


26-5166

No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



LUKE MASOOD ARABZADEGAN — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

W. F. RAMSEY-I UNIT MED. D., et al RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Luke Masood Arabzadegan / TDCJ-ID#: 1316202
(Your Name)

W. F. Ramsey-I Unit / 1100 FM 655
(Address)

Rosharon, TX, 77583
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. HAVE THE LOWER FEDERAL COURTS ALLEGEDLY MADE RULINGS WHICH ARE ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS, AND/OR AN ABUSE OF THEIR DISCRETION, BY UNREASONABLY HOLDING PETITIONER TO THE STANDARD OF AN ATTORNEY?

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

☒ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

Felicia Onemu; Victoria Williams; Unnamed, yet to be named, University of Texas Medical Branch Supervisor(s); Unnamed, yet to be named, Corrections Medical Care Supervisor(s); Linda C. Hone; J. Back; & Jeania Pegoda.

RELATED CASES

Arabzadegan vs. Onemu, No. 4:23-cv-03006, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas. Judgment entered March 31, 2025.

Arabzadegan vs. Onemu, No. 24-20335, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Judgment entered December 26, 2024.

Arabzadegan vs. Onemu, No. 25-20137, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Judgment entered October 20, 2025.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4-6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7-12
CONCLUSION.....	13

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, March 26, 2025 dismissing civil lawsuit.
- APPENDIX B- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, November 18, 2024 order denying Petitioner's appeal.
- APPENDIX C- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, October 20, 2025 order denying Petitioner's petition for rehearing en banc.
- APPENDIX D- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, February 18, 2026 order denying Petitioner's appeal.
- APPENDIX E- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, March 11, 2026 judgment issued as the mandate.
- APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Haines vs. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)	7, 10, 12
Martinez vs. Aaton, 570 F.3d 317 (10th Cir. 1978)	4, 7
M. Ve. Mt. As. of U.S., Inc. vs. St. F. M. A. I. Co., 463 U.S. 29 (1983)	9, 10, 12

STATUTES AND RULES	
5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)	8, 10, 12
18 U.S.C. § 241	12
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	2
42 U.S.C. § 1997d	12
Supreme Court, Rule 10(a)	8, 10, 12
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rules	
10	
11	7, 9
12	7, 9
17	7, 9
26(a)	7, 9
27(a)(3)(A)	10
30	9
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules	7, 9
12(b)(1)	4, 7
12(b)(6)	4, 7

OTHER
N/A

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix D to the petition and is

☒ reported at 2026 U.S. App. LEXIS 4833; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was February 18, 2026.

☒ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

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

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Article & Amendments

Art. IV

1st

5th

6th

14th

12

9, 10, 12

9, 10, 12

9, 10, 12

9, 10, 12

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner asserts the following facts:

On August 09, 2023, the [REDACTED] United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas-Houston Division (hereinafter "District Court"), filed Petitioner's Prisoner's Civil Rights Complaint. See District Court Civil Action No. H-23-3006 (hereinafter "USD#1"). On September 18, 2023, the District Court granted Petitioner in forma pauperis status. See USD#1. On February 09, 2024, the District Court filed Petitioner's more definite statement. See USD#1. Within said statement, Petitioner requested a "Martinez Report" pursuant to Martinez vs. Aaron, 570 F.2d 317 (10th Cir. 1978), and sought the following documents: "Plaintiff's Travis County Jail Medical Records; Plaintiff's TDCJ-ID Medical Records; Plaintiff's TDCJ-ID Grievance File; & The [TDCJ-ID] W. F. Ramsey-I Unit Law Library Logs, which would be pertinent to Plaintiff's claim against Defendant Pegoda." See USD#1, ECF, No. 20, p. 11. Petitioner filed several documents with the District Court relevant to named, and unnamed, yet to be named, TDCJ-ID Inmate Trust Fund Department Employees (hereinafter "ITFE"), to which while acting under color of state or territorial law, allegedly conspired with Respondents Back & Pegoda to retaliate against Petitioner for exercising his access to courts rights via a lawsuit against Respondents Back & Pegoda, by allegedly committing theft & conversion of Petitioner's Inmate Trust Fund Account (hereinafter "ITFA") funds, and Petitioner believes said requested documents are material to the claims of his lawsuit. See USD#1, ECF, Nos. 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 36, 66, 109, & 153. On August 23, 2024, the District Court denied Petitioner's request for in forma pauperis on appeal to the 15th Circuit Court of Appeals (hereinafter "CA5"). See USD#1, and CA5 Case No. 24-20335 (hereinafter "CA5#1"). On November 18, 2024, CA5 denied Petitioner's appeal. See CA5#1 & Appendix-B. On December 02, 2024, the District Court also denied Petitioner in forma pauperis on appeal. See CA5#1. On February 13, 2025, the District Court filed Petitioner's motion for discovery of alleged federal constitutional & statutory violations, yet the District Judge refused to rule on said motion. See USD#1. On March 18, 2025, the District Court struck from the record Petitioner's challenge to Respondents' motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, R. 12(b)(1) & 12(b)(6). See USD#1. On March 20, 2025, the District Court granted Respondents' motion to strike his challenge to Respondents' motion to dismiss as the court considered such untimely. See USD#1. On March 26, 2025, the District Court issued final judgment, dismissing Petitioner's lawsuit. See USD#1 & Appendix-A. On April 21, 2025, the District Court granted Petitioner in forma pauperis for his appeal. See USD#1 & CA5 Case No. 25-20137 (hereinafter "CA5#2"). On June 05, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to compel for statement of facts, and requested the foregoing "Martinez Report" documents. See CA5#2. On June 23, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's June 16, 2025 notice no action would be taken on his

