


No. 25-7180

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



EDWARD L. CLARK, JR.,

Petitioner,

v.

DEBORAH L. CLARK,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the Court of Appeals of California,
Fourth Appellate District, Division Three**

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER

Edward L. Clark, Jr.
Petitioner Pro Se
5582 McFadden Ave
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
(714) 448-7145
ed@theelectricalexpert.com

September 21, 2026

SUPREME COURT PRESS

♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER.....	1
NEW INTERVENING MATTERS	1
I. Offer of Proof of Extorsion, Obstruction of Justice, Abuse of Power, and Denial of Due Process	1
OVERVIEW OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS KNOWN BY THE FAMILY COURT	4
QUESTIONS PRESENTED PENDING IN WRIT OF CERTIORARI	6
LEGAL AUTHORITY	7
CONCLUSION.....	9

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant, Superior Court of California, County of Orange (September 11, 2026)	1a
Minute Order, Superior Court of California County of Orange (September 11, 2026)	3a

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Page

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Ex-Parte Notice of Motion (August 20, 2026)	5a
Motion to Quash/Vacate Family Law Orders (August 24, 2026)	7a
Notice of Motion to Vacate Family Law Docket (September 2, 2026).....	9a
Motion to Dismiss All Family Law Matters (September 8, 2026).....	11a
Family Law Case Docket.....	13a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>John v. Superior Court</i> , 63 Cal.4th 91 (Cal. 2016)	8
 JUDICIAL RULES	
Cal. Code Civ. P. 3.1385	2
Cal. Code Civ. P. 312-365	7
Cal. Code Civ. P. 664.6	4, 5, 9
Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d)	8
Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)	8



THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER

NEW INTERVENING MATTERS

I. Offer of Proof of Extorsion, Obstruction of Justice, Abuse of Power, and Denial of Due Process

1. Whereby Petitioner presented new facts, via noticed motions, to the presiding judge over family law case 05D000275 confirming the extent of Judge Yolanda Tores Extorsion scheme outlined in prior briefs, that caused her forced recusal. Exposing how and why her causing to be filed an abstract of judgment and pre-filing order was absent all jurisdiction with expired statutes of limitations, and illegally circumventing the civil process, *i.e.* fraud on the court rendering all orders void on their face. And motions on calendar in family court are absent jurisdiction.

2. Respondents intent was an effort prior to the panel hearing scheduled for 9/28/2026, to file motions with new evidence of Judge Yolanda Tores conspiracy, colluding with Petitioner and her attorney ex-parte to see and show this panel, if the family law division by chance would police itself based on the evidence presented of Judge Tores ex parte communication scheme to weaponize a clerical function to circumvent the civil process in order to extort a settlement from respondent. Or in the alternative discover if the judicial misconduct is so aggregates in family court,

there are too many people involved, or the orders are coming from a senior political figure so they have no choice but to risk and take a chance the US Supreme Court will deny the instant writ of certiorari from a prose litigant. Allowing fraud in family court to prevail.

Thus, a denial of the instant writ would give the court complete freedom to use the power of Superior Court to ignore and deny due process protection of our Constitution and just take money and assets absent all jurisdiction from a party, without ever having a trial in front of a judge in response to a summons /complaint over fully executed private settlement contracts not merged

3. Attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference

Respondent provides as an offer of proof, of motions filed in family court (Just caption Page to prevent redundant filings).

