

26-5417

ORIGINAL

No. _____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUL 28 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

LORENZO RICHARDSON,

Petitioner,

v.

GERALD BAKER; JET INSURANCE COMPANY; ON POINT RISK SOLUTIONS;
ADAM B. MIDGETTE; THOMAS L. TEAL; TIM C. JARVIS; J.R. MOORE;
DAVID S. BRANNON; WAKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE; GARNER POLICE
DEPARTMENT; SAM HAMADANI, Judge; JUDICIAL BRANCH OF NORTH
CAROLINA; and C.T. JONES,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

No. 25-2068

"Presenting Important, Recurring Questions of Federal Law Protections, For the Faithful and Uniform Application of Procedural Safeguards; Meaningful Access to Courts, De Jure Due Process, Article III Adjudication, and the Promoting of Equal Administration of Justice for All Pro Se Litigants and In Forma Pauperis".

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Pro Se- (pertinent, in propria) Petitioner

LORENZO RICHARDSON

3108 Fields Drive

Raleigh, North Carolina [27603]

919-779-1249

Zorich82@yahoo.com

RECEIVED

JUL 30 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

(Sup. Ct. R. 10.. This Court's supervisory, 1% acceptance review can promote clarity, and restore public confidence in the consistent administration of unbiased justice)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a federal district court may lawfully dismiss a (valid and factual) *pro se*, civil rights complaint and jury trial demand (prematurely) at the pleading stage- in which specifically states & identifies constitutional violations- sufficient to satisfy the federal notice-pleading standard, before service of process and before any defendant had appeared, rebutted, or filed any official, responsive pleading (at all) to the case..... Hence, does that dismissal deprive the Petitioner of the adversarial (adjudication, judiciary) process contemplated by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and of meaningful appellate review, in conjunction with the opportunity to cure any alleged petition discrepancies (**Rule 8 and Rule 15(a)**).
2. Whether Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure **3(c)**, as interpreted by this Court in *Smith v. Barry*, requires federal courts to liberally construe timely docketed, *pro se*, post-judgment filings as the functional equivalent of a notice of appeal- and when the petition objectively & abundantly manifested an evident intent to obtain appellate review ...
3. Whether a court of appeals may lawfully dismiss an appeal for proposed lack of jurisdiction without recognizing timely coordinated, post-judgment filings as satisfying the functional requirements of **Rule 3(c)**, and where those filings provided notice of the challenged judgment and clearly sought judicial review of the denial.....
4. Whether a district court's dismissal of a *pro se* complaint & subsequent injunction order-without permitting amendment (and *de novo review*)- after the submission of a

proposed amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) is consistent with **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)** and this Court's precedents favoring, liberal amendment and construction of pro se pleadings.....

5. Whether this Court should exercise its supervisory (1% “acceptance”) authority under **Rule 10** to clarify the uniform application of these recurring federal procedural principles governing appellate jurisdiction, amendment of pleadings, and **meaningful access to appellate review for self-represented, in forma pauperis litigants**.....

LIST OF PARTIES

The parties to the proceedings below are as follows:

Petitioner

- Lorenzo Richardson

Respondents

- Gerald Baker
- Jet Insurance Company
- On Point Risk Solutions
- Adam B. Midgette
- Thomas L. Teal
- Tim C. Jarvis
- J.R. Moore
- David S. Brannon
- Wake County Sheriff's Office
- Garner Police Department
- Sam Hamadani, (*individually and in her official Judge capacity*)
- North Carolina Judicial Branch
- C.T. Jones

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED	1
LIST OF PARTIES	2
RELATED PROCEEDINGS	3
OPINIONS BELOW	4
JURISDICTION	5
CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY, AND RULE PROVISIONS INVOLVED	5
INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT	7
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	8
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND PROCEEDINGS BELOW	9
I. Commencement of the Civil Action	9
II. District Court Screening and Dismissal	9
III. The timely December 5, 2024 Post-Judgment Filings	9
IV. Subsequent District Court Proceedings	10
V. Proceedings in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	11
I. This Case Presents Vital and Resurfacing Questions Concerning the Collective Enforcement of Federal Procedural Law and is an Appropriate Vehicle.....	11
II. The Court of Appeals' Reliance on Bowles v. Russell Did Not Resolve Whether the December 5 Filings Functioned as a Notice of Appeal	11
III. This Court Should Clarify the Relationship Between Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) and Screening Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)., and the Proper Application of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c).	12

