No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME

PETITIONER

V.

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC;
JUDGE JOHN ANDREWS WEST/
HAMILTON COUNTY (OHIO) COURT OF COMMON PLEAS; AND
DOES 1 THROUGH 250

RESPONDENT(S)

IN RE VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME
ON PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME
(a/k/a Denise V. Newsome)
Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: (513) 680-2922 or
(601) 885-9536
Petitioner

DAVID MERANUS, ESQ.
Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA
2900 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone: (513) 579-1414
Facsimile: (513) 579-1418

HON. JOHN ANDREW WEST (Judge)
Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas
1000 Main Street – Room 595
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone: (513) 946-5785
Facsimile: (513) 946-5784
Respondent

MICHAEL E. LIVELY, ESQ.
Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA
Post Office Box 6491
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
Phone: (513) 961-6200
Facsimile: (513) 961-6201
Attorneys for Respondent
Stor-All Alfred LLC

COMES NOW, Petitioner Vogel Denise Newsome (hereinafter, "Newsome" and/or "Petitioner Newsome") ***WITHOUT*** *waiving defenses* set forth in her October 9, 2010 *"Emergency Motion to Stay; Emergency Motion for Enlargement of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* ("EM/ORS") - incorporating the issues/arguments raised therein as if set forth in full herein. **This is a matter that involves a sitting United States President (Barack H. Obama)/his Administration and their SPECIAL Interest Groups who all have an interest (i.e. financial/personal) in the outcome of this lawsuit**. *This is a matter of EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances in which is not aware whether the United States Supreme Court has seen anything like it.* The lawsuit filed against Newsome in the lower court is one that is a part of "PATTERN" of unlawful/illegal practices that have been leveled against her that are *racially motivated.* In preservation of rights secured to Newsome under the United States Constitution, Laws of the United States and other governing statutes/laws, she submits this her instant ***Petition for Extraordinary Writ*** (hereinafter, "PFEW") and states the following in support thereof:

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether Newsome's *"Emergency Motion to Stay; Emergency Motion for Enlargement of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* was a timely pleading in accordance with United States Supreme Court Rules 22, 23 and/or 33. Whether the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court forward Newsome's

"EM/ORS" to individual justice (Chief Justice John G. Roberts) to which it was addressed. Whether Newsome was deprived equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities and due process of laws in the United States Supreme Court's handling of "EM/ORS."

2. Whether "EM/ORS" is within the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court. Whether the United States Supreme Court is attempting to deprive Newsome rights secured under the Constitution, other laws of the United States, equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities, and due process of laws in the handling of "EM/ORS."

3. Whether Newsome is entitled to the "Emergency Relief" sought in "EM/ORS" and pleadings filed with the United States Supreme Court.

4. Whether Newsome is entitled to **IMMEDIATE** temporary injunctive relief and emergency relief sought in "EM/ORS" ***prior*** to disposition of PFEW – i.e. for instance as set forth in: *Section 706(f)(2) of Title VII* ***authorizes*** *the Commission to seek temporary injunctive relief* ***before*** *final disposition of a charge when a preliminary investigation indicates that* ***prompt*** *judicial action is necessary to carry out the purposes of Title VII*.

Temporary or preliminary relief ***allows a court*** *to stop retaliation before it occurs or* ***continues***. ***Such relief is appropriate if there is a substantial likelihood that the challenged action will be found to constitute unlawful retaliation, and if the charging party*** and/or

EEOC ***will likely suffer irreparable harm because of retaliation***. Although courts have ruled that financial hardships are not irreparable, other **harms that accompany loss of a job may be irreparable**. - - For example, in one case forced retirees showed irreparable harm and qualified for a preliminary injunction *where they lost work and future prospects for work consequently suffering emotional distress, depression, a contracted social life, and other related harms*.

5. Whether the United States Supreme Court in handling of this lawsuit, is attempting to obstruct justice and provide Respondent(s) with an unlawful/illegal and undue advantage in lawsuit due to bias and prejudice towards Newsome.

6. Whether the laws of the United States are equally applied to African-Americans/Black as those similarly situated. Whether the United States has a *"longstanding" history of knowingly discriminating against African-Americans/Blacks in the application of the laws.* Whether Newsome has been discriminated against in the application of the laws of the United States.

7. Whether the United States Supreme Court Justices/Administration have bias, prejudices and/or discriminatory animus towards Newsome. Whether Newsome is required to know of any bias, prejudices or discriminatory animus that Judges/Justices may have against her.

8. Whether the United States Supreme Court Justices/Administration is attempting to COVER UP the criminal/civil wrongs leveled against Newsome. Whether a *"Conflict of Interest"* exist in the United States Supreme Court's handling of this matter. Whether the United States Supreme Court has advised Newsome and parties to this action of any potential *"Conflict of Interest."*

9. What relationship (if any) the United States Supreme Court, its justices and/or employees have with the law firm of *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients (i.e. such as Liberty Mutual Insurance Company).

10. What relationship (if any) the United States Government and/or Government Agencies and employees have with the law firm of *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients (i.e. such as Liberty Mutual Insurance Company).

11. Whether the United States Supreme Court is engaging in *"dilatory" practices for purposes of financially devastating Newsome for purposes of preventing her from litigating this matter and purposes of providing opposing parties with an undue/unlawful/illegal advantage in lawsuit.*

12. Whether the United States Supreme Court has an obligation to correct the legal wrongs made known to it and/or that it has knowledge of. *Whether the United States Supreme Court* ***is required to report*** *criminal/civil wrongs*

reported to it and/or made known through pleadings (i.e. as "PFEW") filed with it.

13. Whether attorneys are governed by the Code of Professional Conduct and/or similar statutes/laws governing practice before the court(s) and representation of clients. Whether Judges/Justices have a duty to report and/or initiate the applicable proceedings against attorneys/lawyers who violate the Code of Professional Conduct and/or similar statutes/laws governing the practice of law.

14. Whether Judges/Justices are governed by the Code of Judicial Conduct and/or similar statutes/laws governing practice of the laws. Whether Judges/Justices have a duty to report and/or initiate the applicable proceedings against judges/justices who violate the Code of Judicial Conduct and/or similar statutes/laws governing the practice of law.

15. Whether Judges/Justices have usurped authority and/or abused power in the handling of legal matters to which Newsome is a party.

16. Whether Judge(s) presiding over legal matters to which Newsome is a party have been **INDICTED** and/or **IMPEACHED** as a direct and proximate result of unlawful/illegal practices. Whether Newsome timely, properly and adequately addressed concerns of unlawful/illegal and unethical practices of judges/justices before the appropriate government entity (i.e. court(s) and/or agency).

17. Whether the INDICTMENT and/or IMPEACHMENT of judges/justices or

attorneys/lawyers affect legal matters in which they are involved.

18. Whether judges/justices have subjected Newsome to discriminatory treatment in the handling of legal matters to which she is a party.

19. Whether Newsome is entitled to ***"emergency"*** injunctive relief and/or emergency relief pending the resolution of Petition for Extraordinary Writ. ***Whether United States Supreme Court has a duty to mitigate damages and to protect Newsome from further irreparable injury/harm she has sustained***.

20. Whether Newsome is entitled to have "ISSUES" raised addressed upon request(s).

21. Whether Newsome is entitled to "Findings of Fact" and "Conclusion of Law" upon request(s).

22. Whether lower courts' decisions are "arbitrary" and/or "capricious" – i.e. can be sustained by facts, evidence and legal conclusions. Moreover, contrary to laws governing said matters. Contrary to rulings of this Court on similar matters.

23. Whether Judge John Andrews West has jurisdiction/legal authority to preside over lower court action where *"Affidavit of Disqualification"* and Criminal *"FBI Complaint"* have been filed against him.

24. Whether Judge John Andrews West owe a specific duty to Newsome to recuse himself

from Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas action.

25. Whether Newsome is entitled to know of "Conflict of Interest" that exist between factfinder(s)/judges/justices and/or opposing parties/counsel.

26. Whether Judges/Justices owe a specific duty to Newsome to recuse themselves when "conflict of interest" exists. Whether Judges/Justices remained on the bench in legal actions where Newsome is a party with knowledge there was a "conflict of interest" due to their relationship with opposing parties and/or their counsel/counsel's law firm.

27. Whether judges/justices assigned cases involving Newsome and having relationships to opposing parties (i.e. such as opposing law firms as *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, their employees and/or clients) had a duty to recuse themselves from lawsuits – i.e. such as Judge Tom S. Lee [see **APPENDIX "11"** – Recusal Orders executed because of relationship to *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz* - provided and incorporated herein by reference] – in which ***knowledge*** of CONFLICT OF INTEREST EXISTED. Whether judges/justices are allowed to discriminate in their compliance with laws governing recusal [see **APPENDIX "12"** – Docket Sheet (*Newsome v. Entergy* - wherein *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz* appears as counsel of record - provided and incorporated herein by reference]. Whether judges/justices should be IMMEDIATELY removed from the bench

and/or the applicable legal actions initiated against judges/justices for removal when record evidence supports judges/justices failure to recuse. How does said failure of judges/judges to recuse themselves affect the public and/or Constitutional rights of citizen(s).

28. Whether Newsome, as a matter of Constitutional right, is entitled to JURY trial(s) when requested. Whether Newsome has been deprived of Constitutional right to jury trial(s).

29. Whether lower courts are required to protect "federal" rights of Newsome in the handling of lawsuit. Whether lower courts failed to protect Newsome's federally protected rights.

30. Whether the Supreme Court of Ohio entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another state supreme court on the same important matter; has decided in important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; and/or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of the United States Supreme Court's supervisory power and/or original jurisdiction.

31. Whether the Supreme Court of Ohio has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals.

32. Whether Supreme Court of Ohio has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court; and/or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

33. Whether the lower courts entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another state supreme court on the same important matter; has decided in important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; and/or has *so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings*, or *sanctioned such a departure*, as to call for an exercise of the United States Supreme Court's supervisory power and/or original jurisdiction.

34. Whether the lower courts have decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals.

35. Whether lower court decision(s) raise question(s) as to the validity of the federal statute or treaty; raise a question statute statute/law relied upon is repugnant to the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States; or address the contention that a right, privilege or immunity is "set up or claimed under the Constitution or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States."

