

25-7180

Case S292065

Appellate Case # GO64157

Lower Family Court Case # 05D000275

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

---

Edward L Clark Jr.

*Petitioner, Respondent*

v.

Deborah L Clark

*Respondent, Petitioner*

---

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari From The  
Court of Appeals of California  
Fourth Appellate District

---

Motion to File Supplemental Brief #2, in Support of Writ of CERTIORARI  
Conference scheduled 5/21/2026

---

Edward L. Clark Jr.  
5582 McFadden Ave.  
Huntington Beach, Ca 92649  
(714) 448-7145  
[ed@theelectricalexpert.com](mailto:ed@theelectricalexpert.com)

Date: MAY 7, 2026

Self Represented

**TO THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES; THE HONORABLE . JOHN G. ROBERTS AND ALL  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JUSTICES.;**

Panel Conference Scheduled For May 21, 2026

Petitioner respectfully files the 2nd supplemental brief to PROVIDE MINUTE ORDER issued by the fourth appellate district confirming its reliance on a pre-filing order as a shield from liability attempting to avoid having to reverse three of its own opinions on the merits of VOID orders and denying Emergency Writ of Supersedeas to stay enforcement of VOID abstract of judgment.

FOR RELATED CASE G066790 where Petitioner appealed three denials by the court to vacate a VOID abstract of Judgment issued without subject matter jurisdiction, and without a summons being served to challenge either private contracts dated 3/21/2016 and 7/12/2021. A VOID Pre-filing orders issued without subject matter jurisdiction, and motion to vacate a debtors exam. and

Attached is the court minute order filed the court is using pre-filing order to dismiss a valid appeal of the lower court denying request to vacate Void Abstract of Judgment, Debtors Exam, and pre-filing order. In addition to dismissing Writ of Supersedeas REQUESTING EMERGENCY STAY OF ENFORCEMENT filed 4/15/2026 and Dismissing Writ of Prohibition TO DISQUALIFY JUDGE YOLANDA TORES filed 4/22/2026

## PRE-FILING ORDER – OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

### OVERVIEW

Petitioner outlined Judge Yolanda Tores issued a pre-filing order STRICTLY as a defense for herself attempting to prevent documents from being admitted into the record, that proves the abuse in family court trying to execute a VOID abstract of Judgment, obtained through fraud on the court.

The NEW evidence herein, confirms how pre-filing order originally intended for truly vexatious litigants Plaintiffs, not defendants) , is used by JUDGES, “to defend themselves” , when they themselves have broken the law and are trying to conceal their own judicial misconduct.

Attached hereto as Appendices #1, the courts order filed 5/6/2026.

### JUDICIAL ADMISSION

Please take Judicial Notice p2 last prg, the court recognizes John v Superior Court (2016) 63 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 91. where prefiling orders do not apply to defendants trying to correct a wrong. However, the pre-filing order is used herein as a political defense to avoid addressing the merits of subject matter jurisdiction, specifically CCP 664.6. which is a direct question in writ of certiorari

Next on page 2 prg 1 the court acknowledges petitioner request to civil court stating “*HE BELIEVES SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION LIES TO LIYIGATE A BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM*” Please take notice it is not Petitioners belief, it is specifically detailed in the California Code of Cicil Procedure CCP 664.6. It is the law and nothing to do with Petitioners belief. Family court does

not have subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts not merged into the record. Especially when family court denies both parties 6-request to merge.

*It should be noted that the appellate court for the first time since 2018 makes a judicial admission the petitioner has been seeking vacatur of the long final judgment entered based on **marital settlement agreement.., that being the 3/21/2016 Private Debt Settlement Agreement***

This Judicial admission is on point to the instant matter in the writ of certiorari and request for emergency stay. The 3/21/2016 Debt Settlement Agreement was not merged into the record. It is a private settlement contract that survives as a private settlement contract under the jurisdiction of civil court pursuant to CCP 664.6.

The family court denied 6-request (noticed Motions by both parties) to merge, therefore pursuant to CCP 664.6 family court does not have subject matter jurisdiction.

