No. 26-6108

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
OCT 30 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

SAMAR CHATTERJEE, PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

HDFC BANK (HDB), RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

DC COURT OF APPEALS
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SAMAR CHATTERJEE
(Your Name)

2301 E STREET NW, UNIT A210
(Address)

WASHINGTON, DC 20037
(City, State, Zip Code)

202-670-5403
(Phone Number)

(Cover Page)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

This writ raises Fifth Amendment Due Process violations of U.S. Constitution by the DC Court of Appeals, the Superior Court of DC and the HDFC Bank conspired to reverse a valid judgement without proper deliberations and process.

We are raising Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection clause violations of U.S. Constitution thru conspiracy by the above three Respondents.

It also involves violations of DC Superior Court Civil Rule 60 by Judge Williams in conspiracy with HDFC Bank.

It also involves violations of DC Superior Court Rule 59 by Judge Williams in conspiracy with HDFC Bank.

It also involves violations of DC Superior Court Rule 54(b) by Judge Williams in conspiracy with HDFC Bank.

It also involves violations of the Federal Tort Claims Act, 1946 and denial of Tort Liability.

These violations are a matter of grave public concern since it causes a serious loss of public trust in our judicial system.

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.

1. **Samar Chatterjee, Pro Se, 2301 E Street NW, Unit A210, Washington DC 20037. Email: samarc1942@gmail.com**
2. **HDFC Bank (HDB), Represented by Attorney Jennifer S. Leete, Esquire, 1601 K ST NW, Washington DC 20006.**
3. **Superior Court of DC, 500 Indiana Ave NW, Washington DC 20001.**
4. **Judge Yvonne Williams, 500 Indiana Ave NW, Washington DC 20001.**

RELATED CASES

Superior Court of District of Columbia: Samar Chatterjee v. HDFC Bank (HDB) No. 2018-CA-004838-B (July 09, 2018).

District of Columbia Court of Appeals: Samar Chatterjee v HDFC Bank (HDB) No. 25-CV-0803 & 26-CV-0082 (September 16, 2025)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 4

JURISDICTION 4

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 5

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 5

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 6

CONCLUSION 9

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Table of Authorities Cited

APPENDIX B – DC Court of Appeals Order of September 14, 2026 (2pages)

APPENDIX C – Verification Affidavit

APPENDIX D – Proof of Service dated October 29, 2026

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

DC Superior Court Rule 60
DC Superior Court Rule 59
DC Superior Court Rule 54(b)
US Constitution, Fifth Amendment
US Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment
US Federal Tort Claims Act

OTHER

(Appendix A)

OPINIONS BELOW

The Petitioner SAMAR CHATTERJEE is filing this Writ of Certiorari as a Pro Se applicant. Hence, he has not been able to do a comprehensive study of the Court Opinions in relation to this case. However, selected Opinions will be presented as the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED in the APPENDIX A of this Writ.

JURISDICTION

In accordance with United States Supreme Court Rules, Petitioner hereby makes the following disclosures of jurisdiction:

1. **Any and all lawsuits filed in the DC Courts and then deliberated in the DC Court of Appeals have jurisdiction in the U.S. Supreme Court.**
2. **COMMON SENSE matters IN THE ENTIRE WORLD, if violated, do have jurisdiction in the U.S. Supreme Court.**
3. **Subject Matter Jurisdiction, Article 28 of American Convention on Human Rights, 1969.**
4. **Furthermore, violations of U.S. Constitution as well as the Rules of the DC Courts by any or all parties are subject to jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court.**
5. **For cases from state courts: This case is from the DC Courts. The date on which the highest state court decided my case was September 14, 2026. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.**
   The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Article 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL & STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. This Writ involves the violations of the U.S. Constitution's Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause by all the Respondents.
2. This Writ involves the violations of the U.S. Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause by all the Respondents.
3. This Writ involves the Federal Tort Claims Act 1946 Tort Liability.
4. This Writ involves the violations of the DC Superior Court Civil Rule 60 by all the Respondents.
5. This Writ involves the violations of DC Superior Court Rule 59 by all the Respondents.
6. This Writ involves the violations of DC Superior Court Rule 54(b) by all the Respondents.
7. This Writ is unique in addressing a combination of Constitutional and State Statutory violations that have grave importance to the public on a national scale.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This Case was originally filed in the DC Superior Court on July 9, 2018 by the Applicant/Plaintiff claiming fraud by the Respondent HDFC Bank (HDB). On July 22, 2019, Judge Y. Williams entered a judgement in favor of the Petitioner requiring the Defendant HDFC Bank to pay the defrauded amount $289,660.14 plus interest to the Samar Chatterjee, the Petitioner.
2. The judgement sent a strong message to the Respondent HDFC Bank that you cannot commit blatant fraud and cover it all up saying "there's no way we could have known, there's nothing else we could have done" when this was all 100% intentionally

conducted by everyone in HDFC Bank knowingly and intentionally.