36. Whether the United States Supreme Court's recent decision in ***Citizens United v Federal***

Election Commission, 558 U.S. 50 (2010), have provide courts with a license and/or defense to engage in criminal acts – i.e. provide arbitrary/capricious decisions for purposes of covering up criminal/civil wrongs leveled against citizens/litigants – *for purposes of protecting TOP/BIG/KEY* ***Financial*** *Campaign Contributors*.

37. Whether Newsome has been deprived equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities of the laws, and due process of laws secured under the United States Constitution.

38. Whether Newsome is a victim of "Pattern-of-Practices," "Pattern-of-Abuse," "Pattern-of-Injustices" and/or "PATTERN" of unlawful/illegal practices as a direct and proximate result of her engagement in protected activities.

39. Whether Newsome is a victim of "Criminal Stalking."

40. Whether Newsome is a victim of Government "BULLYING." Whether the United States Government/Courts allow parties opposing Newsome in legal matters (judicial and administrative) to use their "political" and "financial wealth" for purposes of BULLYING Newsome. Whether said BULLYING is for purposes of intimidation, coercion, threats, bribery, blackmail, etc. to force Newsome to abandon protected rights and/or deprive Newsome equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities of the laws and due process of laws.

41. Whether United States Government and Newsome's former employer(s) have engaged in criminal/civil wrongs leveled against her for purposes of **BLACKLISTING**. *Whether the **United States Government/Courts** have placed information **on the INTERNET** regarding Newsome **that it knew** and/or should have known **was false, misleading and/or malicious***.

42. Whether Government agencies, their employees and others have engaged in TERRORIST ACTS.

43. Whether the United States citizens/public and/or Foreign Nations, their leaders and citizens are entitled to know of the crimes and civil injustices of the United States Government, its officials/employees and co-conspirators leveled against African-Americans and/or people of color.

44. Whether extraordinary circumstances exist to warrant granting of ***Petition of Extraordinary Writ.***

45. Whether conspiracy(s) leveled against Newsome exist. Whether United States Government's/Court(s)' *failure and "neglect to prevent" has created a "threat to the public" in the allowing criminal(s) to remain at large in the general population*.

46. Whether Newsome is being subjected to further criminal/civil violations by the United States Government and its subsidiaries (i.e. such as the Ohio Attorney General's – Richard Cordray's – Office) in RETALIATION for

engagement in protected activities. Whether the United States Government and its subsidiaries are engaging in criminal acts of HARASSMENT, THREATS, COERCION, BLACKMAIL, INTIMIDATION, etc. in the providing of false/frivolous/sham legal process – i.e. such as **2005** Personal Income Tax claims wherein Newsome was **NOT** a resident of the State of Ohio in **2005** [see **APPENDIX "10"** – December 27, 2010 correspondence from Ohio ***Attorney General***] – with knowledge that said actions are **NOT** *applicable to* Newsome and are PROHIBITED by law. Whether Government *records reflect documentation* to support/sustain timely, proper and adequate notification as to Newsome's defenses to claims asserted.

47. Whether Newsome is required to pay the fees alleged in the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas' December 20, 2010, "CASE COST BILLING" [see **APPENDIX "14"** incorporated herein by reference]. Whether Newsome's submittal of "EM/ORS" stays proceeding in the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas. Whether Newsome's filing of *"Opposition/Objection to November 8, 2010 Entry; Request for Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law; and Vacating of Entry"* and filing of this instant "PFEW" with the United States Supreme Court stays and preserves the rights of Newsome – i.e. preclude the CRIMINAL/CIVIL violations of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas.

48. Whether Government Agencies (i.e. its employees) have violated Newsome's Constitutional rights and other rights secured

under the laws of the United States. Whether the Government has engaged in criminal/civil violations in demanding monies from citizens to which it is **NOT** entitled. Whether it is lawful for Government agency(s) to demand monetary relief from citizen(s) under certain time restraints when it, itself owes citizens monies. Whether Government is required to compensate citizen(s) for monies owed when citizen(s) make timely demands – i.e. it has knowledge that citizen(s) are owed monies.

49. Whether citizens of the United States have the right to exercise First Amendment Rights and Rights secured/guaranteed under the United States Constitution and/or Rights secured under the laws of the United States *without fear of reprisal*.

50. Whether Courts and Judges/Justices have legal authority to interfere in matters where Newsome has requested the United States Congress' and/or United States Legislature's intervention. Whether said interference deprives Newsome equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities of the laws and due process of laws – rights secured under the United States Constitution and/or laws of the United States.

51. Whether United States Government Agencies and their Officials/Employees have the right to retaliate against Newsome for exercising rights protected and secured under the laws of the United States and United States Constitution.

52. Whether opposing parties', their insurance providers, special interest groups, lobbyists, and their representatives have legal authority to retaliate against Newsome for her engagement in protected activities. Whether opposing parties and their conspirators/co-conspirators are allowed to stalk Newsome from job-to-job/employer-to-employer and state-to-state for purposes of terminating her employment, blacklisting, etc. in retaliation for Newsome having exercised and/or or engaged in protected activities.

53. What role (if any) has the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees, clients and others have played in the criminal/civil wrongs and conspiracies leveled against Newsome?

54. What relationship (if any) does the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have to United States President Barack Obama and his Administration?

55. What relationship (if any) does the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have to past Presidents of the United States and their Administration?

56. What relationship (if any) does the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have to officials/employees in the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives?

57. What relationship (if any) does the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have in the appointment of judges/justices to the courts?

58. What role (if any) did the law firm *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have in the handling of criminal/civil complaints Newsome filed with the ***United States Department of Justice*** – i.e. based on relationship and KEY position(s) held with the Commission on Civil Rights [Chairman, etc.] which serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws; submitting reports, findings and recommendations ***to the President and Congress***; and issuing public service announcements to discourage discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws . . . served as **Chief Counsel** to the *U.S. House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution*, which responsibilities included advising the Chairman and Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee on legislation and Congressional **oversight** implicating civil and constitutional rights, Congressional authority, separation of powers, proposed constitutional amendments and ***oversight*** *of the* ***Civil Rights*** *Division of the* ***Department of Justice*** *and the* ***U.S. Commission on Civil Rights*** [see for instance **APPENDIX "13"** – Baker Doneslon information regarding Bradley S. Clanton]?

59. What role (if any) did *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its

employees, its clients and the United States Department of Justice play in the COVER-UP of criminal/civil violations leveled against Newsome reported on or about September 17, 2004 in **"Petitioner's Petition Seeking Intervention/Participation of the United States Department of Justice"** - i.e. styled *"VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME vs. ENTERGY SERVICES, INC."* [see **EXHIBIT "34"** of "EM/ORS"] in which Newsome timely, properly and adequately reported the criminal/civil violations of *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz,* Judge G. Thomas Porteous Jr. and others – to no avail.

60. Whether the recent IMPEACHMENT of Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. (i.e. having role as presiding judge in lawsuit involving Newsome) on or about December 8, 2010 [see **APPENDIX "15"** – Article ***"Senate Removes Federal Judge in Impeachment Conviction"*** and EXHIBIT "12" of "EM/ORS" incorporated herein by reference], is pertinent/relevant to this instant lawsuit.

61. What role (if any) did *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees, its clients, others and the United States Department of Justice play in the COVER-UP of criminal/civil violations leveled against Newsome reported on or about September 24, 2004 in **"Request for Department of Justice's Intervention/Participation in this Case"** - i.e. referencing *"Newsome v. Mitchell McNutt & Sams P.A."* [see **EXHIBIT "169"** of "EM/ORS"] in which Newsome timely, properly and adequately reported the criminal/civil

violations of Mitchell McNutt & Sams – to no avail.

62. Whether the INDICTMENT of Judge Bobby DeLaughter [i.e. having a role as presiding judge in lawsuit involving Newsome] on or about January 6, 2009, and his pleading GUILTY on or about July 30, 2009, is pertinent to this instant lawsuit.

63. Whether *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz*, its employees and clients have an interest in the outcome of this lawsuit. If so, whether the United States Supreme Court is aware of said knowledge and/or information.

64. Whether lower court lawsuit in Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas was filed as a direct and proximate result of Respondent Stor-All's, its insurance provider's and/or representatives' knowledge of Newsome's engagement in protected activities.

65. Whether attorneys and their client(s) are allowed to engage in criminal and civil wrongs for purposes of obstructing the administration of justice.

66. Whether the EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances surrounding this lawsuit supports the establishment of special court(s) to litigate matters. Whether the SPECIAL relationships of Judges/Justices to opposing party(s) in litigation involving Newsome warrant the creation of special court(s) to afford Newsome rights secured and guaranteed under the United States Constitution and laws of the United States –

i.e. equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities of the laws and due process of laws.

II. [1]LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page along with contact information for each and their counsel/representative of record.

At all times relevant to this instant action, Respondents Does 1 through 250 served in respective positions with their employer and/or in their individual capacity. Newsome is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 250, inclusive, and therefore sue these Respondents by such fictitious names. Newsome is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Doe Respondent(s) so named (and/or to be named) is responsible and/or participated in the conspiracy[2] against Newsome and in such manner is responsible for the injuries and damages suffered by Newsome as set forth in this instant pleading. Newsome will amend *Petition for Extraordinary Writ* to state the true names and capacities of Respondents Does 1 through 250, inclusive, when they have been identified and/or ascertained. Due to the extraordinary circumstances and scope of CONSPIRACIES leveled against Newsome at the time of the filing of this "PFEW," she is ignorant of the names and capacities of Doe Respondent(s) – i.e. believing that during the course of

---

[1] *BOLDFACE, ITALICS, UNDERLINE, etc.* of text in this ***Petition for Extraordinary Writ*** if for purposes of emphasis.

