No. 26-5980

FILED
JUN 29 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

AYOOLA AJAYI — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Gregory Lee Lueck — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

In the Supreme Court of the State of Utah
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

AYOOLA AJAYI
(Your Name)

USCF, PO Box 165300
(Address)

SLC, UT 84116
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) Violations of equal protection Clause
2) Violations of due process Clause of the fourteenth Amendment protection
3) Courts Open - Redress of injury
4) Gate keeper Clause

LIST OF PARTIES

A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is provided below. If a party is a corporation with a stock ticker symbol, that symbol is also included.

Gregory Lee Lueck

RELATED CASES

- Gregory Lee Lueck V. AYOOLA AJAYI NO# 210902657 Third judicial District Court Final Judgement entered 11-24-2025.
- Gregory Lee Lueck V. Ayoola Adisa Ajayi #20260013-CA In the Utah Court of Appeals. Judgement entered 26th, febuary 2026
- Gregory Lee Lueck V. Ayoola Adisa Ajayi No #20260502-SC In the Supreme Court of the State of Utah. Judgement entered May 19, 2026
- Workman V. Nagle Constr., Inc., 802 P.2d 749, 751 (Utah Ct, App. 1990).
- Serrato V. Utah transit Auth., 2000 UT App 299, 917, 13 P.3d 616

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 12

JURISDICTION 13

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 14

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 15

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 16

CONCLUSION 17

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A => ~~DENIAL~~ Denial of request to set aside default judgement Third ~~district~~ Judicial district Court - Salt lake city Court Case# 210902657

APPENDIX B Court ruled it lack jurisdiction In the Utah Court of Appeals of State of Utah Appellate Case NO# 20260013-CA

APPENDIX C Denied petition for writ of certiorari In the Supreme Court of the State of Utah Supreme Court NO# 20260502-SC

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES — PAGE NUMBER

~~Utah Code 78B-3-208 Section 1~~

- metropolitan water district of SLC and Sandy --- 15,
  V. Zdenek Sorf. NO# 20110443
- Lund V. Brown 2000 UT 75, 11, 11 P.3d 277 --- 15
- Menzies V. Galetka, 2006 UT 81, 54, 150 --- 15
  P.3d 480
- ~~Case~~ 20120523 — — — — — — — — 15
- Bounds V. Smith, 430 U.S 817, 822 (1977) --- 15
- §11. Courts open - Redress of Injuries ----- 15
- City of Cleburne V. Cleburne Living Ctr., 473 --- 14,
  U.S 432, 439 (1985)
- Lee V. City of los angeles, 205 F.3d 668, 686 (9th Cir. 2001) --- 16
- Wolf V. McDonnell, 418 U.S 539, 556 (1974) —— — 14
- Meyer V. ~~Inter Steel~~ West Corp., 632 P.2d 879, 880 (Utah 1981)

STATUTES AND RULES

§11. Courts open - Redress of Injuries — — —

proper service of process rule — —— 16

Utah Code 78B-3-208 Section 1 --- 16

~~Court open~~

OTHER

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 _____ 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 United States district 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.

[X] For cases from **state courts:**

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

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

The opinion of the Court of Appeals of State of Utah court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

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

JURISDICTION

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

[ ] 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).

[X] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was May 19th 2026
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

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

[X] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including ~~A~~April 29,26 (date) on March 24,26 (date) in Application No. ~~A~~202600113

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- Prisoners have ~~first~~ fourteenth Amendment protections from being deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law Wolff V. Donnell, 418 U.S 539, 556 (1974) Appendix A
- Equal protection Clause City of Cleburne V. Cleburne Living Ctr., 473 U.S 432, 439 (1985) - Appendix B
- ~~Court a~~ Proper service of process — Appendix A
- Gatekeeper Clause — Appendix B

