



No. 26- **479**

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

BABIKER E. OSMAN,
Petitioner,

v.

MAGGIE K. HANSON,
Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the Minnesota Supreme Court

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BABIKER E. OSMAN
Pro Se
4428 Savannah Dr. NW
Rochester, MN 55901
(507) 369-4122
babiker.osman@yahoo.com

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a *pro se* litigant's fundamental right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment is violated when a trial court terminates an employment action via a remote video system by cutting off the video communication feed without warning, immediately signing a dismissal order in the litigant's forced absence, and completely denying the litigant any opportunity to object or address the court.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Babiker E. Osman, is the *pro se* Petitioner, Maggie K. Hanson is the only Respondent. There are no other parties nor were there any additional parties in the lower courts who are no longer part of this petition.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Third District Court, State of Minnesota,
County of Olmsted
Babiker E. Osman (Plaintiff) vs. Maggie K. Hanson
(Defendant)
File No.: 55-CV-24-8890
June 20, 2025

Minnesota Court of Appeals
Babiker E. Osman (Plaintiff) vs. Maggie K. Hanson
(Defendant)
File No.: A25-2317
April 14, 2026

Minnesota Supreme Court
Babiker E. Osman vs. Maggie K. Hanson
File No.: A25-2317
June 17, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION ...	3
I. THE LOWER COURT'S NOMINAL TWO-MINUTE PROCEEDING VIOLATES ESTABLISHED PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS PRECEDENT.....	3
II. THE MISUSE OF REMOTE VIDEO TECHNOLOGY TO EXCLUDE LITIGANTS PRESENTS A QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONAL NATIONAL IMPORTANCE	3
CONCLUSION.....	3
APPENDIX.....	1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

<i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i> , 424 U.S. 319 (1976)	3
---	---

Constitutional Provisions and Statutes:

U.S. Const. amend. XIV § 1	1-2
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	1

OPINIONS BELOW

Third District Court, State of Minnesota,
County of Olmsted
Babiker E. Osman (Plaintiff) vs. Maggie K. Hanson
(Defendant)
File No.: 55-CV-24-8890
June 20, 2025

Minnesota Court of Appeals
Babiker E. Osman vs. Maggie K. Hanson
File No.: A25-2317
April 14, 2026

Minnesota Supreme Court
Babiker E. Osman vs. Maggie K. Hanson
File No.: A25-2317
June 17, 2026

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Minnesota Supreme Court denying review was entered on June 17, 2026. A copy of that order is included in Appendix A at App. 1a. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part

...nor shall any State deprive any person of

life, liberty, or property without due process
of law...

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an employment civil action brought by the Petitioner. On June 20, 2025; the trial court conducted a remote video hearing regarding Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. This proceeding lasted less than two minutes. The hearing commenced with the presiding judge instructing the Defendant's attorney to sign the proposed dismissal order.

Immediately thereafter, the video and audio communication link between the Petitioner and the courtroom was abruptly terminated. Believing the disconnection was the result of a temporary technical glitch in the court's virtual trial platform, Petitioner immediately sought assistance from local court administration personnel. Upon inquiring, administrative staff informed Petitioner that the communication had not glitched, but rather that the judge had already terminated the session and officially concluded the trial proceeding.

At no point during this nominal two-minute window was the *pro se* Petitioner permitted to present arguments, respond to the motion, or verbally address the court prior to the case being dismissed. The Minnesota Court of Appeals and the Minnesota Supreme Court subsequently denied relief, leaving Petitioner entirely without meaningful opportunity to be heard.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. THE LOWER COURT'S NOMINAL TWO-MINUTE PROCEEDING VIOLATES ESTABLISHED DUE PROCESS PRECEDENT.

The Court has long held that the fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard "at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976). By disconnecting a *pro se* litigant from a remote hearing before any argument could be uttered, the trial court functionally conducted a closed-door dismissal, directly violating this Court's core precedents.

II. THE MISUSE OF REMOTE VIDEO TECHNOLOGY TO EXCLUDE LITIGANTS PRESENTS A QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONAL NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

As courts nationwide increasingly rely on remote videoconferencing systems, clear guardrails must be established by this Court to ensure virtual tools are not used to summarily lock self-represented litigants out of their own judicial proceedings.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Babiker E. Osman

Pro Se

4428 Savannah Dr. NW

Rochester, MN 55901

(507) 369-4122

babiker.osman@yahoo.com