[2] Respondent (conspirator) becomes the agent of the other conspirator (s), and ***any act done by one*** *of the combination* ***is regarded under the law*** *as the* ***act of both or all***. In other words, what one does, if there is this combination, ***becomes the act*** *of both or all of them,* ***no matter which individual*** *may have done it*. **This is true as to each member of the conspiracy**, *even those whose involvement was limited to* ***a minor role*** *in the unlawful transaction, and it makes* ***no*** *difference* ***whether or not*** *such* ***individual shared in the profits*** *of the actions*. (Am. Jur. Pleading and Practice Forms, Conspiracy § 9).

litigation of this matter and/or investigation by this Court into this matter, the identity(s) of Doe Respondent(s) may become known. By engaging in the conduct described in this "PFEW," Doe Respondent(s) acted under the course and scope of their employment with their respective employer as well as may have acted within their individual capacity. By engaging in the discriminatory conduct described in this "PFEW," Doe Respondent(s) exceeded the authority vested in them as an employee of their respective employer and committed acts of a personal nature, personal bias and/or for personal and financial interest and gain.

III. TABLE OF CONTENTS

In preservation of rights and issues raised, Newsome incorporates herein by reference her "EM/ORS" – See ***APPENDIX "5"*** *- and the contents therein as well as the additional Table of Contents:*

XII. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

IV. INDEX TO APPENDICES

V. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

In preservation of rights and issues raised, Newsome incorporates herein by reference her "EM/ORS" – See ***APPENDIX "5"*** *- and the contents therein as well as the additional Table of Authorities:*

CASES

STATUTES

OTHER AUTHORITIES

RULES

VI. CONCISE STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

> *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 165, 28 S.Ct. 441, 52 L.Ed. 714 (1908) - [HN1] The United States Supreme Court will not take jurisdiction if it should not; but *it is equally true that it* ***must*** *take jurisdiction if it should*. The judiciary **cannot**, as the legislature may, *avoid a measure because it approaches the confines of the Constitution*. The court ***cannot*** *pass it by because it is doubtful*. With whatever doubts, with whatever difficulties, a case may be attended, the court ***must*** decide it, **if it is** *brought before it*. The court *has* ***no more right to decline*** *the exercise of jurisdiction*, **which is given**, *than to usurp that which is not given*. The one or the other would ***be treason*** to the Constitution. ***Questions may occur which the court would gladly avoid, but the court cannot avoid them.*** All the court can do is to exercise its best judgment, and conscientiously perform its duty.

This is a matter that is birthed out of the Supreme Court of Ohio's denial of Newsome's Affidavit of Disqualification. Because of the EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances surrounding this matter, Newsome seeks the United States Supreme Court's ***Original*** *Jurisdiction* through Extraordinary

Writ. Newsome believes that the role of a sitting United States President (Barack H. Obama), his Administration as well as his SPECIAL INTEREST Groups, Lobbyist, etc. role in the lower court actions (which are clearly prohibited by law) supports the extraordinary and exceptional circumstances which exist warranting the relief sought through Extraordinary Writ and/or applicable action the United States Supreme Court deems appropriate. In further support of the United States Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction, Newsome states:

a. On or about **October 9, 2010,** Newsome filed with the United States Supreme Court her **timely** *"EM/ORS"* pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 22, 23 and 30 as well as applicable laws/statutes governing said matters. In compliance with said Rules, Newsome submitted said Motions to the attention of an "individual" justice – Chief Justice John G. Roberts. See **APPENDIX "8"** – October 9, 2010 Cover Letter incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein.

   IMPORTANT TO NOTE: United States Supreme Court Rule 22. ***Applications to Individual Justices*** states in part:

   1. An application ***addressed to an individual Justice*** shall be filed with the Clerk, *who will transmit* ***it promptly*** *to the Justice concerned* if an individual Justice has authority to grant the sought relief.

   2. The original and two copies of any application addressed to an individual Justice shall be

prepared as required by Rule 33.2, and shall be accompanied by proof of service as required by Rule 29.

United States Supreme Court Rule 23. ***Stays***

1. A stay may be granted by a Justice as permitted by law.

2. A party to a judgment sought to be reviewed may present to a Justice an application to stay the enforcement of that judgment. See 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f).

3. An application for a stay shall set forth with particularity why the relief sought is not available from any other court or judge. Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, an application for a stay will not be entertained unless the relief requested was first sought in the appropriate court or courts below or from a judge or judges thereof. An application of stay shall identify the judgment sought to be reviewed and have appended thereto a copy of the order and opinion, if any, of the court or judge below denying the relief sought, and shall set out specific reasons why a stay is justified.

Thus, it is not clear to Newsome whether or not her October 9, 2010 Motion was submitted to the attention of Chief Justice John C.

*Roberts as **MANDATED** and **REQUIRED** by Rule(s) of the United States Supreme Court*. It appears ***from the October 14, 2010*** letter submitted to Newsome under the direction of William K. Suter (Clerk of United States Supreme Court) and executed by Danny Bickell, *that the Clerk's Office may have **USURPED authority** and **OBSTRUCTED** the administration of justice which, as a DIRECT and PROXIMATE result, may have deprived Newsome rights secured under the United States Constitution as well as rights secured under the Rules of the United States Supreme Court*. In so doing, that Mr. Suter/Mr. Bickell *may have **KNOWINGLY**, **DELIBERATELY** and **MALICIOUSLY** deprived Newsome equal protection of the laws, equal privileges and immunities of the laws, and due process of laws secured/guaranteed under the United States Constitution.*

Suter/Bickell stating in October 14, 2010 letter, ***"The papers you submitted are not construed to be a petition for writ of certiorari."*** Actions clearly supporting that the Clerk's Office Suter/Bickell USURPED authority and obstructed the administration of justice for purposes of depriving Newsome PROTECTED rights afforded to her under the United States Constitution and Rules of the United States Supreme Court. Therefore, in efforts of avoiding dilatory and unlawful/illegal practices by Suter/Bickell and to preserve rights, Newsome has proceeded to file this instant pleading – i.e. without waiving her rights and ***RE**-assert* the relief sought in her "*EM/ORS*" herein. See **APPENDIX "5"** –

Excerpt[3] of EM/ORS to support mailing and receipt by this Court.

b. On or about **July 9, 2010**, a *timely* ***Affidavit of Disqualification*** was filed against Judge John Andrew West. A copy of said Affidavit is provided at EXHBIT "9" of "EM/ORS" submitted for filing with this Court. See **APPENDIX "5"** EMORS Excerpt.

c. On or about **July 17, 2010** (*Saturday*), the Supreme Court of Ohio denied *Affidavit of Disqualification.* A copy of that decision appears at **APPENDIX "1."** Supporting how the Supreme Court of Ohio REPEATEDLY and DELIBERATELY withheld decisions and did not provide Newsome with a copy of rulings until SEVERAL days after execution. See copy of envelope.

d. On or about **July 26, 2010**, a *timely* ***Motion for Reconsideration*** was submitted. A copy of said motion was provided at EXHIBIT "10" of October 9, 2010 *"EM/ORS"* submitted for filing with this Court and is hereby incorporated by reference.

e. On or about **August 2, 2010**, the Supreme Court of Ohio denied *Motion for Reconsideration.* A copy that decision appears at **APPENDIX "2."**

f. On or about **August 11, 2010**, a *timely* ***Notification of Intent to File Emergency Writ***

[3] Cover page, Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, Table of Exhibits, Page 1, Relief Sought and Signature/Certificate of Service, and United States Postal Service PROOF of Mailing.

of Certiorari With The United States Supreme Court; Motion to Stay Proceedings – Request for Entry of Final Judgment/Issuance of Mandate As Well As Stay of Proceedings Should Court Insist on Allowing August 2, 2010 Judgment Entry to Stand ("NOITFEW/MTS") was submitted. A copy of said Notification/Motion to Stay was provided at EXHIBIT "8" of October 9, 2010 *"EM/ORS"* submitted for filing with this Court and is hereby incorporated by reference.

g. On or about **August 18, 2010**, the Supreme Court of Ohio executed ***Judgment Entry on Defendant's 8/11/10 Motion for Final Entry and Stay***. A copy of that decision appears at **APPENDIX "3."**

h. On or about October 14, 2010, William K. Suter (Clerk of the Supreme Court of United States)/Danny Bickell returned a portion of Newsome's October 9, 2010 filing (i.e. not entire filing – Letter to Justice Roberts, Filing Fee, Original October 9, 2010 Brief and Exhibits 1 through 15 only [i.e. out of the 169 Exhibits provided]).

i. On or about October 25, 2010, out of concerns that the Clerk's Office of this Court was attempting to "Obstruct Justice" Newsome ***re-submitted*** the original letter provided with her October 9, 2010 filing to Chief Justice John G. Roberts via ***"Registered Letter"*** along with a copy of the October 14, 2010 letter from William K. Suter/Danny Bickell. See **APPENDIX "8"** and is incorporated hereto as if set forth in full.

j. On or about November 8, 2010, Gail Johnson on behalf of William K. Suter (Clerk of Court) and Supreme Court of United States drafted letter advising corrections to the Petition for Extraordinary Writ. On or about January 6, 2011, Newsome submitted revised "PFEW." See **APPENDIX "8"** – *January 6, 2011 Cover Letter* and *copy of November 8, 2010 letter from the Clerk/Gail Johnson* – incorporated herein by reference.

k. Because of the EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances surrounding this action, pursuant to Rule 17 – ***Procedure in an Original Action*** - of the Supreme Court of the United States, "*A petition for an extraordinary writ in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction shall be filed as provided in Rule 20"* of this Court.

l. Pursuant to United States Supreme Court Rule 20 – ***Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ*** – issuance by the Court of an extraordinary writ is authorized by 28 USC § 1651(a).

m. The jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

n. The jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1251 – Original Jurisdiction:

> (a) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more states.. . .

o. Jurisdiction is invoked under United States Supreme Court Rule 17(1) – *Procedure in an Original Action*:

> This Rule applies only to an action invoking the Court's original jurisdiction *under Article III of the Constitution of the United States*. See also *28 U. S. C. §1251* and U. S. Const., Amdt. 11. A petition for an extraordinary writ in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction shall be filed as provided in Rule 20.

p. The jurisdiction of this Court is further invoked pursuant to **Article III, § 2, United States Constitution** - - Section 2: *The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority* . . .