- A. Aug. 20, 2026 Ex-Parte Notice of Motion and Motion to Quash Debtors Exam [Third.Supp.App.5a]
- B. Aug. 24, 2026 Notice of Motion and Motion to Quash/Vacate void court orders and subpoenas issued [Third.Supp.App.7a]
- C. Sept. 2, 2026 Notice of Motion and Motion to Vacate All Hearings on Family Court Docket For Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction; abstract of judgment and Levies filed against respondent [Third.Supp.App.9a]
- D. Sept. 8, 2026 Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 3.1385 (b) that states the court "MUST"

dismiss if cause is not shown upon notice to the court [Third.Supp.App.11a]

4. The corresponding choice by the court, obstructing justice, DENYING MOTIONS ABOVE using the prefiling order to prevent respondent from defending himself, thereby denying due process. The court has chosen as its only defense to roll the dice the US Supreme court will deny the instant writ of certiorari,

A Sept. 11, 2026 Order DENYING Motions 8/20/26, 8/24/2026, and 9/2.2026.[Third.Supp.App.1a]

B. Sept 11, 2026 Minute Order [Third.Supp.App.3a]

Despite prefiling orders pursuant to California Supreme court ruling, are not intended for respondents or defendants trying to defend themselves, the instant ruling are an offer of proof the prefiling order was not issued because respondent is a vexatious litigant, rather was issued to prevent respondent from defending himself to provide a shield to allow for judicial misconduct to go un-checked and prevent appeals to higher courts

Please take judicial notice the family court has never addressed the fact there are two private settlement contracts executed with expired statutes of limitation. Let alone ignoring and never referencing their existence. Thereby not offering any authority to ignore either contract to justify the actions of Judge Hurwitz initially to file and serve RFO 4/17/2018 without subject matter jurisdiction and then for judge Torres to refuse both parties many request to settle case, so she could use case no longer at issue to extort money.

5. Please take judicial notice of the courts refusal to allow Respondent to collaterally attack subject matter jurisdiction or even acknowledge the existence of fully executed private contracts.

6. The hearings still on calendar in family court for 10/30/2026 absent all jurisdiction are: [Third.Supp. App.13a] court register

- A. **Hearing Motion to Consolidate:** If the instant writ is denied, family court is planning to consolidate the civil court matter and take jurisdiction in family court of enforcement matters of a void abstract of judgment.
- B. **Appearance Exam:** The court has threatened with contempt if Respondent doesn't appear, despite the court not having subject matter jurisdiction
- c. **Motion Other:** At this point respondent not sure what this motion is?



OVERVIEW OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS KNOWN BY THE FAMILY COURT

It has been undisputed and gone without any arguments or any supporting authority opposing;

- The fact family court is absent all jurisdiction over private settlement contracts not-merged pursuant to CCP 664.6
- The fact family court lost jurisdiction when jurisdiction was not reserved by the parties

in writing in the 8/31/2006 dissolution judgment

- The statute of Limitation Expired for: (Affirmative Defense)
 - a Renewing 8/31/2006 judgment by 8/31/2016
 - b. 3/21/2016 Private Debt Settlement Agreement statute of limitation expired 3/21/2020
 - c. 7/12/2021 Private Joint Stipulation statute of limitation expired 7/12/2025
- Family Court was properly noticed of settlement from both parties litigants yet has not dismissed mandated by Rule 3.1385 (b)
- Subject matter jurisdiction is not negotiable, cannot be assumed by any court
- A commissioner issued order used for abstract of judgment, not a judge

The instant case is an extreme case of EXTORSION and BRIBERY in abuse of power by Judge Tores, colluding and orchestrating the filing of an abstract of judgment ex parte with Petitioner, applying extreme pressure working with Attorney Richard Brover filing Levies and taking money from bank accounts trying to force Petitioner into a settlement before issues can be resolved in civil court filing pursuant to CCP 664.6. .. Judge Tores cant deny extensive personal knowledge of both private settlement contracts **with expired statutes of limitation.** Thereby proving her intent with malice to obstruct justice to impose extensive harm to Petitioner and his company trying to Extort money.



QUESTIONS PRESENTED PENDING IN WRIT OF CERTIORARI

1. Does a person representing themselves as a prose litigant automatically forfeit his Fourteenth amendment rights to fair and equal protection under the law in a court with Subject Matter Jurisdiction?

