26A644

Taylor v Weber et.al.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 2 - 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR, Applicant, Pro Se / In Propria Persona,

v.

SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity as California Secretary of State; SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS; and other respondents properly named in the state-court proceedings.

Related Proceedings:

Supreme Court of California — S299392, S297311, S297203

California Court of Appeal — D088322

San Diego Superior Court — 26CU023327C

EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES — APPLICATION REQUESTING IMMEDIATE FULL COURT CONSIDERATION AND AN IMMEDIATE TEMPORARY STAY OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2026 CALIFORNIA GENERAL ELECTION

In the alternative: A gubernatorial-contest-specific stay, limited certification restraint, emergency preservation of records, and such further lawful relief as the Court determines available.

PRESENTED UNDER SUPREME COURT RULE 22, WITH AN EXPRESS REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FULL COURT.

Extraordinary-circumstances request under Supreme Court Rule 23.3; jurisdictional argument under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1257(a), 2101(f), and 1651(a); in the alternative, request for consideration of the requirements for an extraordinary writ under Rule 20.

CURRENT COURT DISPOSITION: On November 2, 2026, the California Supreme Court entered an order in S299392 stating: "The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied."

Dated: November 2, 2026

Applicant contact: contact@EbonyEsperanza.com

Mailing Address: PO BOX 391, Del Mar, CA 92014

Telephone: 619-438-2467

RECEIVED
NOV - 4 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Extraordinary Circumstances and Demand for Immediate Full Court Consideration

II. Two Threshold Constitutional Questions Concerning Alleged Retaliation

III. Ten Constitutional Questions Preserved in the California Supreme Court Writ

IV. Federal Jurisdiction, State-Court Finality, and the Lawful Basis for Interim Relief

V. Supreme Court Rule 23.3: Prior Requests, Procedural Returns, and Extraordinary Circumstances

VI. Detailed Procedural History and November 2 S299392 Denial

VII. Original Constitutional Injury: Statewide Candidacy, Signatures in Lieu, and Payment Tender

VIII. Alleged Retaliation, Administrative Nonr-esponsiveness, and the Right to Petition

IX. Fifty-One-Year Election-Litigation Research Integrated With the Constitutional Argument

X. The Election Clock and Judicial Clock; Recurrence and Preservation

XI. Standard for Emergency Stay, Purcell, Irreparable Injury, and the Equities

XII. Scope, Implementation, and Alternative Remedies

XIII. Request for Full Court Consideration and Prayer for Relief

XIV. Procedural Mapping and Proposed Exhibits

XV. Table of Authorities, Signature, and Research Inventory

I. EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES AND DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE FULL COURT CONSIDERATION

Applicant Ebony Esperanza Taylor, proceeding pro se, expressly **DEMANDS EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY-CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDERATION BY THE FULL SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.**

This is Applicant's requested disposition and presentation of the matter.

Applicant recognizes that the Court's Rules determine how emergency applications are processed, and that the demand does not itself compel a particular assignment, create jurisdiction, or guarantee relief.

The California General Election is Tuesday, November 3, 2026.

Applicant asks for an immediate temporary statewide stay to the extent the Court possesses jurisdiction and lawful power to award that relief.

If such extraordinary statewide relief is unavailable, Applicant expressly seeks progressively narrower alternatives:

1. A gubernatorial-only stay;
2. Restraint of final gubernatorial certification, where legally authorized;
3. Preservation and segregation of relevant election materials while lawful counting continues; and
4. Expedited briefing and disposition.

Applicant does not ask that unrelated contests be halted as part of the gubernatorial-only alternative.

The extraordinary circumstances are cumulative.

Applicant challenged gubernatorial qualification procedures before the June 2 primary; pursued writ and stay relief in the San Diego Superior Court and Court of Appeal; sought review and original extraordinary relief in the California Supreme Court; received two returns of federal emergency submissions dated July 20 and September 4, 2026, under Rule 23.3; attempted procedural corrections and clarification; alleges continuing adverse administrative actions after exercising her right to petition; and renewed her request for November election relief in California Supreme Court case S299392, whose writ and separate stay application were filed October 30, 2026.

Election deadlines have advanced during that sequence.

Applicant alleges a pattern of procedural stiff-arming and non-responsiveness, including administrative correspondence that went substantively unanswered and federal Clerk correspondence that identified Rule 23.3 deficiencies without resulting in a merits determination.

She does not characterize the Clerk's returns as judicial denials, or assert that any judicial official's improper motive has been established.

Applicant asks that the documented sequence and any proven governmental contribution to delay be assessed when determining urgency and the equitable significance of her diligence.

The historical election-litigation research described below demonstrates that courts can act in hours or days, require immediate responses, decide operative matters before issuing fuller reasoning, and preserve discrete evidence or ballot categories while merits questions are addressed.

It does not establish a right to a statewide stay.

It demonstrates why a prompt, reasoned determination of this application matters: delayed consideration can leave a constitutional question theoretically open while making prospective remedies practically unattainable.

Supreme Court Rule 23.3 recognizes an exception to the ordinary prior-lower-court-request requirement in the most extraordinary circumstances.

Applicant invokes that language with the documented case-specific record.

The Rule is not a waiver of statutory jurisdiction.

Applicant asks the FULL COURT to determine the jurisdictional issue promptly and then address any legally available interim relief.

II. THRESHOLD CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS CONCERNING ALLEGED RETALIATION

QUESTION ONE — RETALIATION FOR PETITIONING

Whether the First and Fourteenth Amendments prohibit state election officials from imposing adverse administrative consequences on a gubernatorial candidate because she sought judicial review of election laws and the administration of her candidacy, where protected petitioning, adverse governmental action, and the necessary causal relationship are supported by competent evidence.

QUESTION TWO — EFFECTIVE ACCESS TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

Whether subsequent allegedly retaliatory administrative measures, disputed official non-responsiveness, and the advance of fixed election deadlines can substantially impair meaningful judicial access and effective constitutional relief, and what remedies are legally available when those claims have been properly preserved and jurisdiction exists.

Applicant alleges that after pursuing relief, officials issued disputed nomination-fee demands and communicated that certain government services would be withheld absent payment.

Applicant contends that these later acts, their timing, and the absence of substantive responses support inquiry into retaliatory motive and continuing constitutional injury.

She acknowledges that timing alone does not prove retaliation.

The record must show the communications, affected duties, authorized decision-makers, causation, and the officials' stated lawful explanations.

Claims arising after prior judgments must also meet independent preservation and jurisdictional requirements. The S299392 filings are relevant to those later allegations.

III. TEN CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS FROM THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT WRIT

The following ten questions preserve the substance and wording of the questions in Applicant's S299392 writ, subject to the file-stamped version and any pinpoint corrections required by the certified record.

QUESTION THREE — STATEWIDE CANDIDATE QUALIFICATION

Whether the First and Fourteenth Amendments permit California to apply county-based signatures-in-lieu restrictions to a gubernatorial candidate in a manner that excludes otherwise qualified California electors from supporting that statewide candidacy without sufficient constitutional justification.