3. While the Plaintiff was making serious efforts to collect the judgement amount from the Defendant, on November 12, 2025 the HDFC Bank filed a Motion to vacate the abovementioned judgement of July 22, 2019 under Rule 60(b)(4). There was no valid rationale for such a Motion which should have been rejected by Judge Williams as it was filed after over 5 years, even though the Defendant was served all required notices of the court deliberations and judgements from July 9, 2018 to date, as approved by the DC Superior Court/Judge Williams.
4. On January 13, 2025, Judge Williams vacated her judgement of July 22, 2019 based on several false claims and claiming lack of jurisdiction. This was in total contradiction to her earlier approval of jurisdiction and acceptance of service made by the Petitioner under Rule 4. The Petitioner followed all the requirements of service under Rule 4 and served all necessary documents on the HDFC Bank both domestically as well as internationally. Thus, the basis of Judge Williams decision to vacate the judgement was illegal and unconstitutional. This writ to the Supreme Court intends to demonstrate that Judge Williams has violated the DC Laws and the U.S. Constitution by reversing a legal judgement. Much of the reasons presented by Judge Williams are based on false and unverified information that is demonstrated in this Writ and the REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT below.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This Petitioner have done everything in his power to enable expeditious review, including seeking speedy entry of summary judgment and securing an expedited briefing and argument schedule

at the court of appeals. Based on the conclusions of the court of appeals, the Appellant has a cause of action since the Respondents not only violated their own Court Rules but also violated express constitutional prohibitions designed to protect Due Process and Equal Protections.

The DC Superior Court Judge Williams relied on Rule 60(b)(6) to void her judgement of July 22, 2019 using false information and ignoring information that was available to her. The Defendant HDFC Bank (HDB) was surely served all documents relating to the judgement and subsequent orders of the Court under Rule 4 on July 30, 2019 as well as on later dates. The HDFC Bank was served all relevant documents which included the original Complaints and the first judgement of 2019 under the Hague Convention thru the Ministry of Law & Justice, Dept of Legal Affairs, 4th Floor, Kartavya Bhavan-2, New Delhi 110001, India by Sushila Maru and Namit Maru as Process Server on July 30, 2019. See attached Affidavit in APPENDIX C. Thus, the order of Judge Williams on Jan 13, 2025 was defective and should be at once voided by this Court. This was a clear violation of the DC Superior Court Civil Rule 60 and Rule 60(b)(6) also.

Since altering or amending the 2019 judgement required a Motion to be filed within 28 days after entry of judgement under the DC Superior Court Civil Rule 59, the Respondents failed to do so, and hence violated this DC Court Rule 59. The DC Court of Appeals failed to recognize these blatant violations of the DC Court Rules cited above. As such, the Appellate Court failed to protect the Petitioner and public against DC Superior Court's defective order which should have been rejected.

A review of the DC Superior Court deliberations after July 22, 2019 shows constant continuous violations of the Due Process Clause of the US Constitution. Further, the deliberations of Judge Williams after July 22, 2019 have been opaque, secretive and collusive, thus violating the

Fourteenth Amendment and the Equal Protection Clause of the US Constitution. Hence, the 2025 order of Judge Williams was defective and a fruit of blatant violations of the US Constitution.

This Court also recently reaffirmed that parties who can trace their injuries to a separation of powers violations are entitled to call on the courts for protection. As the Court reiterated, "we have found it sufficient that the challenger 'sustain[s] injury' from a judicial act that allegedly exceeds the official's authority." *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau*, No. 19-7, 2020 WL 3492641, at *8 (U.S. June 29, 2020) (quoting *Bowsher v. Synar*, 478 U.S. 714, 721 (1986)). The Court's decision confirms its prior determination in *Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board* that such claims are viable.

The courts have recognized an implied private right of action directly under the Constitution to challenge judicial actions under the Appointments Clause or separation-of powers principles.'" 561 U.S. 477, 491 n.2 (2010) (quoting Brief for United States at 22, *Free Enter. Fund*, 561 U.S. 477 (2010) (No. 08–861)). But, as the Court observed, private plaintiffs are entitled to such "relief as a general matter[.]" *Id.* (citing *Bell v. Hood*, 327 U.S. 678, 684 (1946). "It is an established practice for this Court to sustain the jurisdiction of federal courts to issue injunctions to protect rights safeguarded by the Constitution"; *see also Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 320, 327 (2015). "The ability to sue to enjoin unconstitutional actions by state and federal officers is the creation of courts of equity, and reflects a long history of judicial review of illegal judicial action, tracing back to England."; *accord* App. 29a "Where plaintiffs, like Sierra Club, establish that they satisfy the requirements of Article III standing, they may invoke separation-of-powers constraints to challenge judicial action."

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Hence, the final order of the DC Superior Court dated January 13, 2025 should be rejected at once and the prior order dated July 22, 2019 may kindly be reinstated.

Respectfully Submitted: Samar Chatterjee

Samar Chatterjee, Pro Se Petitioner Phone: 202-670-5403
Address: 2301 E Street NW, Unit A210, Washington DC 20037.

Date: October 29, 2026

NOTICE OF SERVICE: **See Attached in APPENDIX D.**