foregoing motion to compel. See CA5#2. On August 19, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2. On September 02, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to ITFDEs' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner via sending CA5 50 percent of his ITFA funds. See CA5#2. On September 10, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's September 03, 2025 notice his motion to Supplement the appellate record was denied. See CA5#2. On September 12, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to the denial of his motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2. On September 26, 2025, Petitioner received notice from CA5 his objection relevant to denial of motion to Supplement the appellate record was conceived as a motion for reconsideration and filed; notice no action would be taken on his objection relevant to ITFDEs' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner via sending CA5 50 percent of his ITFA funds; and denied his motion for reconsideration of motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2. On September 29, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a petition for rehearing en banc. See CA5#2. On October 13, 2025, Petitioner received Respondents' September 29, 2025 response to his timely brief. See CA5#2. On October 14, 2025, Petitioner timely mailed CA5 a motion for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. On October 22, 2025, Petitioner received notice from CA5 his petition for rehearing en banc, and motion to dismiss Respondents' appeal were filed. See CA5#2. On October 29, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's October 20, 2025 order denying his petition for rehearing en banc. See CA5#2 & Appendix-C. On November 05, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's October 29, 2025 order granting him until November 03, 2025 to file his reply brief. See CA5#2 & "Exhibit-A." On November 07, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a timely 2nd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief, and motion for affirmative relief of leniency toward Pro Se Petitioner's comprehension and prosecution of his appeal. See CA5#2. On November 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court a motion for leave and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See enclosed motions. November 24, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a 3rd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. On December 02, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a request for judicial notice in relation to his delayed 3rd motion for extension of time. See CA5#2. On December 09, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's December 01, 2025 notice his motion for affirmative relief of leniency toward Pro Se Petitioner's comprehension & prosecution of his appeal was filed, and no action would be taken on his 2nd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. On December 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court an inquiry letter regarding his November 10, 2025 motions for leave. Also on December 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to Petitioner's timely 2nd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. On December 12, 2025, Petitioner requested this Court intervene regarding CA5 disregarding his timely 2nd motion for extension of time to respond. On December 19, 2025, Petitioner