IV. Review Is Warranted to Promote Meaningful Access to the Federal Courts and the Equal Administration of Justice.....	12
V. All The Questions Presented Warrant the Supervisory Review Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 10.....	12
IV. This Case Presents an National Important Question Concerning Amendment of Pleadings Following Screening Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)	13
CONCLUSION	14
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED <i>IN FORMA PAUPERIS</i>	15
RULE 39 AFFIDAVIT -DECLARATION	16
PROOF OF SERVICE	21

(21 PAGES OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI, and 40 PAGES OF APPENDIXES)

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (- Index to Appendices)	App. I
Appendix A — Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, entered March 30, 2026	App. 1
Appendix B — Order Denying Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc, entered May 1, 2026	App. 9
Appendix C — Judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, entered November 7, 2024	App. 11
Appendix D — Order Denying Reconsideration, entered December 9, 2024	App. 13
Appendix E — Relevant December 5, 2024 Post-Judgment Filings	App. 16
Appendix F — Order Denying Relief Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60, entered July 23, 2025	App. 35
Appendix G — Relevant Judicial-Conduct Acknowledgment and Disposition Documents, if included	App. 41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205 (2007)	p.11
Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89 (2007)	
Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178 (1962)	
Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)	
Smith v. Barry, 502 U.S. 244 (1992)	p.1, p.8, p.11

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Guide for Prospective Indigent Petitioners for Writs of Certiorari (Supreme Court of the United States)	
---	--

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina

- · Original Complaint filed: **September 18, 2024** (Case No. **5:24-cv-00537-FL**)
- · Amended Complaint: **October 25, 2024** (Doc. 13)
- · (Unlawful) Judgment entered: **November 7, 2024** (Doc. 15)
- · Motion for Reconsideration: **December 5, 2024** (Doc. 22)
- · Amended Complaint: **December 5, 2024** (Doc. 23)
- · Motion for Miscellaneous Relief: **December 5, 2024** (Doc. 24)
- · Order on Motion for Reconsideration entered: **December 9, 2024** (Doc. 25)
- · Additional Motion for Reconsideration: **December 13, 2024** (Doc. 26)
- · Motion to Set Aside Judgment: **April 4, 2025** (Doc. 29)
- · Order denying **Rule 60** Motion to Set Aside: **July 23 /24, 2025** (Doc. 30)
- · -Pre-Filing Injunction Order entered **August 18, 2025**.
- · - Notice of Appeal taken to Fourth Circuit: **September 5, 2025** (Doc. 32)
- · Fourth Circuit Opinion: **March 30, 2026** (Doc. 36)
- · Fourth Circuit Judgment: **March 30, 2026** (Doc. 37)
- · Fourth Circuit Order (rehearing denial): **May 1, 2026** (Doc. 39)
- · Mandate: **May 12, 2026** (Doc. 40)

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

- Case No. **25-2068.....** *Richardson v. Baker, et al*
- Opinion entered **March 30, 2026**.
- Petition for Rehearing denied **May 1, 2026**

(Fourth Circuit)-- Judicial Misconduct Complaint No. 04-25-90021

- Filed against Judge Louise Wood Flanagan on **February 25, 2025** under **28 U.S.C. § 351**.
- Unlawfully & unjustly dismissed on **March 20, 2025** by Chief Judge Albert Diaz contrary to the **Judicial Conduct and Disability Act**.
- The Clerk notified the aggrieved petitioner on **March 21, 2025** of the ability & right to Review- by the Fourth Circuit Judicial Council within 42 days.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The reputable, aggrieved petitioner justifiably pursues that a writ of certiorari be swiftly issued- to review & reverse the erroneous and unlawful judgments below.

OPINIONS BELOW

- The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was entered on **March 30th 2026** appears at **Appendix A** to this Petition and is **unpublished**.
- The unlawful order entered on **May 1st 2026** by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit denying the Petitioner's timely Petition for Panel Rehearing and Petition for Rehearing En Banc appears at **Appendix B**.
- The Judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, entered on **November 7, 2024**, appears at **Appendix C** and is **unpublished**.
- The District Court's Order denying Petitioner's post-judgment filings, entered on **December 9, 2024**, appears at **Appendix D** and is **unpublished**.

