

ORIGINAL

26-152

No. 25-\_\_\_\_

FILED

MAY 08 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

\_\_\_\_\_  
DORA L. ADKINS,

*Petitioner,*

v.

ROSSLYN SYNDICATE, LC.,

*Respondent.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fourth Circuit**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

\_\_\_\_\_  
DORA L. ADKINS

*Pro Se*

P.O. Box 3825

Merrifield, VA 22116

(703) 751-8653

DoraAdkins7@aol.com

May 8, 2026

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ("Fourth Circuit") properly AFFIRMED the district court's order. *Pet. Appendix A.*

II. Whether the Fourth Circuit improperly issued an Order to Show Cause while simultaneously affirming the lower court's judgment, thereby violating Petitioner's right to due process. *Pet. Appendix A.*

III. Whether the Fourth Circuit erred in denying Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc when substantial questions of law and fact remained unresolved. *Pet. Appendix B.*

IV. Whether the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia ("District Court") properly denied Adkins' motion for leave to file a "Proposed Emergency Complaint," (Dkt. 1), properly denied Adkins' Motion to Expedite, properly denied Adkins' Emergency Injunction and properly ordered the hearing noticed for Wednesday, December 10, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. cancelled. *Pet. Appendix C.*

V. Whether the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia ("District Court") properly denied Adkins' Motion for Leave from the Court to File a Proposed Emergency Amended Complaint (Dkt. 18). *Pet. Appendix D.*

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING**

Petitioner Dora L. Adkins was the plaintiff in the district court proceedings, plaintiff/appellant in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals proceedings and is petitioner in this Court. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC., was the defendant in the district court, defendant/appellee in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals and is respondent in this Court.

**CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, Petitioner Dora L. Adkins, appearing *pro se*, states that she is an individual and not a corporation; therefore, there are no parent corporations or publicly held companies owning 10% or more of any stock to disclose.

**LIST OF DIRECTLY RELATED CASES**

- *Adkins v. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC*, No. 1:25-cv-02117, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Judgment entered December 3, 2025.
- *Adkins v. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC*, No. 25-2451, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered March 30, 2026; Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc denied April 21, 2026.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                    | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....                                                                                                                                          | i    |
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING .....                                                                                                                                    | ii   |
| CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....                                                                                                                                | ii   |
| LIST OF DIRECTLY RELATED CASES.....                                                                                                                                | ii   |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....                                                                                                                                          | iv   |
| OPINIONS BELOW .....                                                                                                                                               | 1    |
| JURISDICTION .....                                                                                                                                                 | 1    |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND<br>STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....                                                                                                          | 1    |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....                                                                                                                                        | 2    |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION..                                                                                                                                | 3    |
| I. The Fourth Circuit Departed from the<br>Accepted and Usual Course of Judicial<br>Proceedings by Issuing a Show Cause<br>Order Alongside a Merits Decision. .... | 3    |
| II. The Lower Courts Erred in Denying<br>Emergency Relief Where Irreparable<br>Harm from Chemical Poisoning was<br>Imminently Alleged. ....                        | 3    |
| III. Review is Necessary to Prevent the<br>Permanent Closure of the Courthouse<br>Doors to Pro Se Litigants. ....                                                  | 3    |
| CONCLUSION .....                                                                                                                                                   | 4    |
| APPENDIX                                                                                                                                                           |      |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| CASES                                                                                           | Page(s) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <i>Adkins v. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC</i> ,<br>No. 25-2451 (4th Cir. Mar. 30, 2026) .....          | 2       |
| <i>Adkins v. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC</i> ,<br>No. 1:25-cv-02117<br>(E.D. Va. Nov. 20, 2025) ..... | 2       |
| CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS                                                                       |         |
| U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 .....                                                               | 1       |
| STATUTES                                                                                        |         |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) .....                                                                       | 1       |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) .....                                                                       | 1       |

### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is unreported and is reproduced in the Appendix to this petition (**App. A**).

The orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (Dkt. 1 and Dkt. 18) are unreported and are reproduced in the Appendix to this petition (**App. C** and **App. D**).

The Fourth Circuit's order denying the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc is unreported and is reproduced in the Appendix to this petition (**App. B**).

### **JURISDICTION**

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

1. The judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was entered on March 30, 2026. (**App. A**).
2. A timely petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc was denied by the Fourth Circuit on April 21, 2026. (**App. B**).
3. The petition is filed within 90 days of the date of the order denying rehearing and rehearing en banc.

### **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

1. **U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1:** "...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..."
2. **28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)**
3. **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

This case arises from the District Court's denial of Petitioner's emergency motions and proposed complaint and amended complaints in *Adkins v. Rosslyn Syndicate, LC*. Petitioner sought immediate relief when Petitioner came into direct contact with chemical poisoning in a paid-for Guest Room in two different Guest Rooms at the Respondent, Rosslyn Syndicate, LC. Hotel.

On March 30, 2026, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit issued an unpublished per curiam opinion affirming the District Court's orders. In addition to affirming the denial of emergency relief, the Fourth Circuit took the extraordinary step of issuing an order to the Petitioner to "show cause" why a prefiling injunction and monetary sanctions should not be imposed against Petitioner.

Petitioner filed a timely Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc, which was denied on April 21, 2026. As of April 30, 2026, the Fourth Circuit has not yet issued a final ruling on the Show Cause Order. Petitioner now seeks review by this Court because the lower courts have systematically denied emergency relief and are moving to permanently bar Petitioner from the judicial system, despite the ongoing and irreparable harm Petitioner faces.

## **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

### **I. The Fourth Circuit Departed from the Accepted and Usual Course of Judicial Proceedings by Issuing a Show Cause Order Alongside a Merits Decision.**

The Fourth Circuit's extraordinary step of issuing an Order to Show Cause for a prefiling injunction simultaneously with its per curiam affirmation effectively pre-judged Petitioner as a "frivolous" filer before Petitioner had any opportunity to respond. This procedural shortcut violates the fundamental due process requirement of notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

### **II. The Lower Courts Erred in Denying Emergency Relief Where Irreparable Harm from Chemical Poisoning was Imminently Alleged.**

The District Court and Fourth Circuit failed to properly apply the factors for emergency relief. Petitioner presented evidence of direct contact with chemical poisoning, which constitutes irreparable harm—an injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

### **III. Review is Necessary to Prevent the Permanent Closure of the Courthouse Doors to Pro Se Litigants.**

While courts have the power to manage their dockets, they cannot use prefiling injunctions to bypass the merits of a claim involving physical injury. The Fourth Circuit's denial of the Petition for Rehearing, followed by its move toward sanctions, represents a systemic failure to protect the rights of



self-represented litigants who face ongoing and irreparable harm.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

DORA L. ADKINS

*Pro Se*

P.O. Box 3825

Merrifield, VA 22116

(703) 751-8653

DoraAdkins7@aol.com

May 8, 2026