITY	RESIDENT	EYE COLOR	HAIR COLOR	AGE	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	SECONDARY
	EMAIL case_am_072015@aol.com		RESIDENCE ADDRESS ***					PRIMARY PHONE ***	
	EMPLOYER NAME		BUSINESS ADDRESS ***					WORK PHONE	

NARRATIVE

This is a Fraud Report against the U.S. District Court District of Columbia & U.S. District Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia in Washington, D.C. because Justices, Rudolph Contreras, Trevor N. McFadden, Sri Srinivasan, Amit P. Mehta all committed 'Fraud;' because the decisions are a violation of the Rules. Therefore; add this to the other report. What occurred is that my address was on the Notice of Appeal & yet; the Judgement was not received. Since I never received the decision, I could not submit my Appeal on time. When this occurs; the Plaintiff; must submit a Motion to Reopen (MR). This was done & denied & is not consistent with the Rules; as the judgment is 'not effective' until it has been 'served' to me. Since I complained, the Clerk sent me the electronic copy on November 15, 2024; which was responded too with the MR. Therefore; I can only respond when I receive the Judgment; & it does not matter if it is by hard copy; as per Rule 5(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Furthermore; on September 20, 2024, I complained to the Clerk that I did not receive the Hard Copy. Therefore; the rules are violated & poor judgment has been exercised. This substantiates 'Fraud,' under Rule 60(b)(3) & Rule 77(d)(2); as the Time to Appeal & file the MR is Not Affected by Lack of Notice. For these reasons, the MR should have been accepted & instead the 'Order' issued states that it is 'Denied.' - Rule 5(E); Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 'not effective if the filer or sender learns that it did not reach the person to be served' - Rule 60(b)(3); 'fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party' - Rule 77(d)(2); Time to Appeal Not Affected by Lack of Notice. Lack of notice of the entry does not affect the time for appeal or relieve—or authorize the court to relieve—a party for failing to appeal within the time allowed, except as allowed by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure (4)(a).

APPENDIX C

No. 25-7043

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ALEX MARTINEZ — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. — RESPONDENT(S)
PETITION FOR REHEARING

CITY OF WINNIPEG POLICE REPORT NUMBER, E210029462-76 (FRAUD)

Alex Martinez v. United States Customs and Border Protection, No. 24-5273
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Judgments entered August 19th, 2025 and November 03rd, 2025

WINNIPEG POLICE SERVICE SUMMARY SUPPLEMENT REPORT



REPORT NUMBER: E210029462

INCIDENT INFORMATION

INCIDENT SR	INCIDENT TYPE Supplemental Report	INITIA SUPP ☒	DATE/TIME STARTED 2025-08-22 04:00 AM	DATE/TIME ENDED 2025-08-22 06:00 AM	DATE/TIME 2025-08-22 11:26
REPORT FILED FROM ***	TRACKING NUMBER T25032226	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE 269 Dufferin AVENUE, 513, WINNIPEG, MB			APPROVED BY: ***
LOCATION TYPE	THEFT TYPE	METHOD OF	METHOD OF EXIT	PT OF	PT OF EXIT ENTRY LOC

PERSON LISTINGS

1	TYPE REP	LAST NAME Martinez	FIRST NAME Alex	MIDDLE NAME	DOB ***	RACE	SEX *	DRIVER LIC NO	LIC
	SSN	ETHNICITY	RESIDENT	EYE COLOR	HAIR COLOR	AGE	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	SECONDARY
	EMAIL case_am_072015@aol.com		RESIDENCE ADDRESS ***					PRIMARY PHONE ***	
	EMPLOYER NAME		BUSINESS ADDRESS ***					WORK PHONE	

NARRATIVE

See Report numbers E210029462-58 and E210029462-57 and the attached report as this box to enter the detailed description of the incident is not working properly and is only accepting 200 characters. Please fix it as it is further evidence of negligence from your Police Force!

HANDBOOK OF PRACTICE

and

INTERNAL PROCEDURES

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

for the

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

As Amended Through December 12, 2024

As in the case of petitions for panel rehearing, the rules do not provide for a response to a petition for rehearing *en banc*, except by request of the Court. If any member of the Court wishes a response, the Clerk will enter an order to that effect. The length limits for a petition for rehearing *en banc* also apply to a response. See Fed. R. App. P. 40(d)(4); D.C. Cir. Rule 40(d). There is no oral argument on the question whether rehearing *en banc* should be granted.

The Clerk's Office transmits a vote sheet and the petition for rehearing *en banc* electronically to all members of the original panel, including a senior judge of this Court, and to all other active judges of this Court. A vote may be requested by an active judge of the Court, or by any member of the panel. If no judge asks for a vote within a specified time, and none requests more time to consider the matter, the Clerk will enter an order denying the petition.

If a judge calls for a vote on the petition for rehearing *en banc*, the Clerk's Office transmits electronically to the full Court a new vote sheet, along with any response to the petition ordered by the Court. The question now is whether there should be a rehearing *en banc*. On this question only active judges of the Court may vote, and a majority of all active judges who are not recused must approve rehearing *en banc* in order for it to be granted.

When rehearing *en banc* is granted, the Clerk enters an order granting the rehearing *en banc* and vacating the judgment by the original panel, either in whole or in part, as circumstances warrant. This order is posted on the Court's website and is published in the federal reporter system. An order granting rehearing *en banc* does not indicate the names of the judges who voted against rehearing, but an order denying rehearing *en banc* does indicate the names of the judges who voted to grant rehearing *en banc*, if they wish.

The Court has followed a variety of procedures in conducting rehearing *en banc*. On occasion, only the original briefs have been considered; in other cases, the Court has requested supplemental briefs. The Court almost always hears oral argument in considering a case *en banc*.