- The District Court's Order entered on **July 23, 2025** (or July 24, 2025, if that is the correct docket date) appears at **Appendix F** and is **unpublished**.
- The District Court's Order imposing a pre-filing injunction, entered on **August 18, 2025**, appears at **Appendix G** and is **unpublished**.

JURISDICTION

- The date on which the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit erroneously decided on my valid & factual Civil Rights complaint was March 30th, 2026.
- A timely **Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc** was erroneously denied on May 1, 2026, yet this highly pertinent petition is timely filed pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2101 (c)**.
- This Court's supervisory jurisdiction is invoked under **28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)**; and a copy of the Court of Appeals faulty order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY & RULE PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. V

U.S. Const. amend. XIV

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) p.5

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (if cited)

28 U.S.C. § 1915p.7, p.8, p.10, p.11, p.13, p.15

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)p.2 , p.7, p.8, p.9, p.12, p.13.

28 U.S.C. § 2101(c) p.5

Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 p.1

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) p.1, p.2, p.7, p.9 , p.10, p.12, p.13.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) (*if cited*)

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) (*if cited*) p.3

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

Fed. R. App. P. 3(c) p.1, p.8, p.10, p.11

Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)

Fed. R. App. P. 40 (*if cited*)

RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sup. Ct. R. 10 p.2, p.9, p.12, p.13

Sup. Ct. R. 14

Sup. Ct. R. 29 (*if cited regarding service*)

Sup. Ct. R. 30 (*if cited*)

Sup. Ct. R. 33.2p.7, & Administrative Notice about lack of paper copies p.1

Sup. Ct. R. 39

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This pertinent Petition (passionately and) profusely pursues for this Court to favorably exercise its certiorari jurisdiction (and supervisory discretion) to review & repair recurring and important questions concerning the faithful, equal, and uniform application of federal procedural law. Furthermore, the questions presented extend far beyond Petitioner's individual case and implicate the administration of justice throughout the federal courts for litigants throughout the nation proceeding both with counsel and without counsel, including those granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Moreover, Congress enacted *28 U.S.C. § 1915* to ensure that financial hardship does not foreclose meaningful access to the federal courts (*Supreme Court Rule 33.2- IFP petition*); and The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure establish procedural safeguards designed to promote the just determination of civil actions. In addition, this Court has repeatedly recognized that filings submitted by self-represented litigants should be liberally evaluated according to their substance, consistent with governing law. Thus, the Petitioner justly contends that this case presents an appropriate vehicle for reaffirming those established principles and providing guidance on recurring questions concerning the uniform administration of federal procedural law.

Therefore, this Petition principally concerns two recurring procedural issues; of whether Petitioner's coordinated post-judgment filings submitted on December 5, 2024, should have been recognized as satisfying the functional requirements of a timely notice of appeal, & especially when considered according to their substance and under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c). A Second repeating principle would be whether dismissal of a complaint during screening under *28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)*, without meaningful consideration of a proposed amended complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), comports with the liberal amendment

principles recognized by this Court.... Thus, the integrity of the federal judicial system depends not merely, solely upon the existence of procedural safeguards, but also upon their faithful, impartial, and consistent application (of such). Also, when recurring questions arise regarding the interpretation and application of those safeguards, this Court's review serves an important role in promoting clarity, uniformity, and public confidence in the administration of justice. Therefore, this Petition presents such quality questions, & the Petitioner seeks for the Court to grant the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

This Petition presents recurring questions concerning the faithful, equal, and uniform application of federal procedural law governing litigants proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*; and although this case arises from Petitioner's individual proceedings, the questions presented concern the administration of justice in federal courts throughout the Nation. Furthermore, Congress enacted **28 U.S.C. § 1915** to ensure that financial hardship does not bar meaningful access to the federal courts. Also, the **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure** establish procedural safeguards intended to promote the just resolution of civil actions, and this Court has repeatedly recognized that filings submitted by self-represented litigants should be evaluated according to their substance rather than their caption alone- when the governing rules permit. Therefore, again, the first question presented concerns whether Petitioner's coordinated post-judgment filings submitted on December 5, 2024, when viewed collectively and in light of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c) and this Court's decision in *Smith v. Barry*, should have been recognized as the functional equivalent of a timely notice of appeal.