QUESTION FOUR — PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS

Whether procedural due process is violated when election officials allegedly provide conflicting qualification instructions, fail to resolve disputed payment or signature issues despite timely requests, and permit qualification deadlines to expire without a meaningful opportunity for correction.

QUESTION FIVE — THE ELECTION CLOCK

Whether the continuing progression of election-administration deadlines may eliminate meaningful prospective constitutional remedies where a candidate diligently sought administrative and judicial review while those remedies remained available.

QUESTION SIX — GOVERNMENT-CONTRIBUTED DELAY

Whether government officials may benefit from arguments concerning mootness, laches, disruption, or proximity to an election where their own alleged nonresponsiveness materially contributed to delay.

QUESTION SEVEN — SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS AND MEANINGFUL REVIEW

What effect should be given to unexplained summary dispositions of emergency election proceedings when the orders do not identify whether expressly presented federal constitutional questions were reached on their merits or rejected on other grounds.

QUESTION EIGHT — TEMPORARY PRESERVATION

Whether this Court may grant a temporary gubernatorial-contest-specific preservation order while it considers substantial constitutional questions and determines what effective relief remains legally available.

QUESTION NINE — PRACTICAL IRREVERSIBILITY

Which election-administration event, if any, determines when a particular form of prospective relief becomes unavailable, and whether the answer depends upon the specific remedy rather than a single statewide milestone.

QUESTION TEN — STRUCTURAL JUDICIAL TIMING

Whether the interaction of ordinary judicial procedures and accelerated election deadlines can create a constitutionally significant denial of meaningful review when timely raised claims cannot be adjudicated before the requested remedy is lost.

QUESTION ELEVEN — PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL QUESTIONS

Whether Petitioner may seek express state-court preservation and adjudication of federal constitutional claims while accurately identifying prior state-court dispositions and preserving any available subsequent federal review.

QUESTION TWELVE — EXISTING JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Whether existing constitutional, statutory, and equitable authority provides adequate procedures for resolving time-sensitive gubernatorial election controversies, and what questions concerning a more permanent election-synchronized judicial process may appropriately be addressed through future legislation rather than through relief beyond this Court's jurisdiction.

Applicant recognizes that questions alone do not confer jurisdiction or prove entitlement to a stay.

Only questions actually preserved in a qualifying state record may support the particular path of certiorari review, and new issues must satisfy their own jurisdictional prerequisites.

IV. FEDERAL JURISDICTION, STATE-COURT FINALITY, AND LAWFUL INTERIM AUTHORITY

A. Potential Review Under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)

Applicant identifies three distinct California Supreme Court dispositions:

S297203: Petition for review denied August 19, 2026.

S297311: Original writ denied September 16, 2026.

S299392: Original writ petition and stay application denied by signed order on November 2, 2026.

California Rule of Court 8.532(b)(2) governs the finality of specified denials under state law.

Applicant respectfully requests that the November 2 judgment be evaluated as the most recent express denial of the November gubernatorial relief sought below; the August and September orders document the earlier litigation history.

Applicant respectfully invokes 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) and Supreme Court Rule 13 in seeking review of the federal constitutional questions presented in her California Supreme Court

proceedings. Applicant identifies the November 2, 2026 disposition in Case No. S299392, together with the August 19, 2026 disposition in S297203 and the September 16, 2026 disposition in S297311. Applicant respectfully requests immediate consideration of the federal constitutional questions and extraordinary emergency relief necessary to preserve meaningful judicial review before the November 3, 2026 California General Election.

Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975), addresses certain circumstances of federal finality despite further state proceedings, but is not an automatic cure for a denied original writ.

Applicant asks that each disposition be evaluated on its actual record.

Kowis v. Howard, 3 Cal.4th 888 (1992), further cautions against treating every summary writ denial as a plenary merits adjudication.

D. Supreme Court Rule 23.3

The Rule requires particularized reasons relief is unavailable elsewhere, pertinent lower-court requests and orders, identification of the judgment sought to be reviewed, and specific reasons for the stay.

Applicant invokes its most-extraordinary-circumstances language but recognizes that the exception concerns the ordinary first-request-below requirement and does not waive statutory jurisdiction or other mandatory requirements.

E. NEW NOVEMBER 2, 2026 DISPOSITION — S299392

On October 30, 2026, the California Supreme Court filed the petition and separate emergency stay application.

On November 2, 2026, the California Supreme Court entered a signed order in S299392 stating:

"The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied."

The one-page signed order establishes an actual denial of the contemporaneous November gubernatorial stay request.

The order does not expressly adjudicate a broader halt of all statewide contests, nor does its summary wording show that each constitutional question was decided on its merits.

Under California Rule of Court 8.532(b)(2)(C), denial of an original writ petition without issuance of an alternative writ or order to show cause generally is final upon filing.

Federal finality and reviewability under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) must still be established independently.

F. Judgment, Certiorari, and Distinct Relief

F. CERTIORARI JURISDICTION, SUPREME COURT RULE 13, AND TIMELINESS OF FEDERAL REVIEW

Applicant respectfully invokes 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) and Supreme Court Rule 13 concerning review of qualifying final judgments of state courts of last resort involving federal constitutional questions.

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of a qualifying state-court judgment ordinarily must be filed within 90 days after entry of that judgment.

Supreme Court Rule 13.3 provides that the filing period runs from entry of the judgment or order sought to be reviewed, subject to the Rule's provisions concerning qualifying rehearing proceedings.

Supreme Court Rule 30.1 governs computation of that period, including the extension of a deadline falling on a Saturday, Sunday, federal legal holiday, or qualifying Court closure.

Applicant identifies the following California Supreme Court dispositions:

1. Case No. S297203 — August 19, 2026

The California Supreme Court denied Applicant's petition for review on August 19, 2026. Under the ordinary 90-day calculation, the corresponding certiorari deadline is November 17, 2026, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

2. Case No. S297311 — September 16, 2026

The California Supreme Court denied Applicant's original writ proceeding on September 16, 2026. Under the ordinary 90-day calculation, the corresponding certiorari deadline is December 15, 2026, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

3. Case No. S299392 — November 2, 2026

On November 2, 2026, the California Supreme Court expressly denied Applicant's petition for writ of mandate and application for stay concerning the November 3, 2026 California General Election.

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, the ordinary 90-day filing period runs through January 31, 2027. Because January 31, 2027 falls on a Sunday, Supreme Court Rule 30.1 extends the ordinary deadline to Monday, February 1, 2027, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the period for seeking certiorari review of the November 2, 2026 disposition has not expired.

Applicant seeks immediate extraordinary interim relief pending timely pursuit and disposition of certiorari review, to the extent authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1257(a), 1651(a), and 2101(f), together with the applicable Supreme Court Rules.

Applicant recognizes that compliance with Rule 13 establishes timeliness, not independently the existence of federal appellate jurisdiction or entitlement to the particular stay requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Court examine the November 2 disposition, the earlier California Supreme Court judgments, the federal constitutional questions presented, and the complete record of emergency relief sought below in determining its jurisdiction and the availability of lawful interim relief.

Given the imminence of the November 3, 2026 California General Election, Applicant expressly requests **EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES — IMMEDIATE FULL COURT CONSIDERATION**.