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 5-18-2021 plaintiff- Gregory Lee Lueck filed wrongful death against me in the Utah State district Court and according to attatched exibit A1 249055-1000 A. Your honor you will see that an hearing for this case was scheduled for 7/13/2022. The court did not advised me of this but the invitation was sent to the prison who did not advised inmates of any Schedule until the day of the Schedule for Safety reason. Prison advised the Court I can not be made available and need to be rescheduled reschedule but the clerk of the Court did not respond to multiple email sent. Please see in the exhibit and you will see when she finally responded she said I already has defaulted without even been notified of either the hearing or the judgement. During one of my conversations with prison Contract attorney 2 years later, they advised me of this and multiple letters was sent to the clerk of the Court to find out what happened but never hear back. Please see the exhibit A, A1, B and you will see I even have to grieved prison multiple time to find out what happened [redacted]. Upon finding out I requested for the default judgement to be set aside base on Utah Supreme Court ruling in Case # 20110443 of excusable neglect "Lund V. Brown 2000 UT 75, 11, 11 P.3d 277" which also stated Courts discretion should be excercise in furtherance of justice and should incline towards relief in doubtful case to the end that party may have a hearing. Menzies V. Galetka, 2006 UT 81, 54, 150 P.3d 480 which support granting relief in Controversy Cases. The Court was advised that the clerk of the Court who act as the gate keeper to the Court violate my right by not doing her job and made it imposible for the prison to Carry it's job under Court access "Bounds V. Smith, 430 U.S 817, 822 (1977)" which states prisoner must be given meaningful access to the Court and violation of Courts open- Redress of injury that gives everyone right to defend themself in cases they are party to. But the appeal court find one State ruling that seems to go against every federal and State ruling to violate my fourteen Amendment of due process clause that protect prisoners of being deprived life, liberty or property without due process "Wolff V. mcdonell, 418 U.S 539, 556 (1974)" using ruling from workman V. Nagle Constr., Inc, 802 P.2d 749, 751 (Utah Ct. App. 1990) that stated 30 days to file notice of Appeal Commences on the date that the judgement is entered regardless of when the party receive notice of judgement. But both parties in this case have a lawyer which inmates fighting pro se who has no access to computers or phones to get notifications like those lawyers does, get bad side of the deal like in my Case when the Clerk do not do their job, or the prison do not notify or delieve their mails which violate my fourteenth amendment of due process but the Same Court allowed inmates who have money to get lawyers better Chances and right to file maning motion if the delay is due to their lawyer which also violate my equal protection right just because I do not have money to hire lawyer I can blame or that can notify me "City of Cleburne V. Cleburne Living Ctr., 473 U.S 432, 439 (1985)". Even the Same Court ruled in Case # 20120523 that public respect for the judiciary IS necessary but seems not to apply it equally

Reason for Granting the petition

Gate

Gatekeeper clause should protect our due process and 14th amendment; especially when you are poor or a prisoner and Court using a case between two firms with money as an excuse for gatekeeper's is a miscarriage of justice


REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Your honor the appeal Court find one State case That goes against both State and federal several ruling of due process and also Ignore the violation of gate keeper Clause when it didn't take into Consideration the fact that the clerk do not notify me of the Judgement or reply to The prison in times regarding The hearing rescheduling. Even the same State rule in "In re christensen, 304 P.3d 835, 735 Utah Adv. Rep 4 (Utah 2013) Case 20120523. that when Court Ignore the law with no apparent justification, they undermine public confidence in the Integrity of the judiciary which is necessary for the rule of law". The appeal Court rule that it's okay to violate my fourteenth amendment, equal protection eventhough the Situation is beyond my Control and it is against it is own higher Court ruling that neglect is excusable if it is beyond our control. people in free world have access to notifications through emails or phone apps which we in prison do not have access to. And it even get worst when we Cant afford lawyers to tell us status of our cases prisoner is a member of protected class. which means having limited access to Stuffs other or defendants plaintiff have access to Should limit chances to the right other people plaintiff to defend them have access to neither Should inmates not having money to hire a lawyer or have access to email or phone apps which the same government Consider Controband Should be use against us. which means our only hope of knowing what is going on or get a chance of timely appeal depend on the gate keeper doing their jobs which in this case is the clerk letting me know what is going on and prison delievering our mails. But when the Court now State our gatekeeper clause violation does not matter because of a ruling in "workman v. Nagle Constr., Inc., 802 P.2d 749, 751 (Utah Ct. App. 1990)". which is a case between 2 big and rich companies with big lawyers been applied to an inmate filing pro se is another way of saying when you are a prisoners and poor our fourteen amendment which is guaranteed to every american regardless of class Can be taken away and equal protection does not apply to us. Eventhough Utah Code 78B-3- pg-16 208 section 1 was not even followed

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 7/20/26