If Not

2. Is Subject Matter Jurisdiction still the foundational pre-requisite for any judicial process to be legal, valid and enforceable in the United States?

3. Can a Family Court fabricate and take back subject matter jurisdiction ONCE forfeited, (failing to reserve jurisdiction in judgment before being dismissed) in a dissolution money judgment and after refusing to merge private settlement contracts into the family court judgment for a final accord? And where the statute of limitation is expired.

4. Can a family court judge fabricate a new judgment with a different judgment date (11-years later) using a case number that was no longer at issue because of a fully executed private settlement contract dated 3/21/2016 between the parties?

5. Does the "The Law Of The Land Doctrine" allow an appellate court to supersede the long standing precedence of Subject matter jurisdiction, basically allowing an appellate court to validate void orders by adopting an order it issued on the merits of a void order?.

6. Is it standard judicial conduct to issue a pre-filing order as a shield from legal liability to introduce

extrinsic fraud to enforce VOID orders under the law, that were issued without subject matter jurisdiction and by a person who is not a judge? Or to conceal fraud on the court by judicial officer?



LEGAL AUTHORITY

- **EXPIRED STATUTE OF LIMITATION** – An Affirmative Defense Because a private settlement contract not merged is treated as a civil contract, the state’s civil statute of limitations for written contracts applies strictly. If that timeline has elapsed since the breach occurred, the defendant has an absolute defense. The timeline for the statute of limitation for both the 3/21/2016 contract and the 7/12/2021 contract has elapsed CCP 312-365

- **Significant Development:** New intervening events, the forced recusal of Judge Yolanda Tores have emerged that are critical to the court’s decision. Setting aside the issues of subject matter jurisdiction raised in the instant writ of certiorari, Family court is barred as a matter of law assuming subject matter jurisdiction over a private (Civil) contract that has an expired statute of limitation., notwithstanding the conflict of interest now exposed prejudicing Petitioner/ Respondent in the instant matters.

- **Interest of Justice:** The new information ensures the court has a complete and accurate picture of why tenured lower Superior Court Judges could find themselves intentionally and willfully breaching their oath of office with malice to retaliate against a parties litigant by orchestrating, conducting a sham

case under the perceived protection of a pre-filing order.

- **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. In this case two depositions.
- **Discovery (FRCP 26(e)):** Requires parties to supplement or correct disclosures if new, relevant information is discovered. In this instant matters discovered in depositions
- **Improper Tactics:** If a party attempts to label a responding defendant as vexatious purely to secure a default judgment or **block a valid defense**, courts generally view this as an abuse of the procedural process rather than a standard or valid legal practice

The California Supreme Court in *John v. Superior Court*, 63 Cal.4th 91 (Cal. 2016) determined that statutory pre-filing requirements do not apply to an appeal by a self-represented vexatious litigant.



CONCLUSION

Petitioner, based on all the foregoing and previous filings in this court, respectfully request the U.S. Supreme Court to Grant the instant Writ of Certiorari.

Petitioner respectfully ask the U.S. Supreme to inform the family court it is absent subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts not merged pursuant to CCP 664.6. Especially when family court is requested and fails to merge contracts.

Petitioner respectfully request Informing the family court does not have contempt power to enforce a void abstract of judgment

Order the family court to cease and desist all enforcement activity and vacate the family court docket since family court is absent all jurisdiction over private settlement contracts not merged.

Petitioner respectfully ask the court Order the family court to vacate the pre-filing order, restore respondent reputation and remand any other pending issues back to civil court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Edward L. Clark, Jr.

Edward L. Clark, Jr.