F. CERTIORARI JURISDICTION, SUPREME COURT RULE 13, AND TIMELINESS OF FEDERAL REVIEW

Applicant respectfully invokes 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) and Supreme Court Rule 13 concerning review of qualifying final judgments of state courts of last resort involving federal constitutional questions.

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of a qualifying state-court judgment ordinarily must be filed within 90 days after entry of that judgment.

Supreme Court Rule 13.3 provides that the filing period runs from entry of the judgment or order sought to be reviewed, subject to the Rule's provisions concerning qualifying rehearing proceedings.

Supreme Court Rule 30.1 governs computation of that period, including the extension of a deadline falling on a Saturday, Sunday, federal legal holiday, or qualifying Court closure.

Applicant identifies the following California Supreme Court dispositions:

1. Case No. S297203 — August 19, 2026

The California Supreme Court denied Applicant's petition for review on August 19, 2026. Under the ordinary 90-day calculation, the corresponding certiorari deadline is November 17, 2026, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

2. Case No. S297311 — September 16, 2026

The California Supreme Court denied Applicant's original writ proceeding on September 16, 2026. Under the ordinary 90-day calculation, the corresponding certiorari deadline is December 15, 2026, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

3. Case No. S299392 — November 2, 2026

On November 2, 2026, the California Supreme Court expressly denied Applicant's petition for writ of mandate and application for stay concerning the November 3, 2026 California General Election.

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, the ordinary 90-day filing period runs through January 31, 2027. Because January 31, 2027 falls on a Sunday, Supreme Court Rule 30.1 extends the ordinary deadline to Monday, February 1, 2027, absent a qualifying event affecting that calculation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the period for seeking certiorari review of the November 2, 2026 disposition has not expired.

Applicant seeks immediate extraordinary interim relief pending timely pursuit and disposition of certiorari review, to the extent authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1257(a), 1651(a), and 2101(f), together with the applicable Supreme Court Rules.

Applicant recognizes that compliance with Rule 13 establishes timeliness, not independently the existence of federal appellate jurisdiction or entitlement to the particular stay requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Court examine the November 2 disposition, the earlier California Supreme Court judgments, the federal constitutional questions presented, and the complete record of emergency relief sought below in determining its jurisdiction and the availability of lawful interim relief.

Given the imminence of the November 3, 2026 California General Election, Applicant expressly requests EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES — IMMEDIATE FULL COURT CONSIDERATION.

V. RULE 23.3: PRIOR REQUESTS, PROCEDURAL RETURNS, AND EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES

A. Corrected Scope of California Stay Requests

Applicant previously asked the San Diego Superior Court in the April 28, 2026 amended petition for an immediate **STAY of all election proceedings**, with a separate request for supersedeas concerning the counting of all ballots.

That request was broad, not limited to the gubernatorial contest, and it must be included in the Rule 23.3 history.

Applicant later sought relief in the California appellate courts directed at certification and related election administration.

In the separate October 30, 2026 filings in California Supreme Court case S299392, Applicant specifically requested a stay of the November 3 gubernatorial contest and narrower preservation alternatives.

The California Supreme Court denied the writ petition and stay application on November 2, 2026.

The April request and the October request therefore establish that Applicant sought both broad and narrower STAY relief in California proceedings, although they concern different stages of the election cycle.

The record should not be described as if Applicant had sought only a gubernatorial stay below; nor should the April primary-cycle request be described as an identical November statewide stay without documentary support.

B. The September 28 Roadmap Sent to the Emergency Clerk

This mapping builds upon the September 28, 2026 correspondence sent to Mr. Meek and incorporates the November 2 order.

It identifies both Applicant's April 28 broad stay request before the Superior Court and her later narrower gubernatorial stay request in S299392.

It distinguishes the respective election periods.

File-stamped copies and official orders, not this summary, control.

The mapping is placed immediately after the Rule 23.3 section introduction for prompt Clerk review.

San Diego Superior Court — 26CU023327C

Filed document: April 28 amended petition.

Relief: Immediate stay of all election proceedings; supersedeas concerning the counting of all ballots; payment tender and requested order compelling acceptance.

Disposition record: May 4 removal from calendar; May 12 service discussion; June 2 TRO hearing.

Limitation: Earlier primary-cycle proceedings. Official orders and minutes must establish the precise disposition.

California Court of Appeal — D088322

Filed document: Writ petition and immediate-stay request.

Relief: Immediate stay and mandate; additional TRO or supersedeas language as reflected in accepted papers.

Disposition: June 22 order expressly denied the petition and request for immediate stay.

California Supreme Court — S297203

Filed document: June 23 petition for review and June 26 supplemental notice.

Relief: Petition described earlier appellate stay request and sought equitable remedies concerning election administration or certification.

Disposition: Review denied August 19.

Limitation: Describing a previous stay request is not necessarily equivalent to independently requesting the current stay in that proceeding.

California Supreme Court — S297311

Filed document: Original mandate and prohibition petitions.

Relief: Suspension or restraint of gubernatorial certification; uniform write-in verification; preservation of the status quo.

Disposition: Original writ denied September 16.

California Supreme Court — S299392

Filed document: October 30 writ and separate stay application.

Relief: November 3 gubernatorial-specific stay, limited certification alternatives, and evidence preservation.

Disposition: November 2 signed order denying petition and stay.

Significance: Most directly corresponding lower-court denial for the current gubernatorial alternative.

United States Supreme Court Clerk Returns

July 20 and September 4, 2026: Earlier applications returned, identifying procedural concerns.

September 28: Procedural mapping sent to Mr. Meek.

October 13: Electronic-filing support response.

These are procedural communications, not judicial dispositions.

C. Rule 23.3 Compliance

Applicant's first U.S. Supreme Court emergency submission was returned by Clerk correspondence dated July 20, 2026.

A second was returned by correspondence dated September 4, 2026.

Applicant understands those letters to have identified shortcomings concerning the requirements of Rule 23.3, including the need to demonstrate prior requests for substantially the same relief, actual lower-court dispositions, and supporting orders.

She expressly does not characterize either return as a judicial denial on the constitutional merits.

Applicant reports sending an explanatory roadmap, communicating with the electronic-filing team, attempting to communicate with the emergency Clerk, and seeking supervisory assistance.

She alleges that substantive clarification was not supplied in response to her particular procedural inquiries.

Applicant describes this as repeated procedural returns and non-responsiveness, while acknowledging that the record must distinguish official Clerk action, unanswered communications, service difficulties, and judicial decisions.

Applicant does not assert that these circumstances alone exempt her from the filing rules.

The Rule 23.3 comparison is now materially stronger because the California Supreme Court issued its November 2, 2026 order in S299392 expressly denying the October 30 gubernatorial stay application and writ petition.

Applicant attaches that order and identifies the exact request made below.

The federal request for an entire November statewide election halt is broader than the October 30 S299392 request, **but Applicant also sought an entire stay of election proceedings in the April 28 San Diego Superior Court pleading.**

These requests must both appear in the Rule 23.3 mapping.

Applicant invokes the Rule's extraordinary-circumstances exception for any applicable difference and alternatively asks for the substantially corresponding gubernatorial relief.

