Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 12 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 26A 698

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DAVID M. SIMPKINS and SALLY E. SIMPKINS, Applicants

v.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, et al., Respondents

Arising from the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 26-7061

NO. 26A_____

EMERGENCY NEW APPLICATION FOR AN IMMEDIATE ADMINISTRATIVE STAY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), AND SUPREME COURT RULES 22 AND 23, PENDING WRIT OF CERTIORARI

IMMINENT TIME-BARRED NON-JUDICIAL FORECLOSURE SALE: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2026, AT 9:00 / 10:00 A.M. DECRETAL DISPOSITION ON THE MERITS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2106

TENNESSEE STATE VOID PROSECUTION IS TIME BARRED BY TN LAW

HOA COMPLAINT WAS TiME BARRED BY TN LAW

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States and Circuit Justice for the District of Columbia Circuit

David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins, Pro Se

1375 Round Hill Lane

Spring Hill, Tennessee 37174

(561) 298-2690

d.simpkins.consultant@gmail.com

INDEX

COVER PAGE 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 3

TABLE OF FEDERAL STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS 3, 4

TABLE OF TENNESSEE STATUTES AND RULES 4

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED 6, 7

II. JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE COURT 8

III. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS 9

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRINCIPAL VIOLATIONS 10

V. EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PERMANENT STAY REQUESTED.....17

A. The Imminent, Time-Barred Foreclosure Sale Scheduled for November 17, 2026 17

B. The HOA Proceedings: Expired Savings Statute and Non-Debtor Spouse Levy 19

C. Founding Warrants Void Ab Initio and Absolute Statutory Expiration Void Ab Initio 20

D. The Statutory Expiration Under Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a) 20

E. The Retaliatory Militarized Arrest and Digital Access Blockade 21

F. Primary Motivation Behind the Systematic Targeting: The EBMS Asset Scheme 23

VI. LEGAL ARGUMENT 24

A. The Militarized Assault Dissolves the Case and Overrides Younger Abstention 24

B. Judge Taylor's Adverse-Party Participation Constitutes Structural Due Process Bias 25

C. A Final Decretal Disposition Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2106 is Mandated 25

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF 26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, 475 U.S. 813 (1986) 7

Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) 5, 8, 29

Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977) 13

Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (2009) 7, 25

Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403 (2002) 8

Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989) 7, 22, 25, 27

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944) 23

Johnston v. Cincinnati, N.O. & T.P. Ry. Co., 240 S.W. 429 (Tenn. 1922) 18, 20

Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389 (2015) 21

Manuel v. City of Joliet, 580 U.S. 357 (2017) 23

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) 5

Nieves v. Bartlett, 587 U.S. 391 (2019) 23

Payton v. New York, 445 U.S. 573 (1980) 21, 23

Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs, 571 U.S. 69 (2013) 23, 25

State v. Campbell, 641 S.W.2d 880 (Tenn. 1982) 22

State v. Ferrante, 269 S.W.3d 908 (Tenn. 2008) 6, 20, 23

State v. Moats, 403 S.W.3d 170 (Tenn. 2013) 6, 7, 22

Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83 (1998).....7, 12, 13, 14

Taylor v. Bank of America, 501 S.W.3d 581 (Tenn. 2016).....17

Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985) 22

Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) 7, 25

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) 6, 14, 23, 25

TABLE OF FEDERAL STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

United States Constitution, Fourth Amendment (IV) 8, 22

United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment (V) (Due Process & Takings Clauses).....8

United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment XIV Due Process Clause ..6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 25, 26, 29
United States Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause) 6
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) (Supreme Court Jurisdiction) 8
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (All Writs Act) 6, 8, 9
28 U.S.C. § 2106 (Plenary Power to Vacate/Direct Entry of Judgment) 6, 8, 9, 13, 25, 28, 29
28 U.S.C. § 2284(b)(3) (Three-Judge Panel) 13
Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(1)(B) (Federal Officer Appeal Timeline) 15, 16
Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 47(b) (Prohibition on Manufactured Rules) 15

TABLE OF TENNESSEE STATUTES AND RULES

Tenn. Code Ann. § 28-1-105(a) (Tennessee Savings Statute) 19, 25, 28
Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a) (Absolute One-Year Misdemeanor Ceiling) 6, 10, 12, 20, 25, 29
Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-104 (Misdemeanor Commencement Definition) 6
Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-7-116 (Restrictions on Warrant Execution Methods) 22
Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-3-118(a) (Six-Year UCC Limitation to Enforce Notes) 17, 25, 28
Tenn. R. Crim. P. 3 (Affidavit of Complaint Mandates) 6, 10, 29
Tenn. R. Crim. P. 4(a) (Mandatory Summons Preference) 7
Tennessee Sup. Ct. R. 10B (Mandatory Judicial Disqualification) 7, 11, 13, 21

TO THE HONORABLE CLARENCE THOMAS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT[1]:

Applicants David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins, proceeding pro se, respectfully are notifying the Court of the discovery of URGENT new litigation which are time barred actions that also affect the previously filed *(URGENT - Emergency Stay Tennessee Proceedings Simpkins 10-22-2026.* The Applicants are submitting urgent requests with newly received foreclosure notices and move this Court for an immediate administrative stay and emergency preliminary / permanent injunction (law permitting) to prevent the public auction and extrajudicial taking of the Applicants primary residence pending full consideration of their application and timely certiorari review in this Court[2].

The new discoveries are directly related to the constitutional questions of the civil matters already before the court. At present there are six hundred and six (606) documented constitutional rights violations (not including the HOA structural due process violations by the TN State General Sessions Court Judge Taylor presiding). See *(Expedited Supp Notice Of State Of Tn & Fed Constitutional Rights Violations 11-5-2026)*. This case stands not merely as a matter of first impression regarding structural recusal and federal supremacy, but as a historic threshold in the sheer magnitude of documented governmental overreach brought before the United States Supreme Court.

Pursuant to *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents,*

1 While verifying the correct page numbers, the unknown intruders moved the opening statement up to where it is now which if I attempted to move this back down I would have to start all over and the process would continue os. I have therefore inserted a break between the Statute and Rules in order to present this document to the Court with that adjustment. Please note that any number of changes and modifications will exist throughout this document and due to the failure of the FBI and DHS Cyber Units to do anything about this, is due to their alleged involvement in these actions.

2 To the Court, there appears to be an alleged pattern of new and more creative retaliatory claims to require the Applicants to respond to each one, so the Applicants will appear as vexatious filers. When the Applicants are not. They are responding to what are alleged retaliatory actions in complete absence of jurisdiction. The Applicants respectfully request that the Court also address and issue orders to stop the potential non-stop retaliatory filings never allowing the Applicants justice.

403 U.S. 388 (1971), this uncontradicted record strips subordinate state process of all lawful authority and necessitates immediate federal intervention under the Supremacy Clause, Article VI, Clause 2 to protect the lives and constitutional liberties of the Applicants and American citizens nation wide.