Petitioner Pro Se

5582 McFadden Ave

Huntington Beach, CA 92649

(714) 448-7145

ed@theelectricalexpert.com

September 21, 2026

**THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant, Superior Court of California, County of Orange (September 11, 2026)	1a
Minute Order, Superior Court of California County of Orange (September 11, 2026)	3a

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Ex-Parte Notice of Motion (August 20, 2026)	5a
Motion to Quash/Vacate Family Law Orders (August 24, 2026)	7a
Notice of Motion to Vacate Family Law Docket (September 2, 2026).....	9a
Motion to Dismiss All Family Law Matters (September 8, 2026).....	11a
Family Law Case Docket.....	13a

**ORDER TO FILE NEW LITIGATION BY
VEXATIOUS LITIGANT, SUPERIOR COURT
OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE
(SEPTEMBER 11, 2026)**

FILED

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

SEP 11 2026

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of Court
G COOPER, DEPUTY

Case Number: 05D000275

Name: Edward L. Clark
Firm Name:
Street Address: 5582 McFadden Ave
City: Huntington Beach
State: CA
Zip Code: 92649
Telephone No.: 714-448-7145
Fax No.:
E-mail Address: ed@theelectricalexpert.com
Attorney for (*name*):

☒ SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Orange

Street Address: 700 Civic Center Dr. West

Mailing Address: 700 Civic Center Dr. West

City and Zip Code: Santa Ana, CA 92701

Third.Supp.App.2a

**ORDER TO FILE
NEW LITIGATION BY VEXATIOUS LITIGANT**

Type of case: ☒ Family Law

ORDER

Approval to file the attached document is:

- b. ☒ Denied as to Requests Received on 8/20/26,
8/24/26 & 9/2/26.

/s/ {Illegible}
Presiding Judge or Justice
Terri K. Flynn-Peister
Assistant Presiding Judge

Date: 9/11/26

Denied per minute order dated 9/11/26

**MINUTE ORDER, SUPERIOR COURT OF
CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE
(SEPTEMBER 11, 2026)**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
MINUTE ORDER
09/11/2026

Assistant Presiding Judge: TERRI K. FLYNN-PEISTER
Dept.: C6 at OFF THE RECORD
Clerk: G. COOPER
Bailiff: NOT PRESENT
Reporter: NOT PRESENT
Case Type: DISSOLUTION WITH CHILD
Case Number: 05D000275
Hearing Type CHAMBERS WORK
Appearances NONE

Off the record:

There are no appearances by any party.

The Court, having reviewed and considered the prefiling requests by vexatious litigant Edward Clark, finds and orders the following:

The court is in receipt of prefiling requests from vexatious litigant Edward Clark Jr. received on August 20, 2026, August 24, 2026, and September 2, 2026.

The prefiling requests are hereby DENIED. The proposed filings fail to meet the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 391.7, subdivision (b).

Third.Supp.App.4a

Court orders Clerk to give notice to Respondent.
Respondent to give notice to all other parties.

**EX-PARTE NOTICE OF MOTION
(AUGUST 20, 2026)**

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
AUG 20 2026
DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

EDWARD L. CLARK Jr.
5582 McFadden Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
(714) 448-7145
Email: Ed@TheElectricalExpert.com
In Propria Persona for Plaintiff EDWARD L. CLARK, Jr.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

ATTACHMENT 9

Deborah L Clark.,
Petitioner,

v.

Edward l Clark Jr,
Respondent.

Case No.:05D000275
Assigned to: Judge Pham Cheri

Third.Supp.App.6a

Dept. L-66

EX-Parte NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA AND DEBTORS EXAM
SCHEDULED FOR 8/21/2026.

[concurrently filed incorporated herein by reference
MEMORANDUM POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
DECLARATION OF EDWARD L CLARK]

Date Set: August 21, 2026

Dept L-66

Time: 0845

**MOTION TO QUASH/VACATE
FAMILY LAW ORDERS
(AUGUST 24, 2026)**

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
AUG 24 2026

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

EDWARD L. CLARK Jr.
5582 McFadden Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
(714) 448-7145
Email: Ed@TheElectricalExpert.com

In Propria Persona for Plaintiff EDWARD L. CLARK, Jr.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

ATTACHMENT 9

Deborah L Clark.,

Petitioner,

v.