The federal Clerk's September 4 concern that a petition for review in S297203 merely recounted a prior appellate stay request rather than independently seeking a stay is stated candidly.

Rule 23.3 requires particularized reasons why other courts cannot give the requested relief and relevant lower-court orders.

The October 30 California stay application was denied November 2, one day before the general election.

The prior June primary and certification-restraint requests are identified separately; they are not described as identical to the current federal statewide request.

The accompanying mapping reproduces the specific relief described in Applicant's September 28 correspondence to Mr. Meek, while the file-stamped pleadings and actual orders control any discrepancy.

VI. DETAILED PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND NEW CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT DOCKET

December 2025 to April 2026

Applicant contacted election administrators concerning statewide candidate qualification, signatures in lieu of filing fees, candidate information, and election-related records.

She alleges differing guidance and unresolved requests for correction.

The official emails, notices, submissions, and dated envelopes control the details.

April 28, 2026 — San Diego Superior Court

Applicant's amended petition in 26CU023327C sought writ-related and emergency relief.

As quoted in the later S299392 writ, her accepted pleading expressly tendered payment and requested a judicial order requiring acceptance of a valid cashier's check.

The written request does not alone prove physical delivery of a particular check, but demonstrates that a proposed judicial cure was raised before later disputed payment demands.

May 4, 2026 — Hearing

Applicant arrived after the case had been called.

A bailiff checked whether it could still be heard.

The judge informed Applicant that the matter would not be heard due to her late arrival and removed it from the calendar.

Applicant does not assert she was present at the initial call of the matter.

Respondents did not appear, according to her account.

May 12, 2026 — Hearing

Applicant appeared and addressed concerns raised about proof of service.

A June 2 date was assigned after she presented service documentation.

Official minute orders control.

June 2, 2026 — TRO Hearing

Applicant appeared for TRO-related proceedings and respondents' counsel appeared.

The exact ruling and scope of what was decided must be tied to the official minute order and written disposition, not reconstructed from memory.

June 22, 2026 — D088322

The Fourth District Court of Appeal denied Applicant's petition for writ of mandate and request for immediate stay.

The accepted petition and actual order should be attached together.

June 23–August 19, 2026 — S297203

Applicant filed a petition for review June 23.

The California Supreme Court denied it August 19, 2026, without supplying a reason in the docketed disposition.

July 1–September 16, 2026 — S297311

Applicant initiated an original writ of mandate and prohibition concerning election administration and certification.

It was retained for consideration July 6 and denied September 16, 2026.

July 20 and September 4, 2026 — Federal Returns

Applicant received U.S. Supreme Court Clerk letters referencing Rule 23.3 concerns.

She subsequently worked to identify exact requested relief in each court and assemble a procedural mapping of filings and judicial dispositions.

October 29–November 2, 2026 — S299392

On October 29, initial writ materials were received; the California Supreme Court identified a missing word-count certificate.

On October 30, the corrected writ and standalone stay application were filed, exhibits lodged, the writ retained, and in forma pauperis status granted.

On November 2, the California Supreme Court issued a signed order stating:

"The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied."

This is an express disposition of the renewed emergency request, not merely a docket entry showing a pending matter.

The chronological record demonstrates repeated pursuit of relief.

It does not prove that each filing was procedurally sufficient, that each constitutional question was reached on the merits, or that delay is attributable exclusively to any one court or respondent.

VII. ORIGINAL CONSTITUTIONAL INJURY: CANDIDACY, SIGNATURES IN LIEU, AND PAYMENT TENDER

Applicant sought to qualify for statewide gubernatorial office and alleges that county-specific treatment of signatures in lieu of fees excluded support from otherwise qualified California electors residing outside her county.

The correct operation of Elections Code § 8106, the actual number and origin of signatures, how officials credited or rejected them, the information given to Applicant, and alternatives available to her must be determined from the actual statutory text and record.

Anderson v. Celebrezze, 460 U.S. 780 (1983), and *Burdick v. Takushi*, 504 U.S. 428 (1992), frame assessment of the character and magnitude of the burden and the State's regulatory interests.

Bullock v. Carter, 405 U.S. 134 (1972), and *Lubin v. Panish*, 415 U.S. 709 (1974), address constitutional limits on burdensome filing-fee requirements.

Brown v. Chote, 411 U.S. 452 (1973), illustrates expedited consideration of a candidate filing-fee controversy before a qualification deadline expired.

Meyer v. Grant, 486 U.S. 414 (1988), and *Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation, Inc.*, 525 U.S. 182 (1999), recognize the important First Amendment interests implicated in petition circulation.

Nader v. Brewer, 531 F.3d 1028 (9th Cir. 2008), addresses a geographic residency restriction upon nomination-petition circulators.

Applicant recognizes that petition circulation, who may circulate a petition, where signatures may be credited, and signatures in lieu of filing fees are not legally identical.

Those authorities bear upon the nature and burden of election petitioning, not an automatic finding of unconstitutionality.

Applicant's April 28 pleading stated, in substance and as quoted in her S299392 submission, that she tendered payment and sought an order commanding acceptance of a valid cashier's check.

She later disputed the State's fee calculation or payment demands.

Applicant requests examination of the original fee amount, signatures-in-lieu credits, instrument records, notice and cure opportunities, and any later notices asserting an obligation or threatening service withholding.

These disputes require documentary proof; a disputed check does not itself establish retaliation.

VIII. ALLEGED RETALIATION, NONRESPONSIVENESS, AND THE RIGHT TO PETITION

Applicant alleges that administrative non-responsiveness continued through the candidate-qualification period and after her court filings.

The S299392 writ describes dated correspondence, disputed financial demands, allegedly threatened withholding of government services, and requests for a complete accounting.

Applicant believes later actions were linked to her decision to sue and seek constitutional review.

California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972), recognizes that the right to petition reaches court access.

Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), addresses causation in a distinct First Amendment retaliatory-prosecution setting.

Applicant relies on the foundational anti-retaliation principle, not on treating that decision as a factually identical election case.

Applicant asks that records be examined to determine whether protected petitioning was a motivating cause of any actionable adverse conduct, whether a cognizable injury resulted, and what legitimate explanations officials offer.

She does not allege as a proven fact that any judge intended to evade constitutional issues or that the absence of written reasons establishes wrongdoing.

Applicant further contends that prolonged absence of effective review may have contributed to an administrative environment in which officials felt confident continuing actions she challenged.

This is an inference for testing against the record, not an established finding of retaliatory intent or judicial complicity.

Applicant requests that it be assessed against contemporaneous correspondence, service records, administrative duties, and the sequence of legal challenges.

IX. FIFTY-ONE-YEAR ELECTION-LITIGATION RESEARCH: THE RECOVERED TWENTY-MATTER INVENTORY

Applicant incorporates the recovered twenty-matter election-litigation inventory from 1972–2026, supplementing the curated source matrix.

It includes published opinions, docketed emergency proceedings, source leads requiring verification, and this matter as a case study.

Twenty matters are identified; these are not twenty verified examples of identical procedural treatment and not an exhaustive national dataset.