Therefore, this Third Supplemental Application is respectfully requested for an immediate Emergency Administrative Stay for Foreclosure pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) and for a Decretal Disposition on the Merits pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2106.

This application brings before the Circuit Justice and the full Court other discovered, harmful retaliatory state actions, structural judicial conflicts, and indisputable statutory bars that require immediate federal intervention to prevent imminent, irreparable harm—including the unlawful non-judicial foreclosure sale of Applicants' primary residence scheduled for **November 17, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.**

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Absence of Jurisdictional Commencement under *Ferrante* and *Whitley*: Whether arrest warrants issued seventeen (17) and nineteen (19) days prior to the signing or filing of the mandatory supporting affidavit of complaint is void ab initio under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, Tenn. R. Crim. P. 3, and *Whitley v. Warden*, 401 U.S. 560 (1971)—which mandates that a judicial officer must be supplied with a factually sufficient basis for a probable cause judgment within the affidavit before a valid warrant can issue—thereby completely failing to commence a prosecution or confer subject-matter jurisdiction upon the trial court from inception due to no Affidavits were presented until 17 and 19 days after the issuance of the warrant. under *State v. Ferrante,* 269 S.W.3d 908 (Tenn. 2008)?

2. Jurisdictional Bar and Expiration under *Ferrante* and *Moats*: Whether a state criminal tribunal is permanently stripped of any capacity to maintain a docket under Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a) and § 40-2-104 when the twelve-month statutory limitation period for a Class A misdemeanor expires without

valid legal commencement, rendering any subsequent enforcement or failure-to-appear capias warrants an unconstitutional deprivation of liberty in violation of *State v. Moats,* 403 S.W.3d 170 (Tenn. 2013)?

3. Militarized Excessive Force under *Graham v. Connor*: Whether the deployment of a fifty-officer multi-jurisdictional tactical force, a SWAT TEAM unit, and an armored vehicle equipped with a hydraulic ram to breach the private home of an unarmed senior citizen veteran on a mandatory summons misdemeanor charge—with advanced, hidden recorded law enforcement knowledge that no weapon or threat existed by admitted unconstitutional hidden cameras—for a mandatory summons-Class A misdemeanor under Tenn. R. Crim. P. 4(a) constitutes extreme excessive force under *Graham v. Connor,* 490 U.S. 386 (1989), dissolving any federal equitable protection under *Younger v. Harris,* 401 U.S. 37 (1971)?

4. Judicial Blockade and Forced Interlocutory Abeyance: Whether a presiding state trial judge violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 10B by executing a 381-day administrative "pocket veto" over an emergency jurisdictional motion to dismiss, thereby intentionally paralyzing a pro se litigant's explicit statutory right to an Accelerated Interlocutory Appeal while allowing a time-barred docket to be weaponized with multiple void capias warrants and subsequent arrests causing injuries to a compliant victim of law enforcement abuse of power and authority?

5. Complete Absence of Jurisdiction and Structural Bias under *Caperton*: Whether a state judge who is an active, named party-defendant in pending federal civil rights litigation violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment under *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009) and *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) by refusing disqualification and subsequently presiding over civil collection and criminal dockets targeting his adverse litigants, entering real property execution seizure mandates in a clear absence of all jurisdiction?

6. Unlawful Non-Debtor Property Seizure and Structural Nullity: Whether a trial court violates procedural and substantive Due Process under the Fourteenth Amendment, Tenn. Code Ann. § 26-2-101 *et seq.*, and the controlling mandates of *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie*, 475 U.S. 813 (1986) by summarily executing a wage levy against the separate earnings of a non-debtor spouse who was never a joined party, never served with process, or afforded an independent hearing, to satisfy an individual Homeowners Association judgment for which she bears zero contractual or legal liability—thereby creating a fatal structural defect that renders the resulting execution order a jurisdictional nullity?

7. The Jurisdictional Paradox under Steel Co.: Whether a federal district court commits a severe structural error and an unconstitutional jurisdictional paradox under *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment,* 523 U.S. 83 (1998) by simultaneously disclaiming federal subject-matter jurisdiction

under the Younger abstention doctrine while concurrently executing a final, binding merits dismissal order without prejudice?

8. Extortionate Taking of Property under the Fifth Amendment: Whether weaponizing the criminal machinery of the state—including false imprisonment, militarized tactical raids, and warrantless domestic surveillance—to execute a bad-faith prosecution for the secondary purpose of suppressing and forcing the conversion of a litigant's proprietary financial inventions (The Equity-Based Mortgage System (EBMS) and its Financial Matrix multi-account multiplier) constitutes an unconstitutional taking of private property without just compensation under the Fifth Amendment?

9. Whether this Court should exercise its plenary remedial authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2106; to bypass a futile lower-court remand and enter a final decretal judgment on the merits where the record reveals unrefuted, structural constitutional defects and time-barred claims?

10. First Amendment Right of Access under Christopher: Whether a federal district court clerk's office violates the First Amendment right to petition and the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause under *Christopher v. Harbury,* 536 U.S. 403 (2002) by engaging in an 83-day administrative and financial fee-gating blockade that actively suppresses, delays, and prevents the timely docketing of an emergency verified civil rights complaint?

11. Whether the Applicants are entitled to damages under for constitutional rights violations under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, Carlson v. Green, : Whether the excessive force, vandalism, and arresting an individual with prior knowledge by the law enforcement officers that the Applicant did not own or possess any firearm due to the unknown, unlawful hidden cameras in the Applicants home. And do the acts by the officers knowing no firearm existed, created a violation of the Fourth Amendment, and knowing that they continued with the arrest and detainment does it also violate the Fourteenth Amendment for due process?

II. JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE COURT

The U.S. Supreme Court has jurisdiction and authority for all orders, stays, injunctions, emergency actions and orders to act pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), and 28 U.S.C. § 2106, Supreme Court Rules 22 and 23.

Providing the Court the power to vacate all void lower Court orders and dismissing the expired TN State matters with prejudice, vacate the HOA orders issued in the complete absence of any jurisdiction, with prejudice, vacate the Execution of seizure of the property located at 1375 Round Hill Ln., Spring Hill, TN 37174, located in Spring Hill Place Subdivision, Parcel ID 166-H-D-027.00., Legal Description: Lot 225, Spring Hill Place, Section Nine (9) (Round Hill), Plat Book P51, Page 147, as Corrected by Surveyor's Certificate of Correction recorded n Book 5092, Page 899, Register's Office for Williamson County, Tennessee.

And the Levy, garnishment of the wages of Sally E. Simpkins, since late August with $2,250 removed from her wages as of this date. Mrs. Simpkins is entitled to treble damages and punitive damages to be assessed in the District Court of the District of Columbia. And an order issued to vacate such garnishment in its entirety with prejudice, due to the HOA Debt was past the statute of limitations and the order issued by Judge Taylor against a spouse, non-debtor, was in complete absence of any jurisdiction, with prejudice.

III. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS

This Emergency Supplemental Application presents an extraordinary, compounding collapse of judicial integrity and constitutional due process across state and federal boundaries. Pursuant to the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), and this Court's plenary authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2106, Applicants David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins seek an immediate administrative stay to halt an unconstitutional, time-barred non-judicial foreclosure sale of their primary residence scheduled for November 17, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., alongside a permanent stay of a void state-level criminal prosecution and the immediate termination of an illicit wage levy against a non-debtor spouse.

The record exposes a continuous, cascading chain of 606 documented, uncontradicted constitutional and statutory rights violations engineered to accomplish a singular, predatory objective: the suppression and forced conversion of the Applicants' highly valuable, proprietary financial architecture—the Equity-Based Mortgage System (EBMS) and its core processing engine, the Financial Matrix multi-account matrix multiplier. To protect this commercial piracy scheme, local state actors and lower federal courts have established an absolute procedural blockade. Presiding Administrative Judges Denise André and Murray Thomas Taylor—while laboring under a fatal structural conflict as named, active party-defendants in the Applicants' ongoing federal litigation—have weaponized the machinery of the courts over which they possess complete presiding administrative and docket control as well as setting and presiding over hearings knowing that they are operating in complete absence of jurisdiction to do so. And the Applicants have responded appropriately with TN Supreme Court Rule 10(B) which was allegedly ignored or denied. There is no record of either according to the General Sessions Court Clerk, just the (Execution and Levy) document / order issued by Judge Taylor.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRINCIPAL VIOLATIONS

The state criminal proceedings are legal nullities. The underlying arrest warrants are mathematical and temporal impossibilities, issuance of the first two (2) warrants on June 4th, 2025, seventeen (17) days after issuance and for the 3rd warrant issued on July 5th, 2025, issued nineteen (19) days before any supporting affidavits of complaint were sworn, in direct violation of Tenn. R. Crim. P. 3 and *Whitley v. Warden, 401 U.S. 560 (1971)*. Furthermore, the prosecution permanently expired in July 2026 pursuant to the absolute one-year misdemeanor limitations ceiling of Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a). To permanently insulate this void docket, Judge André has executed a 381-day "pocket veto" over the

Applicants' emergency motion to dismiss on October 22, 2025, docketed on October 23, 2025, intentionally paralyzing their right to an Accelerated Interlocutory Appeal under Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 10B. The alleged fraud on the court culminated in a systemic suppression of exculpatory evidence. In September 2024, Judge André presided over protective order proceedings initiated against the Applicant by the very individuals participating in the network breach of the Applicants' property and electronic devices. Only three weeks prior, the Applicant had filed for protection in the Nashville, TN Federal Court and the Chief Judge of the District Federal Court created a miscellaneous case (which can no longer be found) and never docketed the 74 page Emergency Motion *(Plaintiffs Amended Emergency Motion for Life Threatening Situation 10-9-2024)* which included a (Emergency Request for a Protective Order against the neighbor, possessing absolute physical proof of systemic digital sabotage: a 59-page digital log file containing the explicit name and computer identifier of the hacker (data recovered by Best Buy and accidentally discovered neighbor's information when the express intent was to review all log files and find both MAC and IP Addresses by ChatGPT analysis), an official Cricket Wireless record documenting all 5 phones had been compromised through a prior hacking arrest, (data was compromised) and AT&T router manipulation tracking data proving that neighbors routers were illicitly hijacking the Applicants' network to run illicit traffic. Judge André allegedly violated the Fourteenth Amendment by suppressing this exculpatory data, refusing to allow it onto the record, and instead entering an unconstitutional protective order based entirely on anonymous, unverified video snippets, per the opposing counsel's apologetic statement that the video snippets were not verified.

Simultaneously, Judge Taylor utilized this void framework to execute real property seizures against the homestead and a summary wage levy against Co-Applicant Sally E. Simpkins' separate earnings at employer—despite her being a non-debtor spouse who was never joined, served, or tried. When the

Applicants sought federal civil rights intervention in the DC. Federal Court, the lower federal courts insulated these absence of jurisdiction actions through an unconstitutional jurisdictional paradox under *Steel Co.,* then terminating the Applicants' electronic CM/ECF filing credentials to execute a permanent digital lockout. Because every inferior tribunal has abandoned its constitutional mandate, immediate intervention by the Circuit Justice is required to preserve the status quo and restore the rule of law.

To achieve this forced conversion by using the excessive force arrest, Respondents weaponized the coercive power of the state, deploying an excessive, militarized tactical unit of fifty (50) officers, a Swat Team, and an armored vehicle with battering ram to execute an unlawful, bad-faith arrest based on fabricated, temporally impossible protective order violation which the alleged offense never occurred and upon arriving at the Applicants property Officer Amber Davis disclosed and admitted over the air that the Spring Hill and Franklin, TN Police Departments (*Franklin, TN Swat Team, Armored Vehicle and additional Franklin City Police Officers were out of their jurisdiction)*, stated that all the Police knew that the Applicant did not own or posses a firearm because there were hidden camera's in the property unbeknownst to the Applicants even in their Master Bathroom, (*which are still there in operation from inception*) even though in the October 23rd, Emergency Motion a request was made to remove all hidden cameras and tracking devices and other capabilities that to this day allow them to hack and interfere with every device in the property to include the computer and all cell phones and manipulate legal documents and or delete them.

Furthermore, the underlying misdemeanor prosecution is permanently and mandatorily dead, having passed its absolute, non-discretionary twelve-month statutory ceiling in July 2026 without proper commencement or tolling under Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a). To insulate this void docket, Presiding

Judge Denise André has maintained a 381-day "pocket veto" over the Applicants' jurisdictional motions, paralyzing their right to an Accelerated Interlocutory Appeal under Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 10B. And *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.,* 455 U.S. 422 (1982) (U.S. SC): *"Procedural paralysis cannot be used to extinguish a citizen's right to a jurisdictional determination."* 2. *Ex parte Milligan,* 71 U.S. 2 (1866) (U.S. SC): *"Constitutional protections and judicial duties cannot be suspended through administrative delay." Haines v. Kerner,* 404 U.S. 519 (1972) (U.S. SC): *"Pro se litigants are entitled to immediate protection when constitutional injury is documented."* 4. *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977) (U.S. SC): *"Access to courts requires more than a docket number; it requires a meaningful opportunity to be heard."*

Further, based on the complete absence of jurisdiction rulings by the lower Courts, the Applicants are requesting a review of alleged structural jurisdictional error under ***Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment*** when simultaneously disclaiming jurisdiction under ***Younger*** while entering final dismissals and the D.C. Circuit Appellate Court has administratively blockaded further filing. Further, the lower District Court claims of lack of jurisdiction, then issuing substantial rulings in direct contravention of (lack of jurisdiction), then dismissing the cases (without reaching the Merits), then subsequently (entering a final judgment on the merits). Federal statute 28 U.S.C. § 2284(b)(3) expressly prohibits a single judge from doing so. ***Shapiro v. McManus,*** 577 U.S. 39 (2015): this prohibition "admits of no exception." Under N***guyen v. United States,*** 539 U.S. 69 (2003), this allegedly voids the proceedings entirely. Review is required. Applicants pray for a definitive decretal disposition on the merits under 28 U.S.C. § 2106 vacating all void lower orders and dismissing the expired state matters with prejudice.

