

Six Justices at the U.S. Supreme Court will rule on a case where they are defendants in default to impeach themselves

On Dec. 11, the U.S. Supreme Court will decide Petition No.20-524 and recusal where six Justices were sued for declarative relief that they should be impeached.

WASHINGTON DC, UNITED STATES, December 4, 2020 /EINPresswire.com/ -- According to the court's records, Petitioner Shao asserts in Petition 20-524 that the U.S. Supreme Court, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and the courts of the State of California have all been participating in a series of felonious acts of altering court records, altering their dockets, and participating in ex parte communications. Petition 20-524 presents 23 felonies committed by the U.S. Supreme Court, 6 by the D.C. Circuit, and 19 by the U.S.D.C. for the D.C.

Recusal in this matter is required by law (28U.S.C.A.§455(b)(5)(i)). The six current Justices on the Supreme Court who are Respondents in this Petition may not legally rule on the matter, as they have direct conflicts of interest (Pilla v. American Bar Assoc. (8th Cir.,1976), 542 F.2d 56, 28 U.S.C.A.§455(b)(5)(i)).

The Respondents sued originally included 8 Justices: Chief Justice John G. Roberts, and Associate Justices Anthony Kennedy, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Stephen Beyer, Elena Kagan, and Sonia Sotomayer. Justice Kennedy announced his retirement two weeks after he was served with the First Amended Complaint in this case. Justice Ginsburg passed away recently. There thus remain 6 Supreme Court Justices as respondents.

Petition No. 20-524 covers the ethical and legal violations complained of herein, and is governed by the For the People Act of 2019 (H.R.1). The Justices were sued for failure to fulfill their Constitutionally mandated duty to decide 8 matters, including seven Requests for Recusal (see the dockets for Petitions 17-256, 17-613, 18-344, 18-569, 18-800 and 19-639) and an amicus curiae motion filed by the organization Mothers of Lost Children (18-569). The U.S. Supreme Court recently altered the docket of 18-569 to remove all records of the Amicus Curiae motion, while accidentally leaving the appearance of Amicus Curiae's attorney on the docket. Notably, the U.S. Supreme Court withheld the Request for Recusal in 19-639 from being filed for 21 days after receiving it, until Petitioner Shao hired a process server to inquire about it twice. Shao complained of 23 crimes of docket alteration perpetrated by the U.S. Supreme Court.

In Petition 20-524, Shao complains that the U.S. Supreme Court failed to file Shao's motion for judicial notice of the Amicus Curiae motion in 18-569, which was presented for filing on October 20, 2020. The Supreme court further altered the Request for Recusal by removing all appendices and refusing to scan any into the docket, which they had also done to all prior Requests for Recusal. A new Amicus Curiae motion identical to the one that the Supreme Court attempted to purge from its records in 18-569 was filed in 20-524 on November 9, 2020. When the Acting Solicitor General Jeffrey B. Wall appeared for the Justices, he ignored the court's failure to file Shao's motion for judicial notice, and the new issue of the US Supreme Court's alteration of 18-569's docket.

Shao filed this complaint in May 2018 with the U.S. District Court in D.C. (case number 1:18-cv-01233). The Supreme Court Justices as well as the Presiding Judge Rudolph Contreras, were all in default. After two defaults were entered successfully, Judge Contreras stalled all further default requests, including those against himself, and sua sponte dismissed the entire case, in which 22 defendants had not make an appearance. These included 15 who were in default, six of whom were the above-named Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. The last 11 pages of Petition 20-524 itemized 29 irregularities perpetrated by Judge Contreras, including 19 felonies of alteration of docket entries, forging court records, and engaging in ex parte communications.

The dismissal was immediately appealed to the D.C. Circuit Court (case number 19-5014), where Judge Patricia Millett was leading the panel. In pages 21-28 of Petition No. 20-524, the court's record shows how the D.C. Circuit, led by Judge Millett, committed 7 irregularities, including 6 felonies, when she failed to disclose her financial conflicts of interest with Respondent the American Inns of Court. In 2019 she sponsored her clerk to receive a substantial gift from the American Inns of Court (Temple Bar "Scholarship"). The D.C. Circuit also sua sponte dismissed this appeal by affirming the sua sponte order of Judge Contreras, bypassing appeal.

Yi Tai Shao, Esq. (California lawyer)
SHAO LAW FIRM, PC
+1 408-873-3888
SHAOLAWFIRM_CONTACT@YAHOO.COM
Visit us on social media:
[Facebook](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/494769606>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2020 IPD Group, Inc. All Right Reserved.