Edward l Clark Jr,

Respondent.

Third.Supp.App.8a

Case No.:05D000275
Assigned to: Judge Pham Cheri

Dept. L-66

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO QUASH/VACATE
VOID COURT ORDERS AND SUBPOENAS ISSUED

8/21/2026

[concurrently filed incorporated herein by reference
MEMORANDUM POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
DECLARATION OF EDWARD L CLARK; PETITION FOR
WRIT OF MANDAMUS IN APPELLATE COURT]

Date Set
Dept L-66
Time:

**NOTICE OF MOTION
TO VACATE FAMILY LAW DOCKET
(SEPTEMBER 2, 2026)**

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
SEP 02 2026

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

EDWARD L. CLARK Jr.
5582 McFadden Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
(714) 448-7145
Email: Ed@TheElectricalExpert.com

In Propria Persona for Plaintiff EDWARD L. CLARK, Jr.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

ATTACHMENT 9

Deborah L Clark.,

Petitioner,

v.

Edward l Clark Jr,

Respondent.

Third.Supp.App.10a

Case No.:05D000275
Assigned to: Judge Pham Cheri
Dept. L-66

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO VACATE
ALL HEARINGS ON FAMILY COURT DOCKET FOR
LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION
Vacate fraudulent abstract of judgment and levies
filed against respondent

[concurrently filed incorporated herein by reference
MEMORANDUM POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE;
DECLARATION OF EDWARD L CLARK;]

Date Set
Dept L-66
Time:

**MOTION TO DISMISS
ALL FAMILY LAW MATTERS
(SEPTEMBER 8, 2026)**

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE
SEP 08 2026

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

Edward L. Clark Jr.
5582 McFadden Ave
Huntington Beach, Calif. 92649
In Proper
(714) 448-7145

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

Deborah L. Clark., an individual,

Petitioner,

v.

Edward L Clark Jr.,

Respondent.

Case No.:05D000275
Assigned to: Hon. Yolanda Torres
Dept. L-67

Third.Supp.App.12a

MOTION TO Dismiss PURSUANT TO RULE 3.1385(B)
ALL FAMILY LAW MATTERS ORDERS ISSUED ABSENT
ALL JURISDICTION

**[MEMORANDUM POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
DECLARATION OF EDWARD L CLARK JR.]**

FAMILY LAW CASE DOCKET

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

The Family Law Case Information Website contains information for family law cases.

Information regarding viewing/purchasing documents and sanctions warning for including social security numbers and financial account information in documents submitted to the court (PDF).

What Case Types are on the Web:

Divorces, Legal Separation, Nullity/Annulment

Domestic Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse

Child Support cases filed by the Department of Child Support Services

Parentage cases filed after January 1, 2023 that do not involve assisted reproduction

What is NOT on the Web:

CASE #05D000275

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

PARTICIPANTS

Third.Supp.App.14a

HEARINGS

Days	Time	Description	Department
10/30/2026	08:45	HEARING - MOTION - CONSOLIDATE	L66
10/30/2026	08:45	HEARING - MOTION - OTHER	L66
10/30/2026	08:45	HEARING - ORDER - APPEARANCE & EXAM	L66
08/21/2026	08:45	HEARING - ORDER - APPEARANCE & EXAM	L66
06/12/2026	08:45	HEARING - ORDER - APPEARANCE & EXAM	L66
04/03/2026	08:45	HEARING - RFO - OTHER	L66
04/03/2026	08:45	HEARING - MOTION - OTHER	L66
04/03/2026	08:45	HEARING - MOTION - QUASH	L66

CART

© 2026 Superior Court of Orange County

1.0.0

<https://fampub.occourts.org/ShowCase.do?showCaseForm.index=0&showCaseForm.tab=0&showCaseForm.number=05D000275#caseAnchor>

BLANK PAGE



SUPREME COURT
PRESS