Compouding this structural breakdown, Judge Taylor—while an active, adverse party-defendant in the Applicants' pending federal litigation—refused disqualification in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. Acting in the clear absence of all jurisdiction, Judge Taylor entertained time-barred Homeowners Association (HOA) claims, ordered real property executions, and summarily executed a wage levy against the separate earnings of Co-Applicant Sally E. Simpkins at her place of employment—a non-debtor spouse who bears zero liability and was never a joined party, never served with process, or had opportunity to attend any hearing.

When the Applicants sought refuge in the federal courts, the lower tribunals committed an unconstitutional jurisdictional paradox under *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment*. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia simultaneously disclaimed subject-matter jurisdiction under the *Younger* ***v.*** *Harris* doctrine while concurrently entering a final, binding merits dismissal. This blockade was finalized when the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals flagrantly violated the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure by manufacturing an unwritten "complaint-amendment" requirement to strip the Applicants of their mandatory 60-day federal officer appeal window. *"While appellants contend that the 60-day deadline applies, they neither named a federal official as a defendant in their original complaint nor filed an amended complaint doing so." Oveido v. WMATA*, 948 F.3d 386, 397 (D.C. Cir. 2020), ("While we liberally construe pro se pleadings, pro se litigants do not have a license to ignore the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." The case law quoted has zero applicability to the claims by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. And the second half of the quote was not found in the case law and appears to be a label applied to the Applicants. The Panel cited *Oveido v. WMATA*, 948 F.3d 386, 397 (D.C. Cir. 2020), for the general rule that pro se litigants must follow procedural rules. But Appellants did follow procedural rules; the District Court prevented pre-judgment compliance when

Judge Nichol's (standing order) provided 5 days to create an amended complaint, a red line document detailing the differences between the original and the new amended complaint, only for Judge Nichols to dismiss the entire case 2 days later without notifying the Appellants. At that time they incurred extensive costs for overnight postal notifications to all defendants. For the Court's full understanding of the "ruling" of the Appellate Court Tribunal's ruling being inconsistent with the FRAP Rules and the Appellate Court's own prior authorities is in direct conflict with their own prior case law ruling.

From the Applicants En Banc Hearing Petition; see *(SC21 - En Banc Rehearing Petition by Appellants (FINAL))*;

> **Pgs 3-4**
> As the en banc Ninth Circuit held in *Wallace v. Chappell,* 637 F.2d 1345, 1348 (9th Cir. 1981) (en banc), "Whenever the alleged grievance arises out of a government activity, the 60-day filing period of Rule 4(a) applies if: (a) the defendant officers were acting under color of office, or (b) the defendant officers were acting under color of law or lawful authority..." and the Rule must be given its literal application without creating adding formalistic exclusions. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in their own ruling similarly confirmed in ***United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.***, 642 F.2d 1285, 1292 (D.C. Cir. 1980), *"that the 60-day rule was structured to ensure broad applicability across connected proceedings and prevent procedural traps, noting that where a federal presence exists, "the sixty-day period applies to all parties."* (quoting Fed. R. App. P. 4(a) Advisory Committee Notes).

Pg 9;

> **II. FRAP 4(a)(1)(B) Does Not Impose an "Amended Complaint" Limitation**
> "Under FRAP 4(a)(1)(B), the time to appeal is 60 days when "*one of the parties is... a United States officer or employee sued in an official capacity.*"The Rule does not require a federal party to be joined exclusively via an original complaint or an unhindered amended complaint. The Rule requires only that a federal officer be a party to the action. Imposing an unwritten requirement that pro se litigants must have successfully docketed a formal amended complaint—where the Clerk's Office designated the filings as "REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE REVIEW"—violates FRAP 47(b), which bars the court from imposing any "disadvantage... for noncompliance with any requirement not in federal law, federal rules, or the local circuit rules" absent actual notice."

Pgs 7-8

I. The Panel's Dismissal Rests on a Factual Premise Contradicted by the Official Record of Case

No. 1:26-cv-00310-UNA and the Clerk's Unauthorized Administrative Termination

"The Panel's conclusion that no federal officer was named as a defendant is refuted by the official
CM/ECF record. Case No. 1:26-cv-00310-UNA was an active action naming Clerk Caesar in her official capacity. Further, the Panel's jurisdictional dismissal was on the assertion that Appellants "neither named a federal official as a defendant in their original complaint nor filed an amended complaint doing so." The official CM/ECF records of the District Court fully establish that this premise is factually erroneous."

"On January 31, 2026, Appellants initiated Case No. 1:26-cv-00310-UNA by filing a Complaint (ECF Doc. 1) that explicitly named "ANGELA D. CAESAR, Clerk of the Court, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in her official and individual capacities" as Defendant. The District Court's
official docket categorized the matter under "Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant," identified the cause as "42:1983 Civil Rights Act," and cross-referenced "Related Case: 1:26-cv-00304-CJN." The docket sheet reflects that Case No. 1:26-cv-00310-UNA was marked "Date Terminated:
03/13/2026" and remained assigned to "Unassigned" without any judicial order, memorandum opinion,
or entry of judgment signed by an Article III Judge. The docket shows only administrative entries and
clerk-issued notices:."

Pg 9; "Because no Article III Judge ever entered an order of dismissal in Case No. 1:26-cv-00310-UNA, the federal-officer claim was actively before the court. Cross-referenced on the docket of Case No. 1:26-cv-00304-CJN (ECF Doc. 13) and captioned by Judge Nichols on March 24, 2026, this presence triggered the 60-day timeline under FRAP 4(a)(1)(B)as a matter of law."

Finally, to permanently silence the Applicants, the lower appellate machinery de-platformed them by completely revoking their CM/ECF electronic filing credentials, executing a total digital lockout to structurally prevent them from submitting an Emergency Motion for a Stay. Because every inferior tribunal has abandoned its constitutional mandate and actively locked its doors against the record, the

Applicants possess no other legal remedy. Immediate intervention by the Circuit Justice is required to preserve the status quo, halt the unconstitutional foreclosure sale, immediately terminate the lawless wage levy, and permanently stay the void state-level criminal prosecution, vacate the prior rulings in both the District of Columbia Federal Court, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals

V. EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PERMANENT STAY REQUESTED

A. The Imminent, Time-Barred Foreclosure Sale Scheduled for November 17, 2026

This application brings before the Circuit Justice and the full Court newly discovered, harmful retaliatory state actions, structural judicial conflicts, and indisputable statutory bars that require immediate federal intervention to prevent imminent, irreparable harm—including the unlawful non-judicial foreclosure sale of Applicants' primary residence scheduled for **November 17, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.**

On October 24, 2026, Applicants retrieved notices indicating that Freedom Mortgage Corporation and Rubin Lublin, LLC had initiated non-judicial foreclosure actions against their homestead located at 1375 Round Hill Lane, Spring Hill, Tennessee 37174 (Parcel ID 166-H-D-027.00). This foreclosure action is an absolute nullity. Under Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-3-118(a) and the controlling precedent of *Taylor v. Bank of America,* 501 S.W.3d 581 (Tenn. 2016), any action to enforce a note must be commenced within six (6) years after its acceleration. Rubin Lublin's notice attempts to execute upon a mortgage obligation accelerated in December 2018—nearly eight (8) years ago, while Rubin Lublin Law Firm is claiming they are operating off of a 2019 accelerated note. Because the six-year statutory window has expired, the debt instrument and the corresponding power of sale are completely extinguished.