mailed CA5 his timely 4th motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. Also on December 19, 2025, Petitioner received this Court's December 15, 2025 return of his motion for leave for this Court to address the lower Federal Court's alleged abuse of discretion; motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis; and notice to file for certiorari. See "Exhibit-B" & enclosed motions. On December 30, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's December 22, 2025 notice his motion for reconsideration of the November 17, 2025 clerk's letter taking no action on Petitioner's motion for extension of time was denied. See CA5#2. On January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed CA5 a petition for rehearing of extension of time to reply en banc. See CA5#2. Also on January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed this Court an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari. On January 08, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's January 02, 2026 notice no action would be taken on his timely 3rd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief, as his motion for reconsideration of his 2nd motion for extension of time was denied on December 22, 2025. See CA5#2. On January 20, 2026, Petitioner timely mailed this Court his petition for writ of certiorari. On January 26, 2026, Petitioner mailed the Texas Attorney General a copy of his petition for writ of certiorari, and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Also on January 26, 2026, Petitioner mailed CA5 his 5th motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2. On January 29, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's January 16, 2026 notice his objection to timely 2nd motion for extension of time was filed, and instructed to file a motion to file reply brief out of time. See CA5#2. On January 30, 2026, Petitioner mailed this Court to stay proceedings in CA5. On February 02, 2026, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to file reply brief out of time. See CA5#2. Also on February 02, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's January 23, 2026 notice no action for 4th motion for extension. See CA5#2. On February 12, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's February 06, 2026 notice no action taken on 5th motion for extension. See CA5#2. On February 26, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's February 18, 2026 denial of his appeal. See CA5#2, [REDACTED] Appendix-D. On March 17, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's March 11, 2026 notice final ruling issued. See CA5#2. On March 18, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's March 11, 2026 judgment as the mandate. See Appendix-E & CA5#2. Also on March 18, 2026, Petitioner received this Court's March 13, 2026 return of his December 12, 2025 requested intervention, and refusal to file. On March 23, 2026, Petitioner received this Court's March 18, 2026 return of his motion to address the lower Federal Court's alleged abuse of discretion due to lack of jurisdiction. On March 26, 2026, Petitioner received this Court's March 13, 2026 notice to refile his certiorari. On April 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed this Court a notice of discrepancy regarding his "PROOF OF SERVICE" missing from his January 20, 2026 certiorari. On April 15, 2026, Petitioner timely mailed this Court his petition for writ of certiorari, and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. HAVE THE LOWER FEDERAL COURT'S ALLEGEDLY MADE RULINGS WHICH ARE ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS, AND/OR AN ABUSE OF THEIR DISCRETION, BY UNREASONABLY HOLDING PETITIONER TO THE STANDARD OF AN ATTORNEY?

(i). Standard of Review

Petitioner is a Pro Se litigant, incarcerated in the TDCJ-ID W. F. Ramsey-I Unit, within Brazoria County, Texas, he has struggled mightily while litigating in the District Court and CA5, and he has continuously requested a lenient review of his workproduct. See Haines vs. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972) (per curiam) (generally).

However, Petitioner is of the belief the aforementioned lower Federal Court's have unreasonably held Petitioner to the standard of an attorney.

(a). Denial of material evidence relevant to his civil lawsuit

Petitioner filed an omnibus of motions in an effort to expand the record to obtain evidence he believes material to his claims, yet the lower Federal court's denied all of his motions.

Petitioner asserts the following facts:

1. On August 09, 2023, the District Court filed Petitioner's Prisoner's Civil Rights Complaint. See USDC#1;
2. On February 09, 2024, the District Court filed Petitioner's more definite statement. See USDC#1;
3. Within the foregoing more definite statement, Petitioner requested an expansion of the record via a "Martinez Report" pursuant to Martinez vs. Aaron, 570 F.3d 317 (10th Cir. 1978), and sought the following documents: "Plaintiff's Travis County Jail Medical Records, Plaintiff's TDCJ-ID Medical Records, Plaintiff's TDCJ-ID Grievance File, & The [TDCJ-ID] W. F. Ramsey-I Unit Law Library Logs." See USDC#1, ECF, No. 20, p. 11 & Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (hereinafter "FRAP"), Rs. 10, 11, 12, 17, & 30;
4. The District Court refused to expand the record, and Petitioner is of the belief said court has denied him evidence material to his claims;
5. Petitioner filed an omnibus of motions relevant to his requested expansion of the record, but the District Court denied them all. See USDC#1, ECF, Nos. 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 36, 66, 109, & 153;
6. On February 13, 2025, the District Court filed Petitioner's motion for discovery of alleged Federal Constitutional and Statutory violations, yet the District Judge refused to rule on said motion. See USDC#1;
7. On March 18, 2025, the District Court struck from the record Petitioner's challenge to Respondents' motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, R. 12(b)(1) & 12(b)(6). See USDC#1;
8. On March 26, 2025, the District Court issued final judgment, and

- dismissed his lawsuit. See USD#1 & Appendix-A.;
9. On June 05, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to Compel for Statement of Facts, and requested the foregoing "Martinez Report" documents. See CA5#2.;
 10. On June 23, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's June 16, 2025 notice no action would be taken on his foregoing motion to Compel. See CA5#2.;
 11. On August 19, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2.;
 12. On September 10, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's September 03, 2025 notice his motion to Supplement the appellate record was denied. See CA5#2.;
 13. On September 12, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to denial of motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2.;
 14. On September 26, 2025, Petitioner received notice from CA5 his objection relevant to denial of motion to Supplement the appellate record was conceived as a motion for reconsideration and filed, then the court denied said motion for reconsideration. See CA5#2.;
 15. On September 29, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a petition for rehearing en banc. See CA5#2.;
 16. On October 29, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's October 20, 2025 order denying his petition for rehearing en banc. See CA5#2.;
 17. On November 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court a motion for leave for this Court to address the lower Federal court's alleged abuse of discretion, and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.;
 18. On December 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court an inquiry letter regarding his November 10, 2025 motions for leave.;
 19. On December 19, 2025, Petitioner received this Court's December 15, 2025 return of his motion for leave for this Court to address the lower Federal court's alleged abuse of discretion, motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and notice to file for certiorari.;
 20. On January 06, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari.

