

No. 25-7243

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HUONG GILMER GIACCIO — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

RAY DAVIS, ET AL., — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

HUONG GILMER GIACCIO
(Your Name)

3719 KELLY BLVD
(Address)

CARROLLTON, TEXAS 75007
(City, State, Zip Code)

945-546-0934
(Phone Number)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner **Huong Gilmer Giaccio**, appearing pro se, respectfully petitions for rehearing of this Court's **June 29, 2026**, order denying the petition for a writ of certiorari in **No. 25-7243**.

RULE 44.2 BASIS

This petition is filed within **25 days** after the Court's June 29, 2026, order denying certiorari.

This petition is restricted to **intervening circumstances of substantial effect and substantial grounds not previously presented**. It is filed in good faith and not for delay.

Petitioner does not ask the Court merely to reweigh the same record. The new and urgent circumstance is that, after the certiorari petition was filed and after the Court's denial, the City's municipal enforcement continued and escalated through additional unsupported, disputed citations, fines, warrant pressure, and arrest threats.

INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES

The petition concerned municipal enforcement, warrantless/code-enforcement conduct, repeated unsupported citations, fines, and lack of meaningful review.

Since the proceedings below, and continuing after the certiorari filing, Petitioner has continued to face fines, charges, warrant pressure, and arrest threats from municipal citations that Petitioner disputes as unlawful, unsupported, and lacking violation evidence.

The continuing citations include:

- **Citation 22821**, issued **July 10, 2025**;
- **Citations 33108, 33109, and 33110**, issued **December 23, 2025**;
- **Citations 33129, 33130, and 33131**, issued **April 20, 2026**.

Petitioner states that these citations continue the same municipal enforcement pattern challenged in the petition. The citations are based on alleged short-term rental, lodging-license, single-family rental registration, and occupancy allegations. Petitioner disputes the alleged violations and disputes being the

owner/operator/responsible party. **Petitioner and her family have been living in this home since purchased in 2016, never leasing the home for long or short term rental.**

Petitioner further states that she was arrested or jailed in connection with the municipal enforcement process on or about:

- **September 30, 2024;**
- **October 28, 2024;**
- **July 9, 2025;**
- **March 5, 2026.**

The continuing enforcement is not historical. Petitioner remains exposed to fines, charges, arrest, warrants, and confinement based on disputed citations and alleged nonpayment, without production of competent violation evidence, sworn complaints, reliable witness evidence, rental records, payment records, booking records, or proof that Petitioner personally committed the alleged violations.

WHY REHEARING IS WARRANTED

The denial of certiorari should be reconsidered because the injury has not ended. The challenged municipal enforcement has continued through later citations, continuing fines, warrant pressure, and arrest risk.

Despite repeated challenges, the City continued issuing new disputed citations and using fines, warrant pressure, and arrest risk against me, without meaningful evidentiary review, ability-to-pay review, or lawful alternatives.

Petitioner alleges that the city continues to pursue enforcement without producing reliable evidence showing:

- who created or controlled any online listing;
- who booked the property;
- who paid money;
- who stayed at the property;
- that Petitioner received payment;
- that Petitioner operated a long-term or short-term rental;

- that Petitioner owned or controlled the property at the time alleged;
- that more than four unrelated people occupied the property.

Those citations should be dismissed for lack of violation evidence

The continuing municipal enforcement threatens liberty and property interests. It is not merely a past dispute. Petitioner remains exposed to arrest, jail, warrants, capiases, fines, and court pressure.

This Court has recognized that a person may not be jailed for inability to pay without an inquiry into ability to pay and consideration of lawful alternatives. Petitioner has no job, no income, and no ability to pay thousands of dollars. Petitioner has requested community service and lawful alternatives and is not refusing lawful process.

Rehearing is warranted so the Court may consider whether denial of review should stand in light of the continuing enforcement, repeated arrest history, new citations, ongoing fines, and continuing risk of deprivation of liberty without meaningful evidentiary review, ability-to-pay review, or lawful alternatives.

RELIEF REQUESTED

For these reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court:

1. **Grant rehearing;**
2. **Vacate the June 29, 2026, denial of certiorari;**
3. **Request a response** if the Court deems one helpful; and
4. **Reconsider the petition for writ of certiorari** in light of the intervening circumstances described above.

Respectfully submitted,
 /s/ Huong Gilmer Giaccio
Huong Gilmer Giaccio
 Petitioner, Pro Se
 3719 Kelly Blvd
 Carrollton, Texas 75007
 Phone: 945-546-0934
 Email: hgfive@yahoo.com
 Date: **July 8, 2026**



CERTIFICATE REQUIRED BY RULE 44.2

I, **Huong Gilmer Giaccio**, certify that this **Petition for Rehearing** is restricted to the grounds specified in **Supreme Court Rule 44.2**, including intervening circumstances of substantial effect and substantial grounds not previously presented.

I further certify that this Petition is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Executed on **July 8, 2026**

/s/ Huong Gilmer Giaccio

Huong Gilmer Giaccio

Petitioner, Pro Se

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Huong Gilmer Giaccio', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

DECLARATION REGARDING CONTINUING MUNICIPAL ENFORCEMENT

I, **Huong Gilmer Giaccio**, declared under penalty of perjury:

1. I am the Petitioner in **Supreme Court Case No. 25-7243**.
2. Fines, charges, arrests, warrant pressure, and enforcement against me have continued from municipal citations that I dispute as unlawful, unsupported, and without violation evidence.
3. The continuing citations include **22821, 33108, 33109, 33110, 33129, 33130, and 33131**.
4. Citations **33108, 33109, and 33110** were issued on or about **December 23, 2025**.
5. Citation **22821** was issued on or about **July 10, 2025**.
6. Citations **33129, 33130, and 33131** were issued on or about **April 20, 2026**.
7. I was arrested or jailed in connection with the municipal enforcement process on or about **September 30, 2024; October 28, 2024; July 9, 2025; and March 5, 2026**.
8. I dispute the alleged violations. I dispute being the owner, operator, or responsible party for the alleged violations.
9. I have requested evidence and sworn complaints supporting each citation.
10. I have no job, no income, and no ability to pay thousands of dollars in fines and costs.
11. I have requested community service, waiver, discharge, ability-to-pay review, and other lawful alternatives.
12. I am not refusing to appear or comply with lawful process. I ask for lawful procedures, evidence, ability-to-pay review, and protection from arrest-based enforcement based on unsupported citations and inability to pay.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **July 8, 2026**

/s/ Huong Gilmer Giaccio

Huong Gilmer Giaccio

Petitioner, Pro Se