First is the current question of the legality of the non-judicial foreclosure sale of Applicants' primary residence scheduled for **November 17, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.** according to Rubin Lublin Law Firm website posting of the Applicants residential property located at:

1375 Round Hill Ln., Spring Hill, TN 37174, Parcel ID 166-H-D-027.00.

Legal Description: Lot 225, Spring Hill Place, Section Nine (9) (Round Hill), Plat Book P51, Page 147, as Corrected by Surveyor's Certificate of Correction recorded n Book 5092, Page 899, Register's Office for Williamson County, Tennessee.

Second, the proposed auction violates the absolute notice boundaries governing non-judicial foreclosures under Tenn. Code Ann. § 35-5-101(e)(1). As amended, Tennessee law strictly limits any postponement or continuation of a foreclosure sale without a complete re-advertisement and newspaper re-publication to a maximum window of one (1) year from the originally scheduled sale date. Attempting to finalize a foreclosure sale in November 2026 under a file track according to Rubin Lublin Law Firms recent documents stating they initiated and accelerated foreclosure in 2019 completely unlawfully bypasses this mandatory statutory window. As the Tennessee Supreme Court confirmed in ***Meyers v. Delaware LLC,*** 624 S.W.3d 440 (Tenn. 2021), strict, unyielding compliance with statutory notice and publication timelines is a non-discretionary prerequisite to a valid trustee sale.

Finally, the underlying default judgments utilized to cloud the title of the residence are void as a matter of law. When Judge Murray Thomas Taylor executed adverse civil orders in Williamson County General Sessions Court Case No. 2026-CV-2191, he was an active, named Defendant-Respondent in Applicants connected federal civil rights litigation. Under the Tennessee Supreme Court's foundational ruling in ***Johnston v. Cincinnati N. O. & T. P. Ry. Co.***, 240 S.W. 429 (Tenn. 1922), any order, judgment, or execution entered by a judicial officer who is an interested party or co-defendant in connected litigation is a structural due process nullity.

The public trustee auction is scheduled for a trustee auction for November 17th, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. at the Williamson County Judicial Center, 135 4th Avenue South, Franklin, TN, 37064. According to what the Applicants found on Rubin Lublin's Foreclosure website: https://rlselaw.com/property-listing/tennessee-property-listings/, for the Court's awareness, the website shows a time difference of 1 hour earlier for a 9 a.m. auction, not the noted time of 9:00 a.m.

B. The HOA Proceedings: Expired Savings Statute and Non-Debtor Spouse Levy

In a parallel effort to dispossess Applicants, a clear retaliatory local Homeowners Association (HOA) initiated collection proceedings in Case No. 2026-CV-2191, on June 5th, 2026, exactly 2 days after the filing of the Applicants "Appellate Brief" of which not one respondent ever filed a "Response Brief" which requires the Court to question why they would not file the required response brief within the 30 day time period +3 days for mailing, which the deadline for the "Response Brief" was July 6th, 2026. None of the Respondents ever notified the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals that they had no intention of filing a "Response Brief" and further the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals never addressed the issue of failure to file a "Response Brief." (*But the Appellate Court held the Applicants to not just the letter of the rules and law, but created an impossible new requirement that did not exist in the Appellate Rules nor were there any authorities requiring said "new requirement"*). This HOA action was brought more than two and a half years after the original claim lapsed, violating the strict one-year limitation of the Tennessee Savings Statute (Tenn. Code Ann. § 28-1-105).

Compounding this defect, Judge Taylor—an active, named party-defendant in active federal litigation brought by Applicants—refused disqualification. Operating in a clear absence of jurisdiction, Judge Taylor entered an Order of Execution targeting Applicants' primary residence and signed a summary

wage levy directed at the separate earnings of Co-Applicant Sally E. Simpkins. Under Tennessee law, a spouse's separate wages cannot be levied to satisfy an individual judgment for which she bears no contractual or legal liability, making the execution a severe due process violation in addition to an unlawful execution for seizure of the Applicant's property. When Judge Taylor issued civil orders and execution mandates to seize the property against the Applicants with the intentional to separate the Applicants from their lawful residence, he was at the same time an active named defendant in the Applicant's federal civil litigation for these very type of constitutional deprivation of rights. There is a foundational rule under *Johnston v. Cincinnati, N.O. & T.P. Ry. Co.,* 240 S.W. 429 (Tenn. 1922), that any order, or judgment, or execution thereof entered by a judicial officer who was and interested party or adverse co-defendant in connected litigation os a structural due process nullity.

C. Founding Warrants Void Ab Initio and Absolute Statutory Expiration

The underlying criminal dockets under Criminal Case No. 25CR2872 are absolute nullities. Warrant Nos. 2025060433 and 2025060434 were executed on June 4, 2025, yet their supporting affidavits were not signed or filed until June 21, 2025—seventeen (17) days later. Warrant No. 2025070550 was executed on July 5, 2025, for an offense the affidavit states did not occur until July 24, 2025—a clear temporal impossibility. Under *State v. Ferrante*, 269 S.W.3d 908 (Tenn. 2008), *"a warrant lacking a contemporaneous affidavit is void from inception, and fails to confer subject-matter jurisdiction."*

D. The Absolute Statutory Expiration Under Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a)

Even assuming valid commencement, Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a) commands that all misdemeanor prosecutions must be commenced within twelve (12) months. Because void warrants do not toll the limitations clock, the state's authority permanently expired in July 2026. To insulate this dead docket,

Presiding Judge Denise André has maintained a 381-day "pocket veto" by deliberately withholding a written order on Applicants' Emergency Motion to Dismiss, actively blockading an Accelerated Interlocutory Appeal under Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 10B.

E. The Retaliatory Militarized Arrest and Digital Access Blockade

The bad-faith nature of this multi-front targeting is underscored by the deployment of extraordinary excessive militarized tactical force. On July 28, 2025, and February 19, 2026, state actors deployed approximately fifty (50) officers, a tactical SWAT TEAM, and an armored vehicle with battering ram to breach Applicants' home on a mandatory summons for a Class A misdemeanor. Law enforcement personnel verbally admitted on the record that they possessed advanced knowledge that no firearm existed inside the residence. Under *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*, 576 U.S. 389 (2015), and *Payton v. New York*, 445 U.S. 573 (1980), deploying tactical warfare resources against an unarmed, stationary senior citizen and Navy veteran inside his home for a summons-eligible offense is objectively unreasonable as a matter of law.