Therefore, Petitioner is of the belief the lower Federal court's have allegedly and unreasonably held him to the standard of an attorney's allegedly made rulings which were "arbitrary, capricious, [and/or] an abuse of discretion" (5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)) by denying Petitioner material evidence to his civil lawsuit; as so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power[;]" (Supreme Court (hereinafter "SC"), R. 10(a));

and allegedly harmed & injured Petitioner's Federal Constitutional & Statutory rights. See United States Constitution (hereinafter "SC"), 1st, 5th, 6th, & 14th Amendments (hereinafter "Amds."); Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of United States, Inc. vs. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (irrational rulings due to found facts and choices made); and FRAP, Rs. 10, 11, 12, 17, & 30.

(2). Disregarding Petitioner's timely filed motions requesting an extension to file his reply brief

Petitioner filed several motions relevant to extending the time for him to file a reply brief, yet CA5 has ~~allegedly~~ and unreasonably applied Federal law to prevent said brief from being timely.

Petitioner asserts the following facts:

1. On October 13, 2025, Petitioner received Respondents' September 29, 2025 response to his timely brief. See CA5#2.
2. On October 14, 2025, Petitioner timely mailed CA5 a motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2.
3. On November 05, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's October 29, 2025 order granting him until November 03, 2025 to file his reply brief. See CA5#2 & "Exhibit-A."
4. "The response must be filed within 10 days after service of the motion.. .." FRAP, R. 27(a)(3)(A);
5. On November 07, 2025 (or within 10 days of service), Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief, ~~and~~ and motion for affirmative relief toward Pro Se Petitioner's comprehension and prosecution of his appeal. See CA5#2.
6. On November 24, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a timely 3rd motion for extension of time for ~~to~~ Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief.
7. On December 02, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a request for judicial notice in relation to his delayed 3rd motion for extension of time. See CA5#2.
8. On December 09, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's December 01, 2025 notice his motion for affirmative relief of leniency toward Pro Se Petitioner's comprehension and prosecution of his appeal was filed, and no action would be taken on his 2nd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2.
9. On December 10, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to Petitioner's timely 2nd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief & no action ruling. See CA5#2.
10. On December 10, 2025, Petitioner requested this Court intervene regarding CA5 disregarding his 2nd motion for time to respond.
11. On December 19, 2025, Petitioner timely mailed CA5 his 4th motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief. See CA5#2.
12. Also on December 19, 2025, Petitioner received this Court's December 15, 2025 return of his motion for leave for this Court to address the lower Federal court's alleged abuse of discretion, motion for leave

to proceed in forma pauperis, and notice to file for certiorari. See "Exhibit-8" & enclosed motions.

13. On December 30, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's December 22, 2025 notice his motion for reconsideration of the November 17, 2025 clerk's letter taking no action on Petitioner's motion for extension of time was denied. See CA5#2.
14. On January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed CA5 a [redacted] petition for rehearing of extension of time to reply en banc. See CA5#2.
15. Also on January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed this Court an application to extend the time to file this petition for a writ of certiorari; &
16. On January 08, 2026, Petitioner received CA5's January 02, 2026 notice no action would be taken on his timely 3rd motion for extension of time for Petitioner to respond to Respondents' reply brief, as his motion for reconsideration of his 2nd motion for extension of time was denied on December 22, 2025. See CA5#2.

Therefore, Petitioner is of the belief the lower Federal courts have allegedly and unreasonably held him to the standard of an attorney; allegedly made rulings which were "arbitrary, capricious, [and/or] an abuse of discretion" (5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)) by denying [redacted] extending the time for Petitioner to file his reply to Respondents' brief; also far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power [.] (S.C. R. 10(a)); and allegedly harmed & injured Petitioner's Federal Constitutional and Statutory rights. See USC, 1st, 5th, 6th, & 14th Amds.; Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of United States, Inc. vs. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (irrational rulings due to found facts and choices made); Haines vs. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972) (per curiam) (generally); and FRAP, R. 26(b).