§ 402.02 **Article III Jurisdiction and Its Limitations**

[1] – Original Jurisdiction of Supreme Court Under Article III

[a] Nature of Original Jurisdiction: The Supreme Court is generally a source of appellate review, but *it can act as a **trial court** in certain instances*. Original jurisdiction means the following, as Justice Marshall explained in *Marbury v. Madison*;

5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 174, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)*:*

> [The Court has] the power to hear and decide a lawsuit in the **first** instance . . . [A]ppellate jurisdiction means the authority to review the judgment of another court which has already heard the lawsuit in the first instance. Trial courts are courts that exercise original jurisdiction; courts of appeals. . . exercise appellate jurisdiction. *Id.*

Article III of the U.S. Constitution prescribes the Supreme Court's **original jurisdiction** (*See* U.S. Constitution, Article III, § 2 cl. 2). Under the first clause of Section 2 of Article III, federal courts have jurisdiction over the following: *[A]ll Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority*.

q. Vol. 22 Moore's Federal Practice, § 400.03 ***Relationship of Supreme Court to State Courts:***

[1] STATE COURT MUST PROTECT FEDERAL RIGHTS: The state courts existed before Congress created the federal courts. Their existence was not disturbed by the adoption of the Constitution. State courts ***are required*** to protect federal, as well as state-created, rights.

See Testa v. Katt, 330 U.S. 386, 390-394, 67 S.Ct. 810, 91 L.Ed. 967 (1947) (state court ***could not*** *refuse to enforce federal claim*).

[2] SUPREME COURT MAY REVIEW DECISION OF HIGHEST STATE COURT IF SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION IS INVOLVED: If a party elects to litigate in state court, **the Supreme Court may review a final judgment or decree of the highest state court in which a decision can be had if it turns on a substantial federal question**. More specifically, the decision must:

> (1) raise a question as to the validity of the federal statute or treaty;
>
> (2) raise a question as to whether a state statute is repugnant to the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States; or
>
> (3) address the contention that a title, right, privilege or immunity is "set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States." (*See* 28 USC § 1257(a)).

The constitutionality of this scheme was upheld early in the Court's history.

(*See Cohens v. Virginia,* 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264, 421, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821) (Court has supervising power over judgments of state courts that conflict with Constitution of federal laws or treaties); *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee,* 14 U.S. (1 Wheat.) 304, 342, 14 U.S. 304, 4 L.Ed. 97(1816)("the appellate power of the United States must . . .extend to state tribunals").

The qualifying phrase "highest court of a state in which a decision could be had" means the highest court in the state with appellate power over the judgment.

See Flynt v. Ohio, 451 U.S. 619, 620, 101 S.Ct. 1958, 68 L.Ed 2d 489 (1981) (per curiam) (jurisdiction to review only final judgment of highest state court); *Nash v. Florida Indus. Comm'n,* 389 U.S. 235, 237 n.1, 88 S.Ct. 362, 19 L.Ed.2d 438 (1967) (decision of intermediate appellate court reviewed because Court was "unable to say" that court was not highest one in which decision could be had).

r. Vol. 22 Moore's Federal Practice, § 400.04 ***Supervisory Authority of Supreme Court Over Inferior Federal Courts***

[1] SUPREME COURT HAS EXTENSIVE RULEMAKING POWER: The Supreme Court ***has powers beyond its duty to entertain cases within its original*** *and appellate* ***jurisdiction.*** The Court has ***extensive*** power to prescribe rules of practice and procedure for civil actions. . . The Supreme Court, of course, *has the* ***power to promulgate*** *rules governing practice and procedure before itself, and has done so.*

s. Newsome is not aware whether the Ohio Supreme Court complied with 28 U.S.C. § 2403(a) and certified to the Attorney General *the fact that the constitutionality of an Act of Congress was drawn into question*. Newsome knows that there was sufficient and timely/properly submitted information provided through pleadings filed to support that *the Ohio Supreme Court knew and/or should have known that the "constitutionality of an Act of Congress was drawn into question*." Nevertheless, it is a good thing that Newsome served copies of her filings on the United States Attorney General Eric Holder and United States President Barack Obama to support and sustain the Ohio Supreme Court's knowledge that "constitutionality of Act of Congress was drawn into question." See **APPENDIX "9"** supporting proof of mailing and receipt by United States Attorney General Eric Holder and United States President Barack Obama of: **(a)** July 9, 2010 Affidavit of Disqualification; **(b)** July 26, 2010 Motion for Reconsideration; and **(c)** August 11, 2010 *"NOITFEW/MTS."*

t. Pursuant the United States Supreme Court Rule 29(b), 28 USC § 2403(a) may apply.[4]

u. The following statute may further apply: 28 USC §2403 - ***Intervention by United States or a State; Constitutional Question***: (a) In any action, suit or proceeding in a court of the United States to which the United States or any agency, officer or employee thereof is not a party, *wherein the constitutionality of any Act of Congress* ***affecting the public interest*** *is drawn in question, the court shall certify such fact to the Attorney General, and shall permit the United States to intervene for presentation of evidence, if evidence is otherwise admissible in the case, and for argument on the question of constitutionality*. The United States shall, subject to the applicable provisions of law, have all the rights of a party and be subject to all liabilities of a party as to court costs to the extent necessary for a proper presentation of the facts and law relating to the question of constitutionality.

It may be a good thing that Newsome continued to notify the United States Attorney

[4] U.S. Supreme Court Rule 29(b): In any proceeding in this Court in which the constitutionality of an Act of Congress is drawn into question, and neither the United States nor any federal department, office, agency, officer, or employee is a party, the initial document filed in this Court shall recite that 28 U. S. C. § 2403(a) may apply and shall be served on the Solicitor General of the United States, Room 5614, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W., Washington, DC 20530-0001. In such a proceeding from any court of the United States, as defined by 28 U. S. C. § 451, the initial document also shall state whether that court, pursuant to 28 U. S. C. § 2403(a), certified to the Attorney General the fact that the constitutionality of an Act of Congress was drawn into question. See Rule 14.1(e)(v).

General Eric Holder and United States President Barack Obama as to what was taking place under their WATCH.

VII. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, TREATIES, STATUTES, ORDINANCES and REGULATIONS INVOLVED IN CASE

CONSTITUTION:

a. United States Constitution
b. United States Constitution – Amendments 1, 7, 13 through 15
c. ..... rticle III, § 2, United States Constitution

STATUTES:

d. 18 USC § 2 - *Principals*
e. 18 USC § 241 - ***Conspiracy against rights***
f. 18 USC § 242 - ***Deprivation of rights under color of law***
g. 18 USC § 371 - ***Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud*** United States
h. 18 USC § 372 - ***Conspiracy to impede*** or injure officer
i. 18 USC § 666 - *Theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds*
j. 18 USC § 1001 - S*tatements or entries generally*

k. 18 USC § 1341 - ***Frauds and swindles***

l. 18 USC § 1346 - *Definition of "scheme or artifice to defraud"*

m. 18 USC § 1509 - ***Obstruction of court orders***

n. 18 USC § 1512 - ***Tampering with a witness, victim,*** or an informant

o. 18 USC § 1513 - ***Retaliating against a witness, victim***, or an informant

p. 18 USC § 1519 - ***Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records in Federal investigations*** and bankruptcy

q. 18 USC § 1701 - ***Obstruction of mails generally***

r. 18 USC § 1702 - ***Obstruction of correspondence***

s. 18 USC § 1703 - *Delay or destruction of mail or newspapers*

t. 18 USC § 1708 - *Theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally*

u. 18 USC § 1723 - *Avoidance of postage by using lower class matter*

v. 18 USC § 1726 - *Postage collected unlawfully*

w. 28 USC § 144 -***Bias or prejudice of judge***

x. 28 USC § 455 - ***Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge***

y. 28 USC § 1651 - ***Writs***

z. 28 USC § 1915 - *Proceedings in forma pauperis*

aa. 28 USC § 2101 - *Supreme Court; time for appeal or certiorari; docketing; stay*

bb. 28 USC § 1257 - ***State courts; certiorari***

cc. 42 USC § 1983 - ***Civil action for deprivation of rights***

dd. 42 USC § 1985 - ***Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights***

ee. 42 USC § 1986 - ***Action for neglect to prevent***[5]

STATUTES

28 U. S. C. § 2403(a)

28 U.S.C. § 1251

28 U.S.C. § 1651

28 U.S.C. § 2101

28 USC § 1257

Vol. 22 Moore's Federal Practice, § 400.03 ***Relationship of Supreme Court to State Courts***

---

[5] Every person who, having knowledge that any of the wrongs conspired to be done, and mentioned in section 1985 of this title, are about to be committed, and having power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of the same, neglects or refuses so to do, if such wrongful act be committed, shall be liable to the party injured, or his legal representatives, for all damages caused by such wrongful act, which such person by reasonable diligence could have prevented; and such damages may be recovered in an action on the case; and any number of persons guilty of such wrongful neglect or refusal may be joined as defendants in the action; . . .

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Article III, § 2, United States Constitution

H.R.Rep.No.93-1453, 93d Cong., 2d Sess. (1974), Reprinted in 1974 **U.S.Code Cong. & Admin.News**, pp. 6351, 6352-54

Section 706(f)(2) of Title VII

RULES

United States Supreme Court Rule 14.1(e)(v)
United States Supreme Court Rule 17(1)
United States Supreme Court Rule 20
United States Supreme Court Rule 22
United States Supreme Court Rule 23
United States Supreme Court Rule 29(b)

VIII. CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

*For preservation purposes and **WITHOUT** waiving defenses* set forth in her October 9, 2010 *"EM/ORS"* – Newsome incorporates the issues/arguments raised therein as if set forth in full herein (see also excerpt of EM/ORS at **APPENDIX "5."** Newsome further states the following:

a. See facts set forth at ***Concise Statement of Jurisdiction*** above of this instant pleading.

IX. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUEST:

Prior to addressing the reasons for granting the Petition, Newsome, in the interest of justice as well as for PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest, Newsome request that the United States Supreme Court Justice(s)/Administration ***advise her of whether or not "CONFLICT OF INTEREST" exists in the handling of this matter***.