1. **Objective Unreasonableness under (*Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)):** For a standard, non-violent Class A misdemeanor, Tennessee law restricts process strictly to the service of a single court summons under Tenn. R. Crim. P. 4(a). Mobilizing approximately fifty (50) officers from multiple overlapping jurisdictions (Spring Hill, Franklin, and the Williamson County Sheriff), alongside tactical SWAT units and an armored vehicle with a hydraulic boom ram, is objectively unreasonable as a matter of law. In direct defiance of Rule 4(a), Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-7-116, and the Fourth Amendment, state actors deployed approximately fifty (50) law enforcement officers, tactical SWAT TEAM Members, and an armored vehicle with a hydraulic battering ram to breach Applicants' home on July 28, 2025[3].

2. **The Admission of Prior Knowledge:** Officer Amber Davis admitted on the recorded record that law enforcement possessed advance knowledge that a firearm did not exist inside the residence because the department was actively monitoring covert, unauthorized in-home cameras.

3. **The Fabricated Coercion:** Despite admitting that the predicate safety threat for a tactical raid did not exist, Officer Davis stated: "Because a warrant was issued, it has to be answered, and you have to be arrested no matter what." She threatened that if compliance was not surrendered within two minutes, the tactical units would deploy the armored boom to tear down the entry door and take Applicants down hard.

4. **The Legal Nullity:** Under *State v. Campbell*, 641 S.W.2d 880 (Tenn. 1982), any process issued in direct defiance of mandatory affidavit rules is void ab initio and, in legal effect, never existed. Under *State v.*

---

3 Prior to the Excessive Force Militarized 50+ Police Officers, 8 to 10 SWAT TEAM Members, and the Armored Vehicle with Battering Ram, the Applicants had no notice of a summons or that there was even a warrant issued. On July 10th, 2025, 3 Police Officers, Sgt. Willis, Officer Prinzo, and an additional unknown Officer who refused to show his face always facing outward and very angry, demanded Mr. Simpkins presence outside the residence. In Mr Simpkins' inquiries as to their reasons for violently banging on the doors and windows, the answers were, no Mr. Simpkins is not in trouble, no he has not broken any laws, no arrest warrant had been issued, they were not there with an arrest warrant, but never answered why they were there, only that Mr. Simpkins was demanded to come out. He refused on the grounds of the absurd and harassing behavior and the angry Police Officer raising his voice to "come outside now!" did not seem appropriate. This was a warning that something was amiss, but the Applicants had no idea what was coming.

Ferrante, 269 S.W.3d 908 (Tenn. 2008) and *State v. Moats*, 403 S.W.3d 170 (Tenn. 2013), if the initial charging instrument is a nullity, subject-matter jurisdiction never attaches, and no subsequent appearance or administrative order can cure that absence of authority.

5. Executing a militarized siege on an unarmed, stationary senior citizen and veteran with prior knowledge that zero firearms exist satisfies the elements of bad-faith harassment and extreme excessive force under *Tennessee v. Garner,* 471 U.S. 1 (1985) and *Payton v. New York,* 445 U.S. 573 (1980). Under *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.,* 322 U.S. 238 (1944), a procedural barrier engineered by judges and clerks to insulate such actions from merits review is a structural fraud upon the court that must be set aside.

6. This gross disproportionality establishes bad-faith harassment and retaliatory prosecution under *Nieves v. Bartlett*, 587 U.S. 391 (2019) and *Manuel v. City of Joliet*, 580 U.S. 357 (2017).

7. Under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) and *Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 571 U.S. 69 (2013), bad-faith prosecution and harassment completely eliminate federal abstention. The D.C. federal courts committed reversible legal error by invoking *Younger* to shield a militarized prosecution that was void from day one and conducted in egregious bad faith.

F. Primary Motivation Behind the Systematic Targeting

Alleged motive, a creation by the Applicants that makes every homeowner a debt-free multi-millionaire from their own home in 3 years as provided in exhibits to this court, the Equity Based Mortgage[4]

4 Footnote 2: Conceptual Shift & Sealed Hearing Offer: For the purpose of referencing the widely known term "mortgage," it was retained in the naming convention for clarity. In reality, traditional mortgages will cease to exist under the EBMS. All mortgages are transformed into Financial Investment (Mortgage) Instruments (FIMI), or more accurately, Financial Investment Instruments that simultaneously grow personal and generational wealth. *The Applicants are willing to present the full concept of the EBMS exclusively to the U.S. Supreme Court in a sealed hearing. This is offered so the Justices may fully comprehend the severe actions committed by an organized group to suppress the Applicants and the EBMS, effectively making them prisoners in their own home for 8 years.* The EBMS is a paradigm shift, intended not just for America First, but for the benefit of all humanity.

System, the (EBMS). The underlying motivation behind this systematic harassment resembles a coordinated campaign aimed at the suppression and forced conversion of Applicants' proprietary financial innovations: The Equity-Based Mortgage System (EBMS) and its core software operating engine, the Financial Matrix multi-account matrix multiplier. The system is designed to end all foreclosures in the first year of operation, turning every foreclosure into a financial instrument growing wealth and removing financial struggles for all homeowners and corporations. Then the subsequent existing mortgages across America by licensing the system out to all other current mortgage companies. There are thirty-five additional companies that will be created underneath the EBMS with a focus on newer technologies for the type of materials for residential and commercial construction, all manner of medical facilities, restaurants, other facilities to include, clean air systems, clean and leak free plumbing systems, etc, including Space Industries and Space Exploration.

When Applicants sought federal civil rights intervention, the lower federal courts committed an unconstitutional jurisdictional paradox by disclaiming jurisdiction under *Younger* while concurrently entering final, binding merits dismissals. This insulation was completed when the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals manufactured an extra-legal complaint-amendment requirement to strip Applicants of their 60-day federal officer appeal window in open violation of federal mandates, subsequently de-platforming Applicants by entirely revoking their CM/ECF electronic filing credentials to block an Emergency Motion for a Stay.

VI. LEGAL ARGUMENT

A. The Militarized Assault Dissolves The Case And Overrides Younger Abstention

Under Tenn. R. Crim. P. 4(a), Tennessee law mandates that for a misdemeanor charge, the magistrate shall issue a summons instead of an arrest warrant unless specific findings of flight or danger are established. No such findings exist. Mobilizing fifty (50) officers, tactical SWAT units, and an armored vehicle with a hydraulic boom to assault the home of an unarmed senior citizen and veteran—with advanced, recorded law enforcement knowledge that no weapons were present—is objectively

unreasonable as a matter of law under *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989). This extreme disproportionality establishes bad-faith harassment and retaliatory prosecution, which completely dissolves equitable federal abstention under *Younger v. Harris,* 401 U.S. 37 (1971) and allows the Federal Courts to intervene under *Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs,* 571 U.S. 69 (2013).