The study supports a case-specific argument for prompt assessment, early preservation, and meaningful election-clock analysis.

The complete inventory appears at the end of the application.

A. Early Protection Before Qualification Deadlines

Brown v. Chote illustrates a court acting before the candidate's filing deadline.

Applicant invokes it both for its ballot-access context and its practical lesson: judicial relief capable of preserving participation may become unavailable if a decision occurs only after qualification closes.

B. Expedited Appellate Decision While Ballots Remain Changeable

Council of Alternative Political Parties v. Hooks, 121 F.3d 876 (3d Cir. 1997), illustrates expedited review of a ballot-access controversy.

Its later litigation history also illustrates that expedited handling does not guarantee success on ultimate legal issues.

C. California Recognizes the Election Clock

Costa v. Superior Court, 37 Cal.4th 986 (2006), involved expedited consideration before ballot printing.

Vandermost v. Bowen, 53 Cal.4th 421 (2012), involved expedited original-writ procedures enabling timely election administration.

Faulder v. Mendocino County, 141 Cal.App.4th 159 (2006), illustrates expedited handling and an extraordinary remedy dependent on a specific statute.

Those cases offer procedural comparisons, not automatic authority to reset a gubernatorial election.

California Elections Code § 13314 gives qualifying election writ actions priority over other civil matters, subject to its scope and limitations.

D. Operative Orders and Preservation

Ball v. Chapman, No. 102 MM 2022 (Pa. Nov. 1, 2022), illustrates an operative order requiring segregation or preservation of contested ballots before fuller explanation.

Applicant seeks analogous consideration of narrow measures only if within this Court's authority and appropriate on the record.

E. Compressed Federal Emergency Scheduling

In *Republican National Committee v. Genser*, No. 24A408, the Supreme Court emergency application was docketed October 28, 2024, with responses due October 30.

The application was denied November 1.

The lesson is the capacity for very rapid consideration—not entitlement to a stay.

F. Expedition Despite Adverse Outcomes

Other research examples, including proceedings concerning Pidot, Graveline, Esshaki, Morrison, Wisconsin's 2020 election, Libertarian Party of Illinois, and Clark's recall litigation, suggest procedural mechanisms to verify and compare.

The case identities, dates, and precise results of rows marked research leads must be confirmed from primary sources before being independently cited as established facts.

G. Implication for This Case

The historical collection demonstrates that courts can separate the urgent need to decide whether an interim order is authorized from the later merits process, and can distinguish records preservation from an election-wide halt.

It does not establish disparate-treatment causation by celebrity or political status, prove a constitutional right to universal expedition, or confer Supreme Court jurisdiction.

Applicant asks that legal urgency, merits, irreparable harm, and the time remaining for effective relief—not social prominence—govern prompt assessment.

X. ELECTION CLOCK, JUDICIAL CLOCK, MOOTNESS, LACHES, AND PRESERVATION

Applicant identifies a structural problem: election administration advances through signature deadlines, qualification, ballot printing, mail distribution, voting, canvass and certification, while courts operate under separate timelines.

As each administrative milestone passes, candidate-placement relief may become difficult, even where record preservation or some certification-specific relief remains feasible.

Applicant's earlier filings warned that delay would produce arguments about mootness, laches, disruption and the cautions in *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1 (2006).

Applicant contends that the equitable analysis must include when she sought relief and whether officials materially contributed to delay.

Purcell still warrants substantial caution near an election, especially where ballots have already been cast.

Diligence is not a categorical exception to election-related disruption concerns.

Storer v. Brown, 415 U.S. 724 (1974), is relevant to consideration of certain election controversies capable of repetition yet evading review.

Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976), discusses the seriousness of loss of First Amendment freedoms in an injunction context.

Neither decision eliminates the requirement of jurisdiction, standing, an actionable controversy, or adequate proof of irreparable injury.

Applicant seeks an immediate determination whether a temporary status-quo measure exists that preserves the possibility of legally authorized review without unduly impairing voters' interests.

The record should distinguish what could have been done in April or June from what can practically be done on November 2, one day before Election Day.

XI. EMERGENCY STAY STANDARD, IRREPARABLE INJURY, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The requested stay is an extraordinary remedy.

Under *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 558 U.S. 183 (2010), the analysis for relief pending certiorari addresses a reasonable probability of certiorari, a fair prospect of reversal, and likelihood of irreparable harm, with equitable balancing when appropriate.

Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009), addresses traditional stay considerations in its setting.

Applicant asks that the proper standard be selected based on the actual procedural vehicle.

Applicant asserts potentially irreparable injuries to ballot access, protected petitioning, notice, and effective correction of election-administration errors.

She asks that continuing alleged retaliatory conduct be considered only on a legally adequate and documented record.

The other side of the balance includes millions of California voters, other candidates, lawful votes already cast, county administrators, timely tabulation, and public reliance on announced election procedures.

Applicant recognizes that an immediate statewide stop is a far more intrusive remedy than candidate-specific record preservation.

The Court should determine whether any order is authorized and capable of compliance without disproportionate public harm.

XII. REQUESTED STAY AND ALTERNATIVE REMEDIES

A. PRIMARY REQUEST — STATEWIDE STAY

Applicant requests an immediate temporary statewide stay affecting the November 3, 2026 California General Election if this Court concludes it possesses the authority and the demanding legal and equitable standards are met.

This is an express request, not an allegation that such relief is available as of right.

B. FIRST ALTERNATIVE — GUBERNATORIAL-ONLY STAY

Applicant requests a stay limited to the California gubernatorial contest, including specific activities identified in the S299392 filed papers, if lawful and administratively feasible.

This alternative is aligned more closely with the express relief sought in the October 30 California Supreme Court application.

C. SECOND ALTERNATIVE — LIMITED CERTIFICATION RESTRAINT

Applicant seeks a temporary restriction upon final certification of the gubernatorial contest while otherwise lawful ballot counting continues, only if there is authority, jurisdiction and evidence that the order will preserve effective relief.

D. THIRD ALTERNATIVE — PRESERVATION

Applicant requests preservation of candidate applications, signatures and rejection records, nomination-fee ledgers, cashier's-check documents, correspondence, write-in filings, ballot images where lawfully maintained, gubernatorial ballots and write-in selections, adjudication logs, canvass metadata, server transmission receipts, access and modification logs, database exports, backups, and chain-of-custody materials.

Any order should identify the legally responsible custodian and respect statutory retention and access rules.

E. FOURTH ALTERNATIVE — EXPEDITED BRIEFING AND DECISION

Applicant requests an immediate response schedule, accelerated consideration, and such other lawful interim measures as the Court deems proper.

F. FURTHER CORRECTIVE RELIEF

If a constitutional violation is established and narrower remedies are inadequate, Applicant preserves an argument for corrective relief within an appropriate proceeding and within the powers the law actually provides.

Faulder does not automatically permit a replacement gubernatorial election, and no such change is authorized merely by requesting it here.

XIII. EXPRESS FULL COURT DEMAND AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Applicant expressly **DEMANDS EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY-CIRCUMSTANCES FULL COURT CONSIDERATION**, while acknowledging that the Court governs its own application procedures and that this demand does not compel any specific procedural allocation.