The 7/12/2021 Contract both parties stipulated the 3/21/2016 contract was valid and enforceable, and that the 4/17/2018 RFO to appear was issued in Breach of Contract. No other document exists. The only summons/complaint in the record was in 2006.

Finally, the court p3 prg 1, it is important to note the court states “**In three prior opinions, this court considered and rejected contentions about subject matter jurisdiction**”. This statement is exactly the authority used by the

court. Meaning the court continues to side step offering any authority that contradicts CCP 664.6 that specifically dictates family court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts.

The end result, with the courts failure to author authority, it can be concluded there is no defense for the judicial officer that suggest family court can take jurisdiction it never had.

### **LEGAL AUTHORITY**

- **Significant Development:** New facts have emerged that are critical to the court's decision.
- **Interest of Justice:** The new information ensures the court has a complete and accurate picture of why tenured Superior Court Judges could find themselves intentionally and willfully breaching their oath of office to ensure due process under the law.
- *Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(d)* allows parties to file supplemental pleadings, which set forth transactions, occurrences, or events that happened *after* the date of the original pleading. Unlike amended pleadings, these addenda are filed via motion and court permission, often allowed even if the original pleading was defective
- **FRCP 15(d):** Governs supplemental pleadings (events occurring after the initial filing
- **Purpose:** Allows for updating pleadings with new, post-filing facts or events.
- **Discovery (FRCP 26(e)):** Requires parties to supplement or correct disclosures if new, relevant information is discovered.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

Attached as **Appendices #1** Order issued by the fourth appellate district

Div 3 5/6/2026 confirming its use of pre-filing order to deny Petitioner (a defendant) his right to defend himself by way of appealing void orders under the law. Utilizing a pre-filing order to deny an emergency writ of supersedeas and a writ of prohibition disqualifying family law JUDGE Yolanda Tores..

### **ARGUMENT**

The facts presented by the Fourth Appellate District confirms:

1. A pre-filing order was issued, not because petitioner is a Vexatious Plaintiff, rather as shield against liability from a defendant who has been harassed and utilized as a political pond to extort money from. The court designated Petitioner as a Vexatious litigant for the very reasons previously addressed, in an effort to quash judicial misconduct to prevent escalation to the US Supreme court.

### **CONCLUSION**

Petitioner ask for help from the U.S. Supreme court to utilize its supervisory power over all judiciaries to issue orders that simply require the Orange County Superior Courts enforce the laws of our land pursuant to CCP 664.6 . Issue GVR order vacating all matters in family court from 4/17/2018 to present and remand case back to civil court for any Breach of Contract issues, pursuant to CCP 664.6 over any allege breach of 3/21/2016 and 7/14/2021 contracts alleged. It has been brought to my attention Judge Strickroth in Civil Court has retired, so part of Petitioners previous request for a new judge in Civil court has been resolved.

Respectfully Submitted,



Edward L Clark Jr.  
Prose litigant

### **VERIFICATION**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the facts, exhibits and allegations are true and correct and that this declaration is executed on May 7,, 2026 ,at Huntington Beach, California.

Respectfully Submitted,



Edward L Clark Jr.  
Prose Litigant

**App. “1”**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION THREE

In re the Marriage of DEBOARH L.  
and EDWARD L. CLARK, JR.

DEBORAH L. CLARK,

Respondent,

v.

EDWARD L. CLARK, JR.,

Appellant.

G066790, G066820

(Super. Ct. No. 05D000275)

O R D E R

Appellant Edward L. Clark, Jr., is a vexatious litigant subject to a prefiling order. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 391.7.)<sup>1</sup> In the interest of expediency and judicial economy, this court has prepared one order addressing the two applications filed in case Nos. G066790 and G066820. This court's opinion in case No. G064157, filed on June 25, 2025, describes the procedural background of this case and is incorporated by reference.

In case No. G066790, appellant seeks to appeal the trial court's April 3, 2026 order denying appellant's motion to vacate an abstract of judgment. Appellant applied for permission to file a petition for writ of

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Code of Civil Procedure.

supersedeas and request for immediate stay of enforcement of the abstract of judgment, alleging the trial court engaged in fraud and lacked subject matter jurisdiction over enforcement of his private settlement contract. Appellant submitted, as an exhibit to his petition for writ of supersedeas, a January 28, 2026 abstract of judgment indicating a judgment was entered against appellant on February 26, 2019, and renewed on November 7, 2025. According to the abstract of judgment, appellant owes \$612,513.59 to his ex-wife, Deborah L. Clark.