B. Judge Taylor's Adverse-Party Participation Constitutes Structural Due Process Bias

The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees a litigant an impartial tribunal free from the probability of actual bias. Under *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.,* 556 U.S. 868 (2009) and *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), a structural constitutional conflict arises when a judicial officer sits in judgment of active legal opponents. Judge Taylor is an active, named party-defendant in connected federal civil rights litigation brought by Applicants. His subsequent participation—refusing recusal, entertaining expired HOA accounts, entering property execution orders against the homestead, and levying the separate wages of non-debtor spouse Sally E. Simpkins—renders every order executed under this structural conflict void ab initio.

C. A Final Decretal Disposition Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 2106 Is Mandated In Lieu Of Remand

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2106 explicitly authorizes this Court to modify, vacate, set aside, or reverse any judgment or order lawfully brought before it, and to direct the entry of such appropriate judgment as may be just under the circumstances. Remand to the lower federal or state tribunals is entirely futile. The state criminal prosecution is permanently dead by operation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a). The non-judicial foreclosure is completely barred by the six-year statutory limit under Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-3-118(a). The HOA collection is barred by Tenn. Code Ann. § 28-1-105. Because the lower courts

have erected complete filing blockades and refused to execute written orders, this Court should bypass futile steps and enter a final decretal judgment dismissing the expired matters with prejudice.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Applicants respectfully pray that the Honorable Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, or the Supreme Court upon referral, grant the following emergency and decretal relief:

A. AN IMMEDIATE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TEMPORARY / PERMANENT STAY OF FORECLOSURE:

1. Immediate Administrative Stay and Injunction Halting the Time-Barred Foreclosure Sale: Restraining Freedom Mortgage Corporation, Rubin Lublin, LLC, and all substitute trustees from conducting, completing, or publishing notice for the non-judicial foreclosure sale of Applicants' homestead at 1375 Round Hill Lane, scheduled for November 17, 2026, at 9:00 A.M.; (If a permanent stay is allowed by law, the Applicants respectfully request that a permanent stay order is issued).

2. An Immediate Stay Of All State Actions: Enjoining all state proceedings, dockets, executions, and hearings in Williamson County General Sessions and General Sessions Criminal Courts arising from Criminal Case No. 25CR2872 and Civil Case No. 2026-CV-2191, and any further actions against the Applications are prohibited. If a

3. An Order Vacating All Prior Criminal Process, Void Warrants, Capias Arrest Warrants: Directing that all outstanding Failure to Appear (FTA) capias warrants issued by Judge Murray Thomas

Taylor or Judge Denise Andre, or any other Judge in any court attempting to further violation or Applicants Constitutional Rights are quashed, and enjoining all law enforcement agencies from executing any interference of the Applicants, stops, detentions, or arrests, harassment, no further use of any devices to interfere with any devices that can be violated by the Police or any other Law Enforcement based thereon;

4. An Order Immediately Terminating The Wage Levy: Directing that the wage garnishment executed against the Employer's earnings of Co-Applicant Sally E. Simpkins under Case No. 2026-CV-2191 immediately cease and all levied funds be immediately restored; and

5. Declare The Violations As A Matter Of Law:

Applicants respectfully request the Court to declare that our Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights were violated as by law;

1. The warrants were void *ab initio*,
2. That excessive tactical force was used indirect violation of the Fourteenth Amendment under *Graham v. Connor*,
3. That Judges Andre and Taylor operated in complete absence of jurisdiction,
4. That Applicants are entitled to Bivens actions against all defendants parties to include all Officers from Spring Hill, TN, Franklin, TN, TBI Agents and FBI Agents that were present present at 1375 Round Hill Ln., on July 28th, 2025, and Officers and Swat Team Members present on February 19th, at the Applicants residence and at the roundabout close to the residence when Sgt. Burn attempted to put leg irons on Applicants swollen legs from CHF.

6. If Allowed By Law, Strip / Qualified Immunity Defenses:

Applicants ask that the Court to (Strip / Qualified Immunity Defenses) due to the warrants were temporally impossible nullities at the time of issuance and the statutes of limitation had expired, the state actors and the judges acted in the complete absence of all jurisdiction, therefore they cannot claim judicial or qualified immunity.

B. DECRETAL DISPOSITION OF TIME-BARRED MATTERS AND REMAND FOR DAMAGES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2106 (TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW)

4. Permanent Vacatur, Dismissal With Prejudice, and Expungement of Statutorily Time-Barred Actions: To the extent allowed by law—and treating this Application as a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari for summary decretal disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2106 so that no further certiorari briefing is required on matters indisputably extinguished by Tennessee statutes of limitations—entering a final decretal order:

(a) Permanently vacating and enjoining the time-barred non-judicial foreclosure proceedings initiated by Freedom Mortgage Corporation and Rubin Lublin TN, PLLC (extinguished under Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-3-118(a) and § 35-5-101(e)(1));

(b) Vacating with prejudice all orders, judgments, real property executions, and non-debtor wage garnishments entered in Williamson County General Sessions Civil Case No. 2026-CV-2191 (time-barred under Tenn. Code Ann. § 28-1-105(a) and void for structural judicial bias), and directing the immediate restoration of all wages unlawfully garnished from Co-Applicant Sally E. Simpkins; and

(c) Vacating with prejudice and dismissing Williamson County General Sessions Criminal Case No. 25CR2872 and all void warrants and FTA capias process issued therein (void ab initio under Tenn. R. Crim. P. 3 and permanently time-barred under Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-2-102(a)), and directing the complete expungement and removal of all arrest records, charges, warrants, and adverse entries from all Tennessee State (TBI) and Federal (FBI/NCIC) law enforcement repositories.

5. Reversal and Remand to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for Evidentiary Hearing and Award of Damages: Reversing the D.C. Circuit's dismissal orders in Case No. 26-7061 (dated August 25, 2026, and October 2, 2026), vacating the District Court's dismissal orders in Case Nos. 1:26-cv-00304-CJN and 1:25-cv-04566-AHA, restoring Applicants' electronic filing access, and remanding to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (with reassignment to an impartial District Judge as appropriate)—or entering such direct remedial orders as this Court deems proper under 28 U.S.C. § 2106—for an expedited evidentiary hearing and calculation of compensatory, treble, and punitive damages, restitution, and statutory costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents,* 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and 42 U.S.C. § 1988, commensurate with the documented Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendment violations for the unprecedented six hundred and six (606) documented Constitutional Rights violations.

6. Other Just and Proper Relief: Granting such other and further emergency, injunctive, or decretal relief as this Court deems just and proper to preserve its jurisdiction and prevent irreparable constitutional and property injury.