Applicant does not request that a named Justice refer this matter to the full Court and does not address this application to any Justice by name.

WHEREFORE, Applicant respectfully requests that the **SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**:

FIRST: Immediately determine whether the final November 2, 2026 S299392 denial provides an available qualifying federal judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a), and analyze the separate earlier final dispositions in S297203 and S297311;

SECOND: Consider the most-extraordinary-circumstances language of Rule 23.3 together with the dated record of prior relief requested below, the two federal Clerk returns and Applicant's corrective efforts;

THIRD: Provide immediate FULL COURT consideration of this emergency application, to the extent consistent with the Court's governing procedures;

FOURTH: Grant a temporary statewide stay affecting the November 3, 2026 California General Election if lawful and justified;

FIFTH: Alternatively, grant a gubernatorial-contest-specific stay, narrowly tailored certification restraint, or preservation order, in descending order of breadth as legally permissible;

SIXTH: Require expedited responses or order such accelerated consideration as may be appropriate;

SEVENTH: Examine the two threshold alleged-retaliation questions and ten underlying constitutional questions insofar as they are properly preserved, within jurisdiction, and material to interim relief;

EIGHTH: Consider the 1972–2026 historical litigation research for its limited and documented demonstration of expedited election-case procedures and the practical importance of timely intervention;

NINTH: Preserve records that are legally subject to retention and necessary for effective review, where a preservation order is within the Court's power; and

TENTH: Grant such other interim relief as is just, lawful, jurisdictionally supported and compatible with the rights of affected voters and parties.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Court consider the full chronology.

She sought relief before prior election milestones closed, received procedural returns, worked to correct the record, and obtained acceptance of a new state-court gubernatorial stay application before the general election.

She asks for an immediate decision on what the law permits rather than further procedural delay while the election proceeds.

XIV. PROCEDURAL MAPPING AND PROPOSED APPENDIX

APPENDIX A — SAN DIEGO SUPERIOR COURT 26CU023327C

April 28 amended petition and accepted documents; exact requests for mandate, immediate stay, supersedeas and acceptance of a valid cashier's check; May 4, May 12 and June 2 minute orders; proof of service; official dispositions and dates.

APPENDIX B — CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL D088322

Accepted writ/stay documents and June 22 denial; any separate stay or supersedeas disposition, if entered.

APPENDIX C — CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT S297203

Accepted petition for review, related supplemental filing, August 19 denial, and pinpoint pages showing which federal questions and requests were actually presented.

APPENDIX D — CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT S297311

Accepted original writ petition, precise requests to restrain certification or related action, September 16 disposition, and relevant official docket records.

APPENDIX E — CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT S299392

The October 30 filed writ and standalone stay application, supporting exhibits and proof of service, October 29 deficiency correspondence, official Register of Actions, and the **November 2, 2026 signed order expressly denying the petition for writ of mandate and application for stay**.

The November 2 order should be prominently identified as the most recent lower-court stay disposition.

APPENDIX F — JULY 20 AND SEPTEMBER 4 U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERK LETTERS

Complete copies with the applications to which they relate.

APPENDIX G — PROCEDURAL ROADMAP AND CORRESPONDENCE

September 28 mapping to Mr. Meek, dated contacts, overnight-delivery proofs, electronic-filing team correspondence, and inquiries seeking resolution of Rule 23.3 issues.

APPENDIX H — CANDIDATE QUALIFICATION AND ALLEGED RETALIATION

Elections Code § 8106 materials, signature submissions, credits, rejected signatures, filing communications, April 28 written tender, fee notices, envelope postmarks, payment instrument records, threatened service withholding, and supporting emails.

APPENDIX I — WRITE-IN AND PRESERVATION RECORDS

Official qualification procedures, write-in communications, canvass reports, candidate-specific records where held, audit logs, and responsible custodians.

APPENDIX J — HISTORICAL ELECTION-LITIGATION RESEARCH

Recovered twenty-matter inventory (1972–2026), curated source workbook, and verified opinions.

APPENDIX K — FEDERAL PROCEDURAL DOCUMENTS

Proof of service, exact underlying reviewable judgment, certiorari timeliness and status, and applicable federal filing documents.

The appendix designations are an assembly index. An item should be represented as attached only if it is actually included in the submitted packet.

XV. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND SIGNATURE

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Article III

First Amendment

Fourteenth Amendment

FEDERAL STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)

28 U.S.C. § 2101(f)

SUPREME COURT RULES

Rules 12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 33, 34, and 39.

CALIFORNIA LAW

California Constitution, Article VI, § 10

California Elections Code §§ 8106, 13314

California Rules of Court 8.532(b)(2), 8.485–8.487

California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1085–1086, 1102–1105

CASES

Brown v. Chote, 411 U.S. 452 (1973)

Bullock v. Carter, 405 U.S. 134 (1972)

Lubin v. Panish, 415 U.S. 709 (1974)

Storer v. Brown, 415 U.S. 724 (1974)

Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975)

Anderson v. Celebrezze, 460 U.S. 780 (1983)

Burdick v. Takushi, 504 U.S. 428 (1992)

Meyer v. Grant, 486 U.S. 414 (1988)

Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation, Inc., 525 U.S. 182 (1999)

Nader v. Brewer, 531 F.3d 1028 (9th Cir. 2008)

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

California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972)

Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006)

Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)

Kowis v. Howard, 3 Cal.4th 888 (1992)

Moore v. Harper, 600 U.S. 1 (2023)

Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006)

Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183 (2010)

Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009)

Vandermost v. Bowen, 53 Cal.4th 421 (2012)

Costa v. Superior Court, 37 Cal.4th 986 (2006)

Faulder v. Mendocino County, 141 Cal.App.4th 159 (2006)

Council of Alternative Political Parties v. Hooks, 121 F.3d 876 (3d Cir. 1997)

Republican National Committee v. Genser, No. 24A408 (2024)

RESEARCH APPENDIX — TWENTY RECOVERED ELECTION-LITIGATION MATTERS (1972–2026)

The twenty-matter research inventory includes research leads with unverified captions or dates and this proceeding.

It is not a representative or exhaustive statistical survey. Primary authorities should be used for specific court-filed propositions.

Year	Case or matter	Procedural significance
1972	Chote	Prospective relief before deadline
1973	Mandel v. Bradley	Prospective ballot access
1990	Donaldson election litigation	Ruling before fuller opinion; citation to verify
1997	Council of Alternative Political Parties v. Hooks	Prospective appellate relief
2006	Costa v. Superior Court	Immediate election ruling
2006	Morrison v. Colley	Operative ruling before fuller explanation
2006	Faulder v. Mendocino County	Expedited judicial processing
2012	Vandermost v. Bowen	Implementable pre-election decision
2016	Pidot election litigation	Replacement-election remedy reversed
2018	Graveline v. Benson	Prospective ballot-access relief
2019	Schmitz election litigation	Reasoned pre-deadline disposition
2020	Wisconsin emergency election litigation	Weekend emergency disposition
2020	Alabama People First litigation	Rapid appellate consideration
2020	Esshaki election litigation	Expedited appeal
2020	Libertarian Party of Illinois litigation	Emergency and ordinary proceedings separated

2021 Clark California recall litigation	Election milestones constrain relief
2022 Ball v. Chapman	Preservation before fuller opinion
2024 Genser / RNC, No. 24A408	Rapid emergency docket
2024 West Pennsylvania ballot-access litigation	Remedy compression
2026 Taylor v. Weber and related matters	Present case study; certified records control

Applicant submits this inventory to demonstrate different procedural mechanisms for election-related judicial expedition, not to claim that all twenty matters were decided identically or establish a national statistical pattern.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests immediate determination of whether the law authorizes emergency relief before the November 3, 2026 California General Election.