The Court sitting *en banc* consists of all active judges, plus any senior judges of the Court who were members of the original panel and wish to participate. When the Court sits *en banc* with an even number of judges, and the result is an evenly divided vote, the Court will enter a judgment affirming the order or judgment under review, and it may publish the *en banc* Court's divided views.

In the absence of a request from a party, any active judge of the Court, or member of the panel, may suggest that a case be reheard *en banc*. If a majority of the active judges who are not recused agree, the Court orders rehearing *en banc*.

In addition, a party may petition for initial *en banc* consideration. Such a petition must include a concise statement of the issue and its importance and conform to the other requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 40(b)(2), (c), and (d)(2)-(5). If a party wishes a case to be heard initially *en banc*, the petition ideally should be filed within the first 30 days after docketing, but in no event later than the date on which that party's brief is due. A judge also may suggest *en banc* consideration prior to the panel decision; on occasion this has been done by the panel itself.

C. REVIEW BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In general, a party has 90 days from the entry of judgment or the denial of a timely petition for rehearing, whichever is later, in which to petition for a writ of *certiorari*. A circuit court cannot enlarge this period;

- In Report number: E210029462-58, The Privacy Commissioner of Canada confirm that the release documents provided by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) were done properly. Therefore; their decision on my complaint for errors and omissions is 'not-well founded.' This is good; however, since they are under investigation for other crimes check this for fraud too. Also; this confirms that the CBC has information that they state is for; Journalistic Purposes. This is how they committed crime because they did attacks and seditiously maligned and manufactured allegations for what they state are 'Journalistic' reasons. This is the crime; which you confirmed and as an example, attached is a sample of what Journalistic Principles and Practices are and clearly in my case; these were violated severely.
- In Report number: E210029462-57, Judge Contreras and others of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia committed errors that constitute Fraud. This was reported to the Court and they dismissed it; which cannot be done because it is irrefutable. This was identified and Reported to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in an Appeal and Petition for Rehearing. This was done with the Appellate Mediation Program and in the Attached Order, it was still denied. Therefore; they ignored the crime altogether despite having the Police Report; which cannot occur. Thus; it is a crime and fraud and since the Riots occurred it is very important to stop and arrest them for this.
- In the Report involving the Supreme Court of the United States, they did not accept my Application because they claimed that it was not filed on time and in 90 days. This is false and a fraud; because they stated that in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit when you receive a decision; you must decide whether to file for a Petition for Rehearing; or, file an Application with the Supreme Court. My Response was that this is false and that the 90 days to file starts after the denial of a timely petition for rehearing. This is highlighted on Page 59 in the attached Handbook. Thus use it as evidence to arrest them. If they state that this was recently added; it does not matter because it was clarified because of the Fraud that was done by them. Not because it is a new Rule; or, law.

APPENDIX D

No. 25-7043

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ALEX MARTINEZ — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. — RESPONDENT(S)
PETITION FOR REHEARING

CITY OF WINNIPEG POLICE REPORT NUMBER, E210029462-115 (FRAUD)

Alex Martinez v. United States Customs and Border Protection, No. 24-5273
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Judgments entered August 19th, 2025 and November 03rd, 2025

WINNIPEG POLICE SERVICE SUMMARY SUPPLEMENT REPORT



REPORT NUMBER: E210029462

INCIDENT INFORMATION							
INCIDENT SR	INCIDENT TYPE Supplemental Report	INITIA SUPP	☐	DATE/TIME STARTED 2026-05-20 05:00 AM	DATE/TIME ENDED 2026-05-20 06:01 AM	DATE/TIME 2026-05-20 04:03 PM	
REPORT FILED FROM ***	TRACKING NUMBER T26018522	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE 269 Dufferin AVENUE, 513, Winnipeg, MB				APPROVED BY: ***	
LOCATION TYPE	THEFT TYPE	METHOD OF	METHOD OF EXIT	PT OF	PT OF EXIT	ENTRY LOC	

PERSON LISTINGS									
1	TYPE REP	LAST NAME Martinez	FIRST NAME Alex	MIDDLE NAME	DOB ***	RACE	SEX *	DRIVER LIC NO	LIC
	SSN	ETHNICITY	RESIDENT	EYE COLOR	HAIR COLOR	AGE	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	SECONDARY
	EMAIL case_am_072015@aol.com		RESIDENCE ADDRESS ***					PRIMARY PHONE ***	
	EMPLOYER NAME		BUSINESS ADDRESS ***					WORK PHONE	

NARRATIVE	
Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith was found again in the decision for the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Alex Martinez v. United States Customs and Border Protection Agency, et al. The case cannot be dismissed and denied as everything has been done and filed properly and the case violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA); where when Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith is found; the case stops immediately and the offended party is paid and given the award. It does not carry on to Appeal; or, to any other remedy; just like in Canada. Therefore; you as the Police are required to arrest for Fraud, Perjury and Bad Faith for violations of the United States (U.S.) Code and for ignoring the Law. This is also because intentional deception, actively lying; or, manipulation has occurred to change the outcome of the case; which is a crime. What also makes it Bad Faith is that unfair dealings, ulterior motives; or, an abuse of authority has occurred and the Court has unreasonably refused to follow the Rules and Law and made an unjust Judgment. Read the Petition and you will see that it is not possible to deny the case. Thus; it maybe unbelievable to people that you can arrest a Court and Judge; however, in this matter you can. Therefore; go ahead and do it as quickly as possible and force them to send the Award and payment immediately; as you can do that with this case. Reference the April 2025, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) arrest of Hannah Dugan, a Milwaukee County Circuit Court judge to do this and you will see that this is normal to do.	