In addition, the second question concerns whether the district court's screening dismissal under **28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)**, without meaningful consideration of Petitioner's proposed amended complaint, complies with the liberal amendment principles embodied in

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) and recognized by this Court. Therefore, clarification of these recurring procedural questions would promote greater consistency in the administration of federal procedural law and assist lower courts in applying established legal standards uniformly to all litigants.... Consequently, because these issues bear directly upon the faithful application of existing federal law and present considerations recognized by Supreme Court Rule 10, this Court's review is truly & sunstantially warranted, (and to reverse the errors and injustice of the lowers courts).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Commencement of the Action

Petitioner Lorenzo Richardson commenced this civil-rights action on September 18, 2024, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, **Case No. 5:24-cv-00537-FL**, asserting claims arising under federal law against the named, numerous liable Respondents. Proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, the Petitioner stated constitutional and statutory violations and sought appropriate declaratory, injunctive, monetary, and all other relief; as the plausible complaint did ential factual allegations and supporting materials intended to satisfy the notice-pleading requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

B. District Court Proceedings

However, before service of process was filed upon any defendant and before any responsive pleading from them, the district court conducted faulty screening, allegedly pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)**, and on November 7, 2024, the district court entered, erroneous judgment dismissing the action. Thus, the Petitioner contends that the dismissal occurred before

meaningful adversarial development of the record and before the liberal amendment principles embodied in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) had been fully applied.

C. Petitioner's December 5, 2024 Filings

Furthermore, on December 5, 2024, Petitioner filed coordinated post-judgment documents, including a Motion for Reconsideration, a Notice of Claim for Relief, a proposed Amended Complaint, a Motion for Leave to File Electronically, supporting exhibits, and related materials. Petitioner maintains that, when evaluated according to their substance and considered collectively, these filings objectively sought further judicial review of the district court's judgment and preserved the issues now presented in this Petition. The district court denied post-judgment relief on December 9, 2024.

D. Proceedings in the Court of Appeals

Petitioner subsequently sought review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. The court of appeals dismissed the appeal in part on jurisdictional grounds and otherwise, unlawfully affirmed the district court's discriminatory disposition. Petitioner thereafter timely sought panel rehearing and rehearing *en banc*, which were unjustly denied and this timely Petition followed.

E. Questions Presented

Therefore, this case presents recurring questions concerning the proper application of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), and 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Thus, the Petitioner rightfully holds that clarification of these questions would promote greater consistency in the administration of federal procedural law and assist lower courts in applying established legal standards uniformly to litigants proceeding with and without counsel.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. This Case Presents Vital and Resurfacing Questions Concerning the Collective Enforcement of Federal Procedural Law and is an Appropriate Vehicle.

Federal courts regularly adjudicate civil actions brought by litigants proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, and the questions presented extend well beyond the disposition of one, aggrieved Petitioner's individual case. Hence, it is reiterated that Congress enacted that statute to ensure that financial hardship would not bar adequate access to the federal courts; and while the Federal Rules established procedural guardrails intended to promote the just determination of civil actions. Consequently, the faithful and consistent application of those protections is a matter of continuing importance to the administration of justice.

II. The Court of Appeals' Reliance on Bowles v. Russell Did Not Resolve Whether the December 5 Filings Functioned as a Notice of Appeal

Petitioner authentically contends that the coordinated filings submitted on December 5, 2024—including the Motion for Reconsideration, Notice of Claim for Relief, proposed Amended Complaint, supporting exhibits, and related submissions—should have been evaluated collectively to determine whether they objectively satisfied the functional requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c). Also, this Court's decision in Smith v. Barry, 502 U.S. 244 (1992), recognizes that documents not formally captioned as notices of appeal may nevertheless satisfy Rule 3(c) when they objectively convey the information required by the Rule and demonstrate an intent to obtain appellate review. Thus, clarification from this Court would assist lower courts in applying those principles consistently (, & without pro se discrimination).