7. FINAL DECRETAL DISPOSITION AND MANDATORY EMERGENCY REMAND FOR FULL COMPENSATORY RESTITUTION, RESIDENTIAL ACQUISITION, AND PROTECTIVE SECURITY REMEDIES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2106, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, AND 42 U.S.C. § 1988:

1. Reversing the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals (No. 26-7061), vacating all lower dismissal orders, and executing a mandatory command to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to immediately enter an interim emergency scheduling order within forty-eight (48) hours of this Court's mandate, compelling an expedited evidentiary hearing to calculate and execute an immediate emergency interim damage award to provide full compensatory restitution for the multi-million dollar scope of injuries and protective measures necessitated by the Respondents' actions, including:
2. Eight-Year Compounded Pain and Suffering: Substantial compensatory damages for the severe, long-term emotional distress, physical toll, and profound disruption to life and livelihood resulting from an ongoing, eight-year pattern of coordinated harassment, surveillance, and systemic suppression;
3. Commercial and Intellectual Property Suppression: Restitution for the economic interference, destruction of corporate work products, and systematic suppression of the Applicants' proprietary innovations, specifically the Equity-Based Mortgage System (EBMS) and its core software engines;
4. Commercial and Intellectual Property interference and theft of their new music business, Titanium Knights Music, Titanium Knights Studios, and Titanium Knights Music and Video manipulation costing thousands of hours in loss and alleged financial theft of royalties.
5. Specialized Medical Care: Comprehensive financial support for acute and long-term physical impairment, including the clinical correction of improperly healed fractured digits directly resulting from the unlawful deployment of tactical force;
6. Environmental and Property Remediation: Full funding necessary to address systemic toxic environmental contamination and complete mold detoxification of the Applicants' primary residential property and associated personal property;

7. Emergency Relocation and Housing Stabilization: Immediate capital necessary to secure physical safety outside the hostile jurisdiction, to include interstate travel expenses, interim lodging, temporary boarding facilities for the family pets, and the outright acquisition of a secure, replacement residential homestead;
8. Transportation Infrastructure Preservation: Complete capital necessary for the immediate purchase of a new, secure replacement transport vehicle, alongside the separate funding required to fully overhaul, mechanically reconstruct the entire vehicle, and environmentally decontaminate the Applicants' sabotaged primary transport vehicle; and
9. Long-Term Protective Security Infrastructure: Immediate and ongoing funding to retain specialized, professional long-term security personnel and protective services to ensure the physical safety and bodily integrity of the Applicants against retaliatory official actions during the pendency of this litigation.

Respectfully submitted,



David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins Pro Se
1375 Round Hill Lane
Spring Hill, Tennessee 37174
Phone: (561) 298-2690
Email: d.simpkins.consultant@gmail.com

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1746

We, David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that the facts stated in the foregoing Supplemental Urgent Application to Preserve Residence and Enjoin Foreclosure Pending Certiorari are true and correct to the best of our knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on November 11, 2026.



David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Applicants hereby certify that on this 6th day of November 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Third Urgent Suppl. Appl. Of Retal. and Time Barred Actions was served upon all named Respondents via email, certified mail via US Postal Service and notification of delivery receipt requested and or other delivery services will occur, upon the following:

Office of the Attorney General of Tennessee

P.O. Box 20207

Nashville, TN 37202

Email: tnatg@ag.tn.gov

Williamson County District Attorney's Office

Stacey Edmonson, District Attorney General

7100 Commerce Way, Suite 295

Brentwood, TN 37027

Email: wcdatn@wcdatn.com

Williamson County General Sessions Court

Judge Denise André

135 4th Avenue South

Franklin, TN 37064

Williamson County General Sessions Criminal Court

Judge Murray Thomas Taylor

135 4th Avenue South

Franklin, TN 37064

Williamson County Sheriff's Office

408 Century Court

Franklin, TN 37064

Email: sheriffinfo@williamsoncounty-tn.gov

Angela D. Caesar, Clerk of Court

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

333 Constitution Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20001

Spring Hill Police Department

199 Town Center Parkway

P.O. Box 789

Spring Hill, TN 37174

Rubin Lublin TN, PLLC

Substitute Trustee & Counsel for Freedom Mortgage Corporation

3145 Avalon Ridge Place, Suite 100

Peachtree Corners, GA 30071

(Mailing Address: P.O. Box 502830, San Diego, CA 92150-2830)

Email: notices@rlselaw.com

Freedom Mortgage Corporation

Attn: Legal Department / Foreclosure Division

951 Yamato Road, Suite 175

Boca Raton, FL 33431

Email: legalnotices@freedommortgage.com

APPENDIX A

DATE: November 11, 2026

LIST OF EXHIBITS FOR:

THIRD URGENT SUPP. APPL. OF RETAL. AND TIME BARRED ACTIONS (FINAL) 11-11-2026

1) EXSC1- Urgent - Emergency Stay Tennessee Proceedings Simpkins 10-22-2026
2) EXSC2 - Supp Exhibit Of State Of TN & Fed Rights Infringements 11-5-2026
3) EXSC3 – Caesar Emerg. Verif. Cmplt For Decl. Injunc. Relief & Damages
4) EXSC4 - All 3 Cases In One Image – Caesar
5) EXSC5 - Freedom Mortgage Dated 10-5 Received 10-24
6) EXSC6 - Rubin Lublin Notice of Foreclosure 10-2 Received 10-24-2026
7) EXSC7 – Rubin Lublin Foreclosure Notice 10-7 Received 10-24-26
8) EXSC8 - Exhibits For Foreclosure EX-A800 – EX-A802
9) EXSC9 - App Ct. Order to Dismiss 10-2-2026
10) EXSC10 - Emergency Motion to General Sessions Ct 10-23-25
11) EXSC11 - Execution of Garnishment or Levy Pg 1 Sally Simpkins
12) EXSC12 - Clk of Ct Angela Caesar Dmnd Pmt for Lawsuit 2-4-2026
13) EXSC13 - Judgment On Property By HOA
14) EXSC14 - Sally Simpkins Garnishment 8-8 to 8-21-26
15) EXSC15 - Sally Simpkins Garnishment 8-22 to 9-4-26
16) EXSC16 – Ali Memorandum Order for Complaint Denied 1-14-2026
17) EXSC17 - Execution of Garnishment Levy Pg 2 Sally Simpkins
18) EXSC18 – Judge Nichols' Dismissal Simpkins Case 3-4-2026
19) EXSC19 – Judge Carl Nichols Minute Order 3-24-2026
20) EXSC20 - App. Ct. Tribunal Dismissal of Case 8-25-2026
21) EXSC21 - En Banc Rehearing Response By Appellants (FINAL) 8-28-26
22) EXSC23 - Alleged Law Enforcement Letting Us Know They Will Be Waiting For US When We Are Foreclosed On.
23) EXSC24 - From Kristy Jones GS Civil Supervisor - Quit sending these messages 11-9-2026
24) EXSC25 - License Plate Marked for Targeting Mrs. Simpkins Vehicle

Date: November 11, 2026

We certify that the above information is true to the best of our knowledge.

David M. Simpkins and Sally E. Simpkins

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