(C). Allegedly condoning named, and unnamed, yet to be named, State actors' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner

Petitioner filed an omnibus of documents in an effort to quell named, and unnamed, yet to be named, State actors' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner for exercising his access to courts rights, yet the lower Federal courts denied everything Petitioner filed.

Petitioner asserts the following facts:

1. Petitioner filed several documents with the District Court relevant to named, and unnamed, yet to be named, TDCJ-ID ITFDEs, while acting under color of State or territorial law, which allegedly conspired with Respondents' Back & Pegoda to retaliate against Petitioner for exercising his access to courts rights via a lawsuit against Respondents' Back & Pegoda, by allegedly committing theft & conversion of Petitioner's ITFA Funds, yet the District Judge denied all of Petitioner's documents intended to reveal the alleged conspiracy. See USDC#1, ECF, Nos. 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 36, 66, 109, & 153.
2. On February 13, 2025, the District Court filed Petitioner's motion for discovery of alleged Federal Constitutional & Statutory violations, yet

- the District Judge refused to rule on said motion. See USDC#1;
3. Within the foregoing motion, Petitioner respectfully requested the District Judge acquire money order tracking numbers from Petitioner's Uncle in an effort to attain evidence relevant to allegedly proving which ITFDES' committed theft and conversion of Petitioner's ITFA funds, but the District Judge ignored Petitioner's plea for justice. See USDC#1, ECF, No. 109, pp. 2, 3-4, & Affidavit, pp. 1-3;
 4. On March 26, 2025, the District Court issued final judgment, and dismissed Petitioner's lawsuit. See USDC#1 & Appendix-A;
 5. On June 05, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to Compel for Statement of Facts, and requested an expansion of the record to include the foregoing documents relevant to proving his claims of theft & conversion. See CA5#2;
 6. On June 23, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's June 16, 2025 notice no action would be taken on his foregoing motion to Compel. See CA5#2;
 7. On August 19, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 a motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2;
 8. On September 02, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to ITFDES' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner via sending CA5 50 percent of his ITFA funds. See CA5#2;
 9. On September 10, 2025, Petitioner received CA5's September 03, 2025 notice his motion to Supplement the appellate record was denied. See CA5#2;
 10. On September 12, 2025, Petitioner mailed CA5 an objection relevant to the denial of his motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2;
 11. On September 26, 2025, Petitioner received notice from CA5 his objection relevant to denial of motion to Supplement the appellate record was conceived as a motion for reconsideration and filed, notice no action would be taken on his objection relevant to ITFDES' allegedly retaliating against Petitioner via sending CA5 50 percent of his ITFA funds, and denied his motion for reconsideration of motion to Supplement the appellate record. See CA5#2;
 12. On November 14, 2025, Petitioner mailed this Court a motion for leave for this Court to address the lower Federal Court's alleged abuse of discretion, and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis;
 13. On December 19, 2025, Petitioner received this Court's December 15, 2025 return of his motion for leave to address the lower Federal Court's alleged abuse of discretion, motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and notice to file for certiorari. See "Exhibit-B" & enclosed motions;
 14. On January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed CA5 a petition for rehearing of extension of time to reply en banc. See CA5#2. At the current time this petition is pending;
 15. Also on January 06, 2026, Petitioner mailed this Court an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of

Certiorari.

Therefore, Petitioner is of the belief the lower Federal courts have allegedly and unreasonably held him to the standard of an attorney; allegedly made rulings which were "arbitrary, capricious, [and/or] an abuse of discretion" (5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)) by allegedly refusing to quell named, and unnamed, yet to be named, State actors' retaliating against Petitioner for exercising his access to courts rights via theft and conversion of roughly \$1,700.00 of his ITFA Funds; "so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power [,"] (SC, R. 10(a)); and allegedly harmed & injured Petitioner's Federal Constitutional and statutory rights. See USC, Art. IV, 1st, 5th, 6th, & 14th Amds.; Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of United States, Inc. vs. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (irrational rulings due to found facts and choices made); Haines vs. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972) (per curiam) (generally); 18 U.S.C. § 241; & 42 U.S.C. § 1997d.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Luke Masood Aratzadegan
Luke Masood Aratzadegan/TDCS-ID# 1316202
Date: April 15, 2026
W. F. Ramsey-I Unit
1100 FM 655
Rosharon, TX. 77583
Pro Se Petitioner