Applicant seeks consideration of the full record, including the original candidate-qualification dispute, her continued pursuit of review, both the broad and narrower stay requests presented to California courts, the November 2 denial, alleged subsequent retaliation, and historical examples of expedited election adjudication.

Applicant recognizes that the Court must determine jurisdiction, procedural compliance, constitutional merit, irreparable injury, and the public interest.

She requests that those questions be considered promptly while any lawful remedy remains available.

EMERGENCY, EXPEDITED, EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES — FULL COURT CONSIDERATION REQUESTED.

Respectfully submitted,

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR
Applicant, Pro Se / In Propria Persona

Date: November 2, 2026

Mailing Address: PO BOX 391, Del Mar, CA 92014

Telephone: 619-438-2467

Email: contact@EbonyEsperanza.com

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR, Applicant, Pro Se / In Propria Persona,

v.

SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity as California Secretary of State; SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS; and other respondents properly named in the state-court proceedings.

Related: California Supreme Court S299392, S297311, S297203; California Court of Appeal D088322; San Diego Superior Court 26CU023327C.

PROCEDURAL MAPPING OF EMERGENCY STAY REQUESTS AND JUDICIAL DISPOSITIONS — SUPREME COURT RULE 23.3

Dated: November 2, 2026

Based on Applicant's September 28, 2026 correspondence to emergency Clerk Mr. Meek, supplemented with the November 2, 2026 California Supreme Court order.

A. SAN DIEGO SUPERIOR COURT — 26CU023327C

Filing: Amended petition filed April 28, 2026.

Relief requested: Immediate STAY of all election proceedings; supersedeas staying counting of all ballots; payment tender and order compelling acceptance requested.

Proceedings: May 4 removal from calendar after Applicant arrived after her case was called; May 12 service discussion; June 2 temporary restraining order hearing.

Rule 23.3 significance: The April 28 stay request was broad, affecting all election proceedings, and was not limited by its wording to the gubernatorial contest.

Distinction: The April request arose during the earlier primary-election period. The exact judicial treatment of each requested form of relief must be established by the corresponding minute orders and written orders.

B. CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL — D088322

Filing: Petition for writ of mandate and request for immediate stay.

Relief requested: Immediate stay; writ of mandate; additional temporary restraining and supersedeas requests as reflected in the accepted petition.

Disposition: June 22, 2026 order expressly denying the petition and request for immediate stay.

Rule 23.3 significance: Establishes an appellate stay request and express judicial denial in the earlier election controversy.

C. CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT — S297203

Filing: Petition for review filed June 23, 2026; supplemental notice received June 26, 2026.

Relief reflected: The petition recounted the appellate request for immediate stay and sought equitable relief affecting election administration or certification. The supplemental notice identified approaching canvass and certification deadlines and expressed preparedness to submit a formal interim application.

Disposition: Petition for review denied August 19, 2026.

Rule 23.3 significance: Documents pursuit of review and reference to emergency relief previously requested.

Distinction: The September 4 federal Clerk letter stated that the S297203 petition itself did not seek a stay. Describing an appellate stay request does not necessarily constitute a separate stay application to the California Supreme Court.

D. CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT — S297311

Filing: Original petition for writ of mandate filed July 1, 2026; writ of prohibition submitted June 30, 2026.

Relief requested under mandate: Suspension of certification insofar as gubernatorial write-in data was concerned and application of uniform verification and tabulation procedures before final certification.

Relief requested under prohibition: Restraint of certification of gubernatorial election results until constitutional compliance was ensured and preservation of the status quo.

Disposition: Original writ proceeding denied September 16, 2026.

Rule 23.3 significance: Documents certification-related and preservation requests presented in the California Supreme Court.

E. CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT — S299392

Filing: Original petition for writ of mandate and prohibition and separate emergency stay application filed October 30, 2026.

Relief requested: Express temporary stay concerning the November 3 gubernatorial contest, with alternative limited certification and record-preservation relief.

Disposition: November 2, 2026 California Supreme Court order:

"The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied."

Rule 23.3 significance: This is the most directly corresponding California Supreme Court denial concerning the current November gubernatorial-specific alternative.

F. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT — PRIOR EMERGENCY SUBMISSIONS

July 20, 2026: Clerk correspondence returned the earlier submission identifying procedural concerns, including Rule 23.3.

September 4, 2026: Second Clerk correspondence identified Rule 23.3 concerns.

September 28, 2026: Applicant transmitted a detailed court-by-court procedural mapping to emergency Clerk Mr. Meek and requested clarification of the procedural requirements.

October 13, 2026: Applicant received an electronic-filing support response directing her to the Court's rules and Clerk's Office.

These communications document efforts to address filing requirements. Clerk returns are not characterized as judicial rulings on the constitutional merits.

G. COMPLETE RULE 23.3 EXPLANATION

Applicant previously asked the San Diego Superior Court in her April 28, 2026 amended petition for an immediate STAY of all election proceedings, with a separate request for supersedeas concerning the counting of all ballots.

That request was broad, not limited to the gubernatorial contest.

Applicant subsequently sought appellate relief involving election administration, certification, and preservation.

In separate October 30, 2026 California Supreme Court filings in S299392, Applicant specifically requested a stay of the November 3 gubernatorial contest and narrower preservation alternatives.

The California Supreme Court denied the writ petition and stay application on November 2, 2026.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that her California proceedings included **both broad and narrower STAY requests**.

Applicant recognizes that the requests concern different stages of the 2026 election cycle. The April primary-cycle request is not represented as identical in date or practical effect to a November 3 statewide halt.

Applicant respectfully invokes the most-extraordinary-circumstances provision of Rule 23.3 to the extent a material difference remains between the relief sought below and that requested here.

Applicant requests that the complete lower-court record be evaluated, rather than considering only the docket of S297203 or S299392 in isolation.

The relevant court orders and accepted pleadings are identified in the proposed appendices.

