

26-5218

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

FILED

JUN 08 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

YVONNE JETT, Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, Respondents.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WORKERS COMPENSATION PROGRAM

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Yvonne Jett, Pro Se  
19972 Stanton Avenue #62  
Castro Valley, CA 94546  
(510) 593-9465

**QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether the lower courts violated Petitioner's Fifth Amendment right to due process by dismissing her claims as frivolous and moot without an evidentiary hearing despite documentary evidence?
2. Whether dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. §1915 is proper where document evidence supports allegations of fraud, spoliation, and constitutional violations?
3. Whether the lower courts erred in finding the case moot despite continuing injury and hardship?
4. Whether dismissal without meaningful consideration of evidence violated the Fourth, Seventh, and Fourteenth Amendments?
5. Whether the exclusive jurisdiction of (FECA) and the (CSRA) bar federal courts from reviewing systemic fraud, malfeasance, and claim manipulation by federal agencies, or must the Supreme Court intervene to protect the civil rights of thousands of injured employees when the administrative system fails to provide an adequate remedy?
6. Whether the (CSRA) and (FECA) unconstitutionally strip courts of jurisdiction over Colorable First and Fifth Amendment claims brought by Forma Pauperis litigants, presenting an issue of National Importance concerning the Constitutional Rights of all Federal Employees?

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner: Yvonne Jett

Respondents: United States Postal Service, United States Department of Labor,  
Workers Compensation Program

Related Proceedings:

Yvonne Jett v. United States Postal Service, No. 3:24-cv-01472-SK, United States  
District Court for the Northern District of California. Judgment entered December 2,  
2024.

Yvonne Jett v. United States Postal Service, No. 24-7739, United States Court of  
Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Judgment entered March 17, 2026.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Questions Presented .....i**

Parties to the Proceeding and Related Proceedings ..... ii

Table of Contents ..... iii

Table of Authorities ..... iv

Opinions Below ..... 1

Jurisdiction ..... 2

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved ..... 3

Statement of the Case ..... 4

Reasons for Granting the Petition ..... 5

Conclusion ..... 6

Appendix.....7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944)

Loeffler v. Frank, 486 U.S. 549 (1988)

Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)

McCarthy v. Madigan, 503 U.S. 140 (1992)

Rochin v. California, 342 U.S. 165 (1952)

Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372 (2007)

Southern Pacific Terminal Co. v. ICC, 219 U.S. 498 (1911)

Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592 (1988)

28 U.S.C. §1254(1)

28 U.S.C. §1915

39 U.S.C. §401(1)

5 U.S.C. §8116(c)

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12

**OPINIONS BELOW**

The original judgment of the Ninth Circuit and the orders of the District Court are in the petition attachments along with the latest Employment Compensation Appeals Board that never addressed any errors in the case.

**JURISDICTION**

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was entered on March 17, 2026. Jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1). The district court judgment was entered on December 2, 2024. Jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1331,1346,8128(b).

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

U.S. Const. amends. IV, V, VII, and XIV.

28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(e)(2).

28 U.S.C. §1331. 1346,8128(b).

39 U.S.C. §401(1) (Postal Reorganization Act).

5 U.S.C. §8116(c) (Federal Employees' Compensation Act).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12.

Relevant provisions are reproduced in the Appendix.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Petitioner Yvonne Jett was employed by the United States Postal Service. During her employment, Petitioner suffered injuries while performing her duties and sought accommodation related to those injuries. Petitioner alleges that accommodation was denied and that she was terminated twice despite her injuries and Schedule Award Case closed. Petitioner further alleges alteration of records, destruction of evidence, fabricated reports, edited video evidence, spoliation of evidence FCE report and fraud affecting the integrity of the adjudicative process.

Petitioner pursued administrative remedies timely, appeals timely and subsequently sought relief in federal courts. The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Petitioner's claims moot with prejudice on December 2, 2024. Petitioner appealed.

On March 17, 2026, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed dismissal, concluding that the action was frivolous, moot, and that Petitioner was deny proceeding in forma pauperis with no explanation. Petitioners contend these conclusions were reached despite documentary evidence and without an evidentiary hearing, or jury trial.

**REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

I. This case presents important questions regarding dismissal of claims as frivolous despite documentary evidence supporting the allegations and affecting injured federal employees.

II. The decision below presents an important question regarding application of the mootness doctrine. Petitioner contends continuing injury and hardship remain unresolved and relies on *Southern Pacific Terminal Co. v. ICC*.

III. The petition presents important questions concerning due process and access to the courts. Petitioner relies upon *Mathews v. Eldridge*, *Webster v. Doe*, *McCarthy v. Madigan*, and *Loeffler v. Frank*

IV. The case presents important questions regarding allegations of fraud upon the court and spoliation of evidence. Petitioner relies upon *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*

V. The petition presents important questions under the Fourth, Fifth, Seventh, and Fourteenth Amendments.

VI. Review is warranted because the petition presents recurring questions concerning federal employees, government accountability, and access to the courts.

VII. Review is warranted so that federal employees are not subjected to prejudicial errors that only the Supreme Court can fix.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Yvonne Jett', with a stylized, cursive script.

Yvonne Jett

Pro Se

Dated: July 10, 2026