In case No. G066820, appellant applied to file a petition for writ of prohibition to disqualify the family law judge and remand all matters to a civil law courtroom, where he believes subject matter jurisdiction lies to litigate a breach of contract claim. Appellant accuses the trial court of bank fraud, wire fraud, and forgery, among other illicit conduct.

Vexatious litigants must obtain permission to file “new litigation” in propria persona from the “presiding justice or presiding judge” of the court in which it is proposed to be filed. (§ 391.7, subd. (a).) Permission shall be granted only if the presiding justice or presiding judge determines that the proposed litigation has merit and is not being filed to harass or delay. (*Id.*, subd. (b).) “The vexatious litigant statutes do not apply solely to the trial courts. Each writ petition and appeal constitutes ‘litigation.’ [Citations.] The critical finding is whether ‘the litigant[’]s actions are unreasonably impacting the objects of appellant’s actions and the courts as contemplated by the statute.” (*In re Kinney* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 951, 958.)

Appellant cites *John v. Superior Court* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 91, for the proposition that the prefilng order does not apply where a vexatious litigant was the “defendant” in the trial court for purposes of the judgment at

issue. (*Id.*, at pp. 96–100.) But this court may nevertheless conclude that an appealing defendant is a vexatious litigant subject to a prefiling order where, as here, the party is the “person who commences, institutes or *maintains* a litigation . . . .” (§ 391, subd. (d), italics added; see *In re Marriage of Kouwabina & Veltman* (2025) 115 Cal.App.5th 293, 300–301.) We conclude the prefiling order applies here, as appellant continuously attempts to maintain this litigation.

Indeed, appellant has a lengthy history filing appeals and petitions in this court seeking vacatur of the long final judgment entered based on a marital settlement agreement. In three prior opinions, this court has considered and rejected appellant’s contentions about subject matter jurisdiction and fraud accusations against various judicial officers. The purpose of the vexatious litigant procedure is “to curb misuse of the court system by those persistent and obsessive litigants who, repeatedly litigating the same issues through groundless actions, waste the time and resources of the court system and other litigants.” (*Pittman v. Beck Park Apartments Ltd.* (2018) 20 Cal.App.5th 1009, 1024.)

Further, the vexatious litigant must support the request to file new litigation by providing “facts and legal authority telling the court with specificity why [the proposed litigation] has merit.” (*In re R.H.* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 678, 708, disapproved on other grounds in *John v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 63 Cal.4th at p. 99, fn. 2.) Here, both writ petitions are incoherent and untethered to the law. The petitions fail to cite relevant legal authority to support petitioner’s position.

California Rules of Court, rule 8.486(b)(1)(B) clearly states a writ petition must be supported by an adequate record, which would include all

documents and exhibits “supporting and opposing the petitioner’s position.” (*Ibid.*) To facilitate meaningful review, a petitioner must include copies of any “documents submitted to the trial court that are necessary for a complete understanding of the case and the ruling under review.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.486(b)(1)(C).) Petitioner failed to comply with these rules. The documents provided do not provide the court with a complete understanding of the case or the ruling under review. A petition that “does not include the required record or explanations or does not present facts sufficient to excuse the failure to submit them,” may be summarily denied. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.486(b)(4).)

For the reasons stated above, there is no potential merit to the proposed writ petitions filed in case Nos. G066790 and G066820. The filing of these petitions appears to be designed solely to delay payment and prolong proceedings in the trial court. Because there is no arguable issue that respondent court erred in denying appellant’s motion to vacate the abstract of judgment, appellant’s requests for permission to file an appeal and writ petitions in case Nos. G066790 and G066820 are DENIED, and the request for an immediate stay is DENIED. The proceedings in case Nos. G066790 and G066820 are DISMISSED.

MOTOIKE, ACTING P. J.