Respectfully submitted,

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR
Applicant, Pro Se
November 2, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Extraordinary Circumstances and Demand for Immediate Full Court Consideration

II. Two Threshold Constitutional Questions Concerning Alleged Retaliation

III. Ten Constitutional Questions Preserved in the California Supreme Court Writ

IV. Federal Jurisdiction, State-Court Finality, and the Lawful Basis for Interim Relief

V. Supreme Court Rule 23.3: Prior Requests, Procedural Returns, and Extraordinary Circumstances

VI. Detailed Procedural History and November 2 S299392 Denial

VII. Original Constitutional Injury: Statewide Candidacy, Signatures in Lieu, and Payment Tender

VIII. Alleged Retaliation, Administrative Nonresponsiveness, and the Right to Petition

IX. Fifty-One-Year Election-Litigation Research Integrated With the Constitutional Argument

X. The Election Clock and Judicial Clock; Recurrence and Preservation

XI. Standard for Emergency Stay, Purcell, Irreparable Injury, and the Equities

XII. Scope, Implementation, and Alternative Remedies

XIII. Request for Full Court Consideration and Prayer for Relief

XIV. Procedural Mapping and Proposed Exhibits

XV. Table of Authorities, Signature, and Twenty-Matter Inventory

Detailed Rule 23.3 Mapping — Following Section V.

Twenty-Matter Research Inventory — Following Section XV.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CONSTITUTION

United States Constitution, Article III

United States Constitution, First Amendment

United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment

FEDERAL STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)

28 U.S.C. § 2101(f)

28 U.S.C. § 1746

SUPREME COURT RULES

Supreme Court Rule 12 — Review on Certiorari

Supreme Court Rule 13 — Time for Petitioning

Supreme Court Rule 14 — Content of Petition

Supreme Court Rule 20 — Extraordinary Writs

Supreme Court Rule 21 — Motions

Supreme Court Rule 22 — Applications

Supreme Court Rule 23 — Stays

Supreme Court Rule 29 — Filing and Service

Supreme Court Rule 33 — Document Preparation

Supreme Court Rule 34 — General Requirements

Supreme Court Rule 39 — In Forma Pauperis

CALIFORNIA AUTHORITIES

California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10

California Elections Code § 8106

California Elections Code § 13314

California Rule of Court 8.532(b)(2)

California Code of Civil Procedure § 1085

California Code of Civil Procedure § 1102

FEDERAL DECISIONS

Anderson v. Celebrezze, 460 U.S. 780 (1983)

Brown v. Chote, 411 U.S. 452 (1973)

Bullock v. Carter, 405 U.S. 134 (1972)

Burdick v. Takushi, 504 U.S. 428 (1992)

Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation, Inc., 525 U.S. 182 (1999)

California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972)

Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975)

Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)

Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006)

Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183 (2010)

Lubin v. Panish, 415 U.S. 709 (1974)

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

Meyer v. Grant, 486 U.S. 414 (1988)

Moore v. Harper, 600 U.S. 1 (2023)

Nader v. Brewer, 531 F.3d 1028 (9th Cir. 2008)

Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009)

Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006)

Storer v. Brown, 415 U.S. 724 (1974)

CALIFORNIA AND OTHER STATE DECISIONS

Costa v. Superior Court, 37 Cal.4th 986 (2006)

Faulder v. Mendocino County, 141 Cal.App.4th 159 (2006)

Kowis v. Howard, 3 Cal.4th 888 (1992)

Vandermost v. Bowen, 53 Cal.4th 421 (2012)

Ball v. Chapman, No. 102 MM 2022 (Pa. 2022)

FEDERAL ELECTION COMPARATORS

Council of Alternative Political Parties v. Hooks, 121 F.3d 876 (3d Cir. 1997)

Republican National Committee v. Genser, No. 24A408 (2024)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR, Applicant, Pro Se / In Propria Persona,

v.

SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity as California Secretary of State; SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS; and other respondents properly named in the state-court proceedings.

Related: California Supreme Court S299392, S297311, S297203; California Court of Appeal D088322; San Diego Superior Court 26CU023327C.

EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE — EXPRESS REQUEST FOR FULL COURT CONSIDERATION

Dated: November 2, 2026

SEPARATE MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION BY THE FULL COURT

Applicant Ebony Esperanza Taylor moves under the Court's governing rules and authority to manage its docket for immediate consideration of her accompanying corrected emergency application, including a requested determination of jurisdiction and any lawful interim relief.

Applicant expressly requests consideration by the **FULL SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**, recognizing that the Rules govern presentation and allocation of applications.

I. IMMEDIATE CHANGE IN PROCEDURAL POSTURE

The California Supreme Court has now issued a signed order dated November 2, 2026, in S299392:

"The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied."

The general election is November 3, 2026.

This order supplies a concrete lower-court disposition for the October 30 gubernatorial stay request, rather than the previously described pending state-court status.

II. PRIOR PROCEDURAL ATTEMPTS AND RULE 23.3

Applicant pursued relief in Superior Court No. 26CU023327C, Court of Appeal D088322, California Supreme Court S297203 and S297311, and most recently S299392.

The Court of Appeal denied an immediate stay June 22. The California Supreme Court denied S297203 August 19, S297311 September 16, and the S299392 writ and stay November 2.

Applicant received federal Clerk returns July 20 and September 4 referencing Rule 23.3 and sent a detailed procedural mapping to emergency Clerk Mr. Meek September 28.

The September 4 concern concerning S297203 is acknowledged; Applicant relies chiefly on the more recent, expressly denied gubernatorial stay in S299392 for the equivalent narrower relief.

Applicant expressly sought an immediate STAY of all election proceedings in the April 28, 2026 San Diego Superior Court amended petition, including supersedeas concerning the counting of all ballots.

The October 30, 2026 S299392 stay application concerned the November gubernatorial contest and included narrower preservation alternatives. Both requests are identified in the Rule 23.3 mapping, with their distinct election periods.

Rule 23.3 requires a particularized explanation of why relief is unavailable from other courts and generally requires first seeking relief below, except in the most extraordinary circumstances.

Applicant identifies an earlier broad stay request in San Diego Superior Court on April 28, 2026, as well as the later gubernatorial-specific stay sought in S299392.

Because these requests concern different election stages, the April request is not asserted to be identical in date and effect to the November 3 statewide relief.

III. GROUNDS FOR EXPEDITION

Applicant alleges constitutional harms affecting candidate qualification and protected petitioning, together with subsequent disputed financial demands and alleged retaliation.

Twenty recovered research matters spanning 1972–2026 show varying expedited procedures and identify the risk that ballot printing, distribution, voting and certification can narrow available remedies.

Brown v. Chote, 411 U.S. 452 (1973); *Vandermost v. Bowen*, 53 Cal.4th 421 (2012); *Republican National Committee v. Genser*, No. 24A408 (2024).

These cases demonstrate procedural capacity rather than establishing entitlement to a stay.

IV. RELIEF REQUESTED

Applicant asks the Court to:

1. Consider this motion immediately.
2. Determine the applicable jurisdictional and Rule 23.3 issues promptly.
3. Consider the accompanying request for a temporary statewide stay or, in the alternative, a gubernatorial-specific stay, limited certification relief and targeted preservation.
4. Require any expedited response the Court finds appropriate.
5. Make an immediate disposition in accordance with its Rules.

Applicant does not request that a separate motion override statutory jurisdiction, the Rule 22 process, or the interests of other voters and parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 2, 2026

Signature: _____

EBONY ESPERANZA TAYLOR
Applicant, Pro Se

Mailing address: PO BOX 391, Del Mar, CA 92014
Email: contact@EbonyEsperanza.com
Telephone: 619-438-2467

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.