III. This Court Should Clarify the Relationship Between Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) and Screening Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)., and the Proper Application of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(c).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) reflects a longstanding policy that a Leave to Amend filing should be freely given when justice so requires. Thus, the Petitioner submitted a proposed amended complaint on Dec 5th 2024- together with additional factual allegations, prima facie evidence, exhibits and supporting materials following the district court's faulty judgment from Nov 7th 2024. Therefore, this Petition presents the recurring procedural question of how Rule 15(a)'s liberal amendment policy should operate when a complaint has been dismissed during screening under § 1915(e)(2)(B); and guidance from this Court would promote greater consistency in the administration of federal civil litigation.

IV. Review Is Warranted to Promote Meaningful Access to the Federal Courts and the Equal Administration of Justice.

This Petition does not necessarily seek the “creation of new procedural rights” or exceptions to established jurisdictional requirements. Rather, it seeks the faithful and uniform application of protections that Congress has enacted, and which the Federal Rules expressly provide, and that this Court has recognized as essential to meaningful access to the federal courts. Therefore, Equal justice depends not only upon the existence of those safeguards, but upon their consistent application to all litigants- without discrimination (, whether pro se, indigent & all).

V. All The Questions Presented Warrant the Supervisory Review Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 10.

Supreme Court Rule 10 recognizes that this Court's review is appropriate when important questions of federal law warrant clarification to promote the uniform administration of justice, and the significant questions presented within this petition satisfy those considerations.

**IV. This Case Presents an National Important Question Concerning
Amendment of Pleadings Following Screening Under 28 U.S.C. §
1915(e)(2)(B) .**

Pursuant to *28 U.S.C. § 1915*, each and every year, thousands of litigants commence civil actions in the federal courts while proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, and Congress enacted that statute to ensure that financial hardship does not foreclose meaningful access to the federal judicial system. Therefore, this warranted Writ adequately presents recurring questions concerning the administration of federal procedural law & persistent lack of Federal Clarification- that extend well beyond Petitioner's individual litigation.

Likewise, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure established safety protocols intended to promote the fair and orderly resolution of civil litigation. Also, this Court has repeatedly recognized that filings submitted by self-represented litigants should be evaluated according to their substance (where appropriate under governing law).

Therefore, the questions presented concern the faithful and uniform application of those established principles—not only in Petitioner's proceedings—but in federal courts throughout the Nation. Hence, guidance and edification from this Court would promote greater clarity, consistency, and uniformity concerning the interpretation and application of Federal Laws, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure **15(a)**, Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure **3(c)**, *28 U.S.C. § 1915*, and this Court's precedents governing meaningful access to judicial review.

Accordingly, this Petition presents national discrepancies and deserving considerations recognized by **Supreme Court Rule 10**; which warrants this Court's review (& correction).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing, valid, factual & lawful reasons, the truth speaking Petitioner sincerely contends that this case presents recurring and important questions concerning the faithful, equal, and uniform application of federal procedural law - that unquestionably deserve this Court's review. Nevertheless, this Petition does NOT necessarily seek "the creation of new rights" (nor the relaxation of established procedural requirements.) Rather, it seeks the faithful and uniform application of protections already enacted by Congress, and that the Federal Rules expressly provide, and that this Court has long recognized as essential to meaningful access to the federal courts and the fair administration of justice. Therefore, the questions presented extend significantly, far past the circumstances of a single litigant; and do heavily concern the consistent administration of justice throughout the federal judicial system and the proper application of established, procedural safeguards governing litigants proceeding with and without counsel. Furthermore, equal justice under the law and the integrity of the federal judicial system depends not only upon the existence of legal rights and procedural protections, but upon their faithful, impartial, and consistent uniform application, & nondiscrimination against indigency & pro se parties. Thus, when recurring questions arise concerning those substantial protections, this Court's review serves an important role in promoting clarity, consistency, and public confidence in the administration of justice...Hence, Petitioner plausibly contends that this extremely pertinent, valid & factual case presents an appropriate opportunity for this Court to reaffirm those enduring principles for the benefit of all who seek justice in federal courts. Accordingly, Petitioner adamantly seeks that this Court grants the Writ of Certiorari and award such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Truthfully detailed (discussed) , **LORENZO RICHARDSON** Petitioner, Pro Se, 7/27/26



ALL RIGHTS RESERVED