Newsome has obtained information which will support that Respondent Stor-All Alfred LLC's/its insurance provider (Liberty Mutual Insurance Company) and Liberty Mutual's counsel - i.e. for instance, *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz ["Baker Donelson"])* has ***advertised*** its SPECIAL relationships/ties to "*highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as*:"

- **Chief of Staff** *to the President of the United States*
- **United States Secretary of State**
- United States **Senate** ***Majority*** Leader
- **Members of** the *United States Senate*
- **Members of** the *United States House of Representatives*
- Director of the *Office of Foreign Assets Control for United States*
- **Department of Treasury**
- **Director** of the *Administrative Office of the United States*
- Chief Counsel, Acting Director, and Acting Deputy Director of United States

Citizenship & Immigration Services within the *United States Department of Homeland Security*

- **Majority** and **Minority Staff Director** of the ***Senate Committee on Appropriations***
- ***Member of United States President's Domestic Policy Council***
- Counselor *to the Deputy Secretary for the United States Department of HHS*
- **Chief of Staff** *of the Supreme Court of the United States*
- **Administrative Assistant** to the ***Chief Justice*** *of the United States*
- *Deputy under Secretary of International Trade for the United States Department of Commerce*
- *Ambassador* to Japan
- *Ambassador* to Turkey
- *Ambassador* to Saudi Arabia
- *Ambassador* to the Sultanate of Oman
- *Governor of Tennessee*
- *Governor of Mississippi*
- *Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee*
- *Commissioner of Finance & Administration* (Chief Operating Officer) - State of Tennessee
- Special Counselor to the Governor of Virginia
- *United States* ***Circuit Court of Appeals Judge***
- *United States* ***District Court Judges***
- **United States Attorneys**
- ***Presidents*** *of State and Local Bar Associations*

EMPHASIS ADDED in that information is pertinent to establish the CONSPIRACY and PATTERN-OF-CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs leveled against Newsome out of which this instant relief is sought. This information originally located at:

http://www.martindale.com/Baker-Donelson-Bearman-Caldwell/law-firm-307399.htm

see attached at **APPENDIX "6"** attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein. It is such information which had been posted for several years. See **APPENDIX "7"** listing pulled approximately September 11, **2004**. However, *since Newsome has gone PUBLIC and is releasing this information, Baker Donelson has* ***SCRUBBED*** *this information from the Internet.*

Newsome believes this request is made in good faith in that the record evidence will support that in approximately a ***one-year*** period, Judges and/or their Aides associated in legal matters regarding Newsome have been "INDICTED" and/or "IMPEACHED" – i.e for instance Judge John Andrew West's (*Judge in the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas matter former Bailiff, Damon Ridley,* ***was recently found GUILTY*** *for attempted bribery for taking monies* ***for purposes of getting cases dismissed*** *as Judge West and opposing parties in the lower court action are attempting to do without legal authority and cause*).[6]

---

[6] *Potashnick v. Port City Const. Co.,* 609 F.2d 1101 (1980) - [n.4] A judge faced with a potential ground for disqualification *ought to consider how his participation in a given case* ***looks to the average person on the street***; use of the word "might" in statute was intended to indicate that **disqualification** *should follow if* ***reasonable man****, were he to know* ***all*** *the circumstances,* ***would harbor doubts*** *about judge's impartiality*. 28 U.S.C.A. § 455(a).

Furthermore, two other Judges (i.e. Judge Bobby DeLaughter was INDICTED and pled GUILTY and Judge G. Thomas Porteous as of approximately **December 8, 2010**, has been IMPEACHED according to proceedings before the United States Senate) have been prosecuted for their unlawful/illegal practices. All acts in which the United States Department of Justice was fully aware of and clearly having knowledge of NEXUS and/or relationship of Judge(s) in matters involving Newsome because she reported concerns of criminal/civil wrongs by Judge(s) and/or their conspirators/co-conspirators. To no avail.

Our first ground for reversal *results from the trial court judge's* ***failure to disqualify*** *himself from participation in the proceeding before him*. . . . The parties do not allege that the judge exhibited any actual bias or prejudice in the case; they assert only that under the circumstances his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

. . . The Applicable Statute

At the time this lawsuit was instituted, the . . . statute relating to judicial disqualification provided:

> *1108 Any justice or judge . . . shall disqualify himself in any case in which he has a substantial interest, . . . as to render it improper, in his opinion, for him to sit on the trial, appeal, or other proceeding therein.

28 U.S.C. § 455 (1970). While the case was pending, but prior to the commencement of trial, 28 U.S.C. § 455 was amended to bring the statutory grounds for disqualification of judges into conformity with the recently adopted canon of the Code of Judicial Conduct [FN2] relating to disqualification of judges for bias, prejudice, or conflict of interest. See **H.R.Rep.No.93-1453, 93d Cong., 2d Sess.** (1974), Reprinted in 1974 **U.S.Code Cong. & Admin.News**, pp. 6351, 6352-54 (hereinafter cited as 1974 U.S.Code Cong. & Admin.News). . . .

> FN2. Canon 3C of the Code of Judicial Conduct was adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States in April, 1973.

Court records will support for instance that Newsome had concerns regarding *"conflict of interest"* and requested RECUSAL of judges/magistrate in *Newsome vs. Melody Crews, et al;* USDC Southern District of Mississippi (Jackson); Case No. 3:07-cv-00099 (see Docket Nos. 110, 104 and 160) due to relationship to opposing parties and/or their attorneys/attorneys' law firms. To no avail. Then Newsome finds that Judge Tom S. Lee (i.e. judge assigned her lawsuits) recused himself based upon his relationship to Baker Donelson:

> "Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a), the undersigned is compelled to disqualify himself in the above styled and numbered proceedings for the reason that the law firm of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, counsel for the defendants, is on the recusal list of the undersigned United States district judge.
>
> Accordingly, the undersigned does hereby recuse himself in this cause."

information which is of public record and can be found on the INTERNET and/or in court records for instance in *Joni B. Tyler, et al. vs. JPF1, LLC, et al.;* Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-338 TSL-FKB (Recusal Order dated **March 25, 2010**); and *Joyce Walker vs. Captain D's LLC, et al.,* Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-679 TSL-JCS (Recusal Order dated **November 13, 2009**); however, Judge Lee failed to recuse himself when presiding over said lawsuit with KNOWLEDGE that Baker Donelson was and its client(s) were involved.

Newsome further believes that a reasonable person/mind may conclude that with the recent assignment to the United States Supreme Court of Justices Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagen were recommended for appointment for vacancies which arose with this Court by

United States President Barack Obama; therefore, leaving Newsome and/or a reasonable person/mind with valid concerns whether the Justices of this Court can remain impartial in deciding this matter.

As a matter of law, Newsome is required to bring such concerns and to request DISCLOSURE of the United States Supreme Court as to whether or not "Conflict of Interest(s)" exists with its Justices and/or Court Administration.

B. REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION:

For preservation purposes and WITHOUT waiving defenses set forth in her October 9, 2010 "EM/ORS," she herein incorporates the issues/arguments and relief sought in said pleading for purposes as to "reasons for granting the Petition for Extraordinary Writ" out of which this instant action arises. In further support thereof, Newsome states:

a. Ohio Supreme Court has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another state supreme court on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of the United States Supreme Court's supervisory power;

b. Ohio Supreme Court has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;

c. Ohio Supreme Court has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court; or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court;

d. Newsome hereby incorporates herein by reference "ISSUES" set forth in her October 9, 2010 *""EM/ORS"* which list the following:

1. Affidavit of Disqualification;
2. ***Supremacist/Terrorist/Ku Klux Klan Act;***
3. ***Irreparable Injury/Harm;***
4. Threats to Counsel/ Appointment of Counsel;
5. Unfit for Office;
6. Finding of Fact/Conclusion of Law;
7. ***Due Process of Fourteenth Amendment to U.S. Constitution;***
8. ***Equal Protection of Fourteenth Amendment to U.S. Constitution;***
9. ***U.S. Office of President/ Executive Office; United States Department of Justice/ Department of Labor Role In Conspiracy;***
10. Selective Prosecution;
11. "Serial Litigator" Issue;
12. Congressional Investigation(s);
13. Prohibition/Mandamus Action(s);

14. ***Pattern-of-Practice;*** and

15. Relief Sought.

e. **PREREQUISITES**: **(i)** Writ Will Be In Aid Of The Court's Appellate Jurisdiction; **(ii)** Exceptional Circumstances Warrant the Exercise of the Court's Discretionary Powers; **(iii)** Adequate Relief Cannot Be Obtained In Any Other Form or From Any Other Court; and **(iv)** for Other Reasons Known to this Court.

Newsome believes her PFEW support that there are extraordinary and exceptional circumstances which exit and meet the prerequisites required to support granting of relief sought herein - Vol. 23 Moore's Federal Practice, § 520.02 ***Considerations Governing Issuance Of Extraordinary Writ***: [1] PREREQUISITES TO GRANTING EXTRAORDINARY WRIT: Supreme Court Rule 20 specifies that the issuance of an extraordinary writ "***is not a matter of right***, but of *discretion sparingly exercised.*[7]

The Rule then sets forth four prerequisites to the granting of extraordinary writ. It ***must*** be shown:

---

[7] See *Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. v. Federal Election Comm'n.,* 542 U.S. 1305, 125 S.Ct. 2, 159 L.Ed. 2d 805, 807 (2004) (Rehnquist, C.J., in chambers) (Supreme Court will issue extraordinary writ only in most critical and exigent circumstances, only when necessary or appropriate in aid of Court's jurisdiction, and only when legal rights at issue are indisputably clear); *Brown v. Gilmore,* 533 U.S. 1301, 122 S.Ct. 1, 2-3, 150 L.Ed. 2d 782 (2001) (Rehnquist, C.J., in chambers) (under All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, injunction against implementation of presumptively valid state statute pending Court's disposition of certiorari petition is appropriate only if legal rights at issue are indisputably clear).

(1) the writ will be in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction:

Newsome believes that Extraordinary Writ sought will be in aid of the U.S. Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction – 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) provides that the "Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress ***may issue all writs necessary or appropriate*** in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law." The statute **does not** purport to restrict this Court to issuing writs sole in the aid of its appellate jurisdiction. This Court has chosen to limit the application of its Rule 20 to situations in which the writs are in aid to the Court's appellate jurisdiction, and thereby has left the matter of the extraordinary writs in aid of the Court's original jurisdiction unregulated so far as this Court's Rules are concerned. *Thus, the U.S. Supreme Court* ***has a continuing power*** *to issue extraordinary writs in aid of either its original jurisdiction*[8] *including as a part of jurisdiction(s) the exercise of general*

[8] *See Ex parte* Hung Hang, 108 U.S. 552, 553, 2 S.Ct. 863, 27 L.Ed. 811 (1883) (Court has authority to issue writ); *Pennsylvania v. Wheeling Belmont Bridge Co.,* 59 U.S. 421, 431, 15 L.Ed. 435 (1885) ("act of congress cannot have the effect and operation to annul the decision of the court already rendered); *Ex parte* Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 374, 25 L.Ed. 717 (1879) ("Having this general power to issue the writ, the court may issue it in the exercise of original jurisdiction where it has original jurisdiction. . . "); *see also* Wagner, *Original Jurisdiction of National Supreme Courts,* 33 St. John's L. Rev. 217 (1959); *cf.* Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 147, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803) ("The term 'appellate jurisdiction' is to be taken in its larger sense, and implies in its nature the right of superintending the inferior tribunals.").

supervisory control *over the court system* – ***state*** *or federal*:[9]

> **(2)** exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers:

Newsome believes that "exceptional circumstances" as set forth herein as well as in the *"EM/ORS"* and lower court records, warrant the exercise of the U.S. Supreme Court's discretionary powers." *While there need* ***not*** *be a laundry list of "exceptional circumstances*," the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly asserted that the peremptory writs are drastic and extraordinary remedies that must be reserved for only truly extraordinary cases.[10] *In this instant action, the*

---

[9] *See e.g.,* Connor v. Coleman, 440 U.S. 612, 624, 99 S.Ct. 1523, 59 L.Ed. 2d 619 (1979) ("When a lower. . .court refuses to give effect to, or misconstrues our mandate, its actions are controlled by this Court. . ."); *MCullough v. Cosgrave,* 309 U.S. 634, 635, 60 S.Ct. 703, 84 L.Ed. 992 (1940) (Court directed . . . Court judge to vacate order and retry cases expediently); *Ex parte* United States, 242 U.S. 27, 52, 37 S.Ct. 72, 61 L.Ed. 129 (1916) (mandamus proper remedy for enforcing . . . when. . . Court that passed it has defeated its execution). - - Vol. 23 Moore's Federal Practice, § 520.02[2] (Matthew Bender 3d ed.).

[10] See *Bagley v. Byrd*, 534 U.S. 1301, 122 S.Ct. 419, 419-420, 151 L.Ed. 2d 370 (2001) (Stevens, J., in chambers) (Court will deny applications for stay of lower-court proceedings pending Court's disposition of . . . petition unless application demonstrates that denial of stay will either cause irreparable harm or affect Supreme Court's jurisdiction to act on . . . petition); *In re Michael Sindram,* 498 U.S. 177, 179, 111 S.Ct. 596, 112 L.Ed. 2d 599 (1991) (petitioner "identifies no 'drastic' circumstances to justify extraordinary relief" as required by Sup. Ct. R. 20.1); *Will v. United States,* 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 19 L.Ed. 305 (1967) ("only exceptional circumstances amounting to a judicial 'usurpation of power' will justify the invocation of this extraordinary remedy"); *Ex parte Fahey*, 332 U.S. 258, 260, 67 S.Ct.

"ORIGINAL" *jurisdiction of this Court also sought because of the* ***MULTIPLE*** *parties involved and the* ***MULTIPLE*** *jurisdictions – i.e.* ***DIVERSITY*** *of parties and states involved.*

(3) adequate relief cannot be had in any other form; and

Newsome believes that the record evidence as well as the Extraordinary Writ she seeks to bring before the U.S. Supreme Court will support a PATTERN-OF-PRACTICE, PATTERN-OF-ABUSE, PATTERN-OF-OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, PATTERN-OF-DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS, PATTERN-OF-CORRUPTION, and many more unlawful/illegal PATTERN-OF-INJUSTICES leveled against Newsome will support that she has in GOOD FAITH sought relief through the appropriate administrative and judicial remedies prior to bringing this matter before this honorable court. Because of the EXCEPTIONAL circumstances set forth herein as well as in "*EM/ORS"* and lower court records which supports the action, Newsome seeks to bring, the writ sought in that it is permissible and warranted as a matter of law - *Ex parte Harding,* 219 U.S. 363, 374; 31 S.Ct. 324, 55 L.Ed. 252 (1911) (writ only applicable to exceptional cases) – and is sustained by facts, evidence and legal conclusions.

(4) adequate relief cannot be had in any other court below:

1558, 91 L.Ed. 2041 (1947) ("These remedies should be resorted to only where appeal is a clearly inadequate remedy.").

Newsome believes that the record evidence will support that without the U.S. Supreme Court's intervention through Extraordinary Writ sought, that "adequate relief cannot be had from any other court." Moreover, efforts by lower courts to "CLOSE DOORS OF COURT(S) to Newsome." Newsome further believes that the "EM/ORS" will sustain the legal avenues EXHAUSTED prior to bringing this instant Petition for Extraordinary Writ action. Further supporting that because of the PATTERN of criminal/civil wrongs as well as CONSPIRACIES leveled against Newsome; adequate relief cannot be had in any other Court and requires the intervention of the United States Supreme Court's original jurisdiction for the resolution. Thus, warranting and supporting the relief Newsome seeks through bringing Extraordinary Writ. [*Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 165, 28 S.Ct. 441, 52 L.Ed. 714 (1908) (remedies at law not inadequate). Furthermore, *the **"ORIGINAL"** jurisdiction of this Court also sought because of the **MULTIPLE** parties involved and the **MULTIPLE** jurisdictions – i.e. **DIVERSITY** of parties and states involved* – sustaining that this matter ***CANNOT** be had in any **single** court below because said single court would **LACK** jurisdiction over parties/litigants because of the DIVERSITY of jurisdictions involved*; wherein the "ORIGINAL" jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court encompasses and allow for its JURISDICTION over multiple parties/ litigants who reside in different states. Therefore requiring the United States Supreme Court's.

f. Newsome believes it is of PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest that Extraordinary Writ sought be granted.

g. Newsome believes here is/are question(s) of public importance that are involved, or where the question is of such a nature that it is peculiarly appropriate that such action by the U.S. Supreme Court should be taken.

X. CONCLUSION and RELIEF SOUGHT

For the above foregoing reasons and those set forth in Newsome's October 9, 2010 *"EM/ORS"* the ***Petition for Extraordinary Writ*** should be GRANTED. For preservation of issues and relief sought Newsome hereby incorporates the relief sought in her October 9, 2010 "EM/ORS" which includes the following (however, is not limited to same).[11]

[11]Dates provided below are those submitted in October 9, 2010 "EM/ORS" to support timely submittal; however, the United States Supreme Court allowed the deadline originally provided to lapse; therefore, requiring that it provide reasonable dates for persons/agencies to comply with relief sought. Newsome believes that in GOOD FAITH the United States Supreme Court should grant the applicable relief sought and make the necessary adjustment to dates for purposes of expedition of matters and mitigating damages/injuries already sustained by Newsome:

i) In the interest of justice, grant a permanent injunction enjoining the following government agency(s); persons, businesses, law firms:

a) The United States Executive Office (White House)/President Barack H. Obama;

b) United States Senate;

c) United States House of Representatives;

d) United States Department of Justice;

e) United States Department of Labor;

f) United States Department of Treasury;

g) United States Department of Education;

h) Ohio Supreme Court;

i) Ohio Attorney General;

j) Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas;

k) Hamilton County Municipal Court;

l) State of Louisiana;

m) State of Mississippi

n) Commonwealth of Kentucky;

o) State of Ohio;

p) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);

q) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);

r) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);

s) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);

t) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky);

u) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals;

v) Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue;

w) GMM Properties;

x) Spring Lake Apartments LLC;

y) Stor-All Alfred, LLC;

z) Floyd West & Company;

aa) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

bb) Christian Health Ministries;

cc) Entergy Corporation/Entergy New Orleans, Inc.;

dd) Wood & Lamping, LLP;

ee) Page Kruger & Holland;

ff) Mitchell McNutt & Sams;

gg) Liberty Mutual Insurance Company;

hh) Schwartz, Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA;

ii) Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA;

jj) Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz;

kk) Brunini Grantham Grower & Hewes;

ll) Baria Fyke Hawkins & Stracener (a/k/a Hawkins Stracener & Gibson PLLC);

mm) JP Morgan Chase Bank NA;

nn) PNC Bank NA;

oo) and others that the United States Supreme Court may be aware of that Newsome may have missed – i.e. based on the facts and evidence contained in this instant filing and/or record of those listed herein.

their subdivisions/departments/branches, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any further employment violations and criminal/civil wrongs addressed of herein and/or known to them that is prohibited by Title VII.

ii) In the interest of justice, that the United States Supreme Court enter EMERGENCY Order(s)/Judgment(s) for permanent injunction enjoining the following government agency(s); persons, businesses, law firms - See Pages 281 thru 284 of "EM/ORS" and the ***Motion for Leave*** ("MFL") submitted with this instant filing respectively for remaining relief requested - their subdivisions/departments/ branches, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, successors, assigns, and all persons in active

concert or participation with them, from engaging in any further conspiracies and/or criminal/civil wrongs leveled against Newsome addressed herein and/or known to them that is prohibited by statutes and laws of the United States and the States in which they reside and/or conduct business.

iii) In the interest of justice, Newsome request the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) and take the proper action to have the cases regarding Newsome in the following Courts "REOPENED" (if closed) and the record(s) "CERTIFIED:"

a) Ohio Supreme Court;

b) Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas;

c) Hamilton County Municipal Court;

d) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);

e) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);

f) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);

g) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);

h) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky); and

i) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

iv) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) for purposes of DETERRING and PREVENTING further conspiracies leveled against Newsome and the ***birthing/breeding*** of more CAREER CRIMINALS (i.e. CRIMINAL BULLIES) for purposes of mitigating damages and pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1986.

> *U.S. v. Jimenez Recio,* 123 S.Ct. 819 (2003) - Essence of a conspiracy is an agreement to commit an unlawful act.
>
> Agreement to commit an unlawful act, which constitutes the essence of a conspiracy, *is a* ***distinct evil*** that may exist and be

punished whether or not the substantive crime ensues. *Id.*

Conspiracy ***poses a threat to the public*** over and above the threat of the commission of the relevant substantive crime, both because *the combination in crime* ***makes more likely*** *the commission* ***of other*** *crimes* and because it **decreases the probability** that *the individuals involved* ***will depart from their path of criminality***. *Id.*

v) In the interest of justice, Newsome request the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) and take the proper action to have the cases/charges brought by Newsome in the following Government/Administrative Agencies "REOPENED" (if closed) and the record(s) "CERTIFIED:"

a) Executive Office of the United States/White House;

b) United Stated Department of Justice;

c) United States Department of Labor;

d) United States Department of Treasury;

e) United States Department of Education; and

f) United States Legislature/Congress.

vi) In the interest of justice, issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment to have the United States Department of Labor make available to Newsome ALL records regarding charges/cases brought by Newsome filed against:

a) Floyd West & Company;

b) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

c) Christian Health Ministries;

d) Entergy Services, Inc./Entergy New Orleans;

e) Mitchell McNutt & Sams; and

f) Wood & Lamping.

vii) Based upon the United States Department of Labor's failure to follow rules governing charges filed, Newsome is requesting that, in the interest of justice and under the laws governing jurisdiction to CORRECT legal wrongs made know, that the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) to the following former employers requiring the "OPENING" (if closed) and "CERTIFICATION" of employment records regarding Newsome. This request is made in good faith in that Newsome is entitled to said relief for purposes of mitigating damages until legal actions are resolved for the following employers and those this Court has become aware of through this instant filing:

a) Floyd West & Company;

b) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

c) Christian Health Ministries;

d) Entergy Services, Inc/Entergy New Orleans;

e) Mitchell McNutt & Sams;

f) Page Kruger & Holland; and

g) Wood & Lamping.

viii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s) to ***Wood & Lamping LLP*** to reinstate Newsome's employment *for purposes of mitigating damages* until legal matters are resolved; however, instructing that in the interest, safety and wellbeing of Newsome she is not required to return to place of employment – i.e just returned to receipt of payroll and benefits restored to which she is entitled. *Newsome presently seeks back pay/front pay in the amount in the amount of approximately* ***$88,888.53*** ***as of November 5, 2010***. Newsome request that Wood & Lamping be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,882.85*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. Newsome further seeks this Court's

intervention in that the injunctive relief sought herein is that in which she was entitled to; however, was deprived of by the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division's and EEOC's efforts to COVER-UP employment violations in its role in CONSPIRACIES leveled against Newsome.

> *Section 706(f)(2) of Title VII* ***authorizes*** *the Commission to seek* *temporary injunctive relief* ***before*** *final disposition of a charge when a preliminary investigation indicates that* ***prompt*** *judicial action is necessary to carry out the purposes of Title VII*.
>
> *Temporary or preliminary relief* ***allows a court*** *to stop retaliation before it occurs or* ***continues***. ***Such relief is appropriate if there is a substantial likelihood that the challenged action will be found to constitute unlawful retaliation, and if the charging party*** and/or EEOC ***will likely suffer irreparable harm because of retaliation***. Although courts have ruled that financial hardships are not irreparable, other **harms that accompany loss of a job may be irreparable**. - - For example, in one case forced retirees showed irreparable harm and qualified for a preliminary injunction *where they lost work and future prospects for work consequently suffering emotional distress, depression, a contracted social life, and other related harms*.

Newsome believes that the record evidence as well as the FALSE/MALICIOUS information posted on the INTERNET by the United States Government Agencies will support unlawful/illegal acts infringing upon her Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights and other protected rights for purposes of BLACKLISTING her and to see that Newsome ***is NOT*** employable.

> In another case (*Lagies v. Copley,* 110 Cal App 3d 958, 16 Cal Rptr 368), the plaintiff, . . .alleged that officials and *managerial employees of his corporate employer* ***abused their positions*** *of authority over him by* ***conduct*** *including demotions,* ***discriminatory treatment****, denial of long-*

accepted avenues of advancement, and ***defamation of his reputation*** *to his coworkers*, . . . *and* ***to the public generally***, apparently in retaliation for a story *which* ***offended*** *the* ***chairperson*** *of the board.* The complaint further charged that the ***individual*** *defendants* ***conspired*** *to* ***get plaintiff to quit, tarnish his reputation****, and* ***blackball*** *him* ***by preventing his being hired*** . . .; that ***they published*** his confidential sources *thus* ***destroying his credibility*** . . .; that they ***virtually isolated plaintiff in his place of employment*** *rendering him a de facto pariah*, . . ., assigning him to more and more degrading tasks . . .. ***Reversing*** *a dismissal of the complaint, the* ***court held*** *the plaintiff alleged facts and circumstances which reasonably could lead trier of fact to conclude* ***that defendants' conduct was extreme and outrageous***. The court noted that according to the pleadings, *defendants* ***intentionally humiliated*** *plaintiff*, . . . ***singled*** *him out for denial of merit raises*, . . ., ***blackballed him***, *thus* ***precluding other employment***, . . . thus ***destroying his credibility*** . . ., *all* ***without just cause*** *or* ***provocation***. The court concluded that the pleadings charged more than insult and more than mere direction of job activities.

ix) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment(s) to ***Mitchell McNutt & Sams*** to pay Newsome *back pay and front pay in the amount of* ***$182,101.34*** as of *November 5, 2010, for purposes of mitigating damages until legal matters are*. Newsome request that MM&S be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,515.53*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. The record evidence supports MM&S admission of subjecting Newsome to ***Discriminatory*** practices and a ***Hostile Work Environment*** – See Pages 287 thru 288 of "EM/ORS" and "MFL"" respectively for remaining relief requested. **NOTE:** In preservation of her rights, on or about December 1, 2010, Newsome submitted for filing her complaint against Mitchell McNutt & Sams in the United States District Court of Mississippi – Southern (Jackson Division); Civil Action No. 3:10cv704 HTW-LRA.

x) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment(s) to ***Page Kruger & Holland*** to pay Newsome *back pay and front pay in the amount of* ***$168,321.38*** as of *November 5, 2010, for purposes of mitigating damages until legal matters are resolved*. Newsome request that PKH be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,560.99*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. The record evidence supports PKH's admission of subjecting Newsome to ***Discriminatory*** practices and ***Retaliation*** *because of its learning of lawsuit filed by her and knowledge of Newsome's engagement in PROTECTED activities* - See Page 288 of "EM/ORS" and "MFL"" respectively for remaining relief requested.

xi) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Kenton County Circuit Court to return monies by date set by this Court in **that it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire in the amount of approximately* ***$16,250.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally released to opposing parties (GMM Properties and its counsel Gailen Bridges) in or about October 2008*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to GMM Properties awarding Newsome monies by date set by this Court in **that it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire in the amount of* ***$18,480.00*** *(i.e. which encompasses the amount of rent and storage from October 2008 to October 2010)*. Furthermore, ordering that GMM Properties *is to continue to pay Newsome the* ***amount of $770.00*** *until the conclusion of all legal matters pending and/or to be brought for good-faith purposes and the mitigating of damages/injuries and irreparable harm sustained*.

xiii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Spring Lake Apartments LLC awarding Newsome monies by the date set by this Court in **that it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided*

by Newsome to expire, *in the amount of* ***$40,320.00*** *(i.e. which encompasses the amount of rent and storage from February 2006 to present/October 2010*. Furthermore, ordering that Spring Lake Apartments LLC *is to continue to pay Newsome the* ***amount of $720.00*** *until the conclusion of all legal matters pending and/or to be brought for good-faith purposes and the mitigating of damages/injuries and irreparable harm sustained*.

xiv) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Wanda Abioto to return monies owed Newsome by date set by this Court in that **it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire in the amount of* ***$4,000.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xv) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Richard Allen Rehfeldt to return monies owed Newsome by date set by this Court in that **it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire in the amount of* ***$700.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xvi) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Brian Bishop to return monies owed Newsome by date set by this Court in that **it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire in the amount of* ***$1,500.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xvii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue to return monies owed Newsome by date set by this Court in that **it has allowed** the **November 5,**

2010 *deadline provided by Newsome to expire* *in the amount of* ***$600.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained through the use of SHAM LEGAL PROCESS*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer - See Page 290 of "EM/ORS" and "MFL"" respectively for remaining relief requested.

xviii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to United States Department of the Treasury to return monies owed Newsome by date set by this Court in **that it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire* *in the amount of* ***$1,800.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained through the use of ABUSE OF POWER and Sham Legal Process*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer. See Page 290 of "EM/ORS" and "MFL"" respectively for remaining relief requested.

xix) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Stor-All Alfred LLC to pay monies to Newsome by date set by this Court in that **it has allowed** the **November 5, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire* *in the amount of* ***$5,500.00*** *for costs associated with replacing property unlawfully/illegally stolen through the use of SHAM LEGAL PROCESS, ABUSE OF POWER, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE and other reasons known to it*. Reward of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of ***mitigating*** damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer. See Pages 290 thru 291 of "EM/ORS" and "MFL"" respectively for remaining relief requested.

xx) That the United States Supreme Court request the United States Congress to create a "SPECIAL/INFERIOR Court" to handle ALL of the pending lawsuits and/or lawsuits filed on behalf of Newsome in the following Courts:

a) Ohio Supreme Court;

b) Hamilton County (Ohio) Court of Common Pleas;

c) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);

d) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);

e) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);

f) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);

g) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky)

h) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals; and

i) Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue.

xxi) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) requiring that the following Government Agencies/Courts **"CERTIFY"** record(s) regarding Complaints/Charges filed by Newsome – i.e. *providing a DEADLINE since it allowed the* ***November 23, 2010*** *provided by Newsome to expire and to make the record available for review in the Cincinnati, Ohio Offices of the*:

a) United States Department of Justice; and

b) United States Department of Labor.

Said Government Agencies/Courts are to also provide this Court and Newsome with their *Findings of Fact* and *Conclusion of Laws* regarding the Complaints/Charges filed by Newsome by a date determined by this Court since it allowed the **November 23, 2010** *deadline provided by Newsome to expire*.

xxii) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) requiring the United States Legislature and/or United States Congress to **"CERTIFY"** records regarding July 14, 2008 "*Emergency Complaint and Request for Legislature/Congress*

Intervention; Also Request for Investigations, Hearings and Findings" submitted by Newsome and to provide this Court and Newsome with the status of said Complaint and the *Findings of Fact* and *Conclusion of Laws* of said Complaint by date provided by this Court in **that it has allowed** the ***November 30, 2010 deadline provided by Newsome to expire***. See **EXHIBIT "38"** (BRIEF Only and supporting "PROOF OF MAILING/RECEIPTS") of "EM/ORS." *Emergency Complaint* was submitted to the attention of the following for handling:

Original To:

a) Senator Patrick Leahy;

Copies To:

b) Representative John Conyers;

c) President Barack Obama (i.e. then United States Senator);

d) Senator John McCain; and

e) Representative Debbie Wasserman-Schultz.

xxiii) In the interest of justice, that the United States Supreme Court based upon the facts, evidence and legal conclusions contained herein REPORT and/or INITIATE the appropriate actions (i.e. IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL, SUSPENSION and/or DISBARMENT) against any/all of the following members of a Legal Bar for violations of ***CANON***, ***Rules of Professional Conduct***, ***Rules of Judicial Conduct*** and/or applicable Statutes/Rules:

a) United States President Barack Obama;

b) United States Vice President Joseph Biden;

c) United States Attorney General Eric Holder;

d) United States Senator Patrick Leahy;

e) United States Representative John Conyers Jr.;

f) United States Senator William Thad Cochran;

g) Ohio Attorney General Richard Cordray;

h) Judge John Andrew West;

i) Judge Nadine L. Allen;

j) Judge Gregory M. Bartlett;

k) Judge Ann Ruttle;

l) Justice Thomas J. Moyer;

m) Justice Robert R. Cupp;

n) Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger;

o) Justice Maureen O'Connor;

p) Justice Terrence O'Donnell;

q) Justice Paul E. Pfeifer;

r) Justice Evelyn Lunberg Stratton;

s) Justice W. Eugene Davis;

t) Justice John D. Minton, Jr.;

u) Judge William Barnett;

v) Judge Tom S. Lee;

w) Magistrate Judge Linda R. Anderson;

x) Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. (i.e. on or about December 8, 2010, has **recently been IMPEACHED** as a result of proceedings before the United States Senate);

y) Magistrate Judge Sally Shushan;

z) Judge Morey L. Sear;

aa) Prosecuting Attorney Joseph T. Deters;

bb) Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Christian J. Schaefer;

cc) Attorney General Jack Conway;

dd) James Moberly West, Esq.;

ee) Gailen Wayne Bridges, Jr., Esq.;

ff) Brian Neal Bishop, Esq.;

gg) David M. Meranus, Esq.;

hh) Michael E. Lively, Esq.;

ii) Patrick B. Healy, Esq.;

jj) Molly G. Vance, Esq.;

kk) Raymond H. Decker, Jr., Esq.;

ll) C. J. Schmidt, Esq.;

mm) Thomas J. Breed, Esq.;

nn) Grover Clark Monroe II, Esq.;

oo) Benny McCalip May, Esq.;

pp) Lanny R. Pace, Esq.;

qq) Clifford Allen McDaniel II, Esq.;

rr) J. Lawson Hester, Esq.;

ss) Wanda Abioto, Esq.;

tt) Brandon Isaac Dorsey, Esq.;

uu) Richard Allen Rehfeldt, Esq.;

vv) Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett, Esq.;

ww) Allyson Kessler Howie, Esq.;

xx) Renee Williams Masinter, Esq.;

yy) Amelia Williams Koch, Esq.;

zz) Jennifer F. Kogos, Esq.;

aaa) L. F. Sams Jr., Esq.;

bbb) Thomas Y. Page, Esq.;

ccc) Louis J. Baine, Esq.; and

ddd) Attorneys/Judges/Justices who become known to the United States Supreme Court through the handling of this matter.

xxiv) In the interest of justice and if the laws permit, Newsome requests the ***Granting*** *of Motion to Stay* and ***Granting*** *Enlargement of Time* and the relief sought therein – i.e. that as a matter of law is still pending before this Court – so that she may prepare to bring the appropriate action in the United States Supreme Court's ***"ORIGINAL"*** jurisdiction if permissible by law due to the EXCEPTIONAL and EXTREME circumstances addressed in this instant filing – i.e. ***Granting*** *Stay of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas lawsuit (Case No. A0901302) out of which this instant filing arises*. Moreover, that based on Judge West's/Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas' – **ACTING TRUE TO FORM** – attempts to unlawfully/illegally dismiss lawsuit before it with knowledge that it lacked jurisdiction and with knowledge that this matter is still pending before the United States Supreme Court. Further sustaining that Newsome's decision to file "EM/ORS" was the correct action to take to protect rights guaranteed and secured under the Constitution and other laws of the United States.

xxv) ALL costs associated, expended and/or to be expended in the litigation of this action; and

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of **March, 2011**.

Vogel Denise Newsome, Petitioner – Pro Se
Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: (513) 680-2922 or (601) 885-9536

---

xxvi) Any and all applicable relief known to the United States Supreme Court to correct legal wrongs and injustices complained of herein.

XI. APPENDIX

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION
1.	July 17, 2010 Judgment Entry (Ohio Supreme Court)
2.	August 2, 2010 Judgment Entry on Defendant's 7/27/10 Motion for Reconsideration
3.	August 18, 2010 Judgment Entry on Defendant's 8/11/10 for Final Entry and Stay
4.	October 25, 2010 Letter to United States Supreme Court Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
5.	Excerpt from: *"Emergency Motion to Stay; Emergency Motion for Enlargement of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* - Cover page, Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, Table of Exhibits, Page 1, Relief Sought and Signature/Certificate of Service, and United States Postal Service PROOF of Mailing.
6.	*Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz* Information – as of March 2010
7.	*Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz* Information – as of September 2004
8.	October 9, 2010 Cover Letter to Chief Justice John G. Roberts

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION
9.	United States Postal Service PROOF-of-MAILING to United States President Barack Obama and United States Attorney General Eric Holder for: (1) July 9, 2010, (2) July 26, 2010 and August 11, 2010 filings with the Supreme Court of Ohio
10.	December 27, 2010 Correspondence from Ohio Attorney General Richard Cordray's Office
11.	Recusal Orders executed by Judge Tom S. Lee
12.	DOCKET SHEET Excerpt – *Newsome v. Entergy*
13.	Baker Donelson Information regarding *"Commission on Civil Rights Appointment"* of Bradley S. Clanton
14.	Case Cost Billing – Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas
15.	December 8, 2010 Article - *Senate Removes Federal Judge in Impeachment Conviction*
16.	January 6, 2011 Cover Letter Accompanying Petition for Extraordinary Writ and providing RESPONSE to November 8, 2010 Letter from the Clerk (Gail Johnson/William K. Suter).

XII. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the forgoing pleading was MAILED via U.S. Mail first-class to:

Honorable John Andrew West – *Judge (and)*
Patricia M. Clancy – *Clerk of Court*
Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas
1000 Main Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

David Meranus, Esq.
Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA
2900 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Michael E. Lively, Esq.
Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA
Post Office Box 6491
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

Solicitor General of the United States[12]
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. – Room 5614
Washington, D.C. 20530

Barack H. Obama – U.S. President[13]
Executive Office of the President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500-0005

Dated this 12th day of **March, 2011.**

Vogel Denise Newsome

---

[12] USPS Delivery Confirmation No. 0309114000019264195 3
[13] USPS Delivery Confirmation No. 2306157000008475886 4

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC vs.
DENISE V. NEWSOME;
Common Pleas Case No. A-0901302; Ohio Supreme Court Case No. 10-AP-069

JUDGMENT ENTRY

Defendant Denise V. Newsome has filed an affidavit with the Clerk of the Court under R.C. 2701.03 seeking to disqualify Judge John Andrew West from acting on any further proceedings in Case No. A0901302, an action pending in the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County.

Newsome alleges that Judge West has a personal bias or prejudice against her and in favor of the plaintiff, a personal interest in the outcome of the underlying case, and a conflict of interest. For the following reasons, I find no basis for ordering the disqualification of Judge West.

APPENDIX "1"

Newsome first alleges that Judge West made legal rulings after she filed an affidavit of disqualification on May 28, 2010. Newsome argues that Judge West must be disqualified because he lacked authority and jurisdiction to make such rulings while her affidavit of disqualification was still pending. It is true that properly filed affidavit of disqualification "deprives the judge against whom the affidavit was filed of any authority to preside in the proceeding until the chief justice of the supreme court * * * rules on the affidavit * * *." R.C. 2701.03(D)(1). But Newsome's May 28 affidavit was not properly filed because she filed the affidavit with the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts. R.C. 2701.03(B) provides that an affidavit of disqualification against a common pleas judge shall be filed with the clerk of the supreme court. Thus, Judge West did not lack authority to issue rulings

against an affidavit that fails to comply with the provisions of R.C. 2701.03 is a nullity and has no effect on the proceedings before the trial court. See *In re Disqualification of Pokorny* (1992), 74 Ohio St.3d 1238.

Newsome also contends that Judge West must be disqualified because she filed a criminal complaint against him with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is well settled, however, a judge will not be disqualified solely because a litigant in a case pending before the judge filed a complaint against the judge with Disciplinary Counsel or a similar body. *In re Disqualification of Kilpatrick* (1989), 47 Ohio St.3d 605, 606. It follows that a judge is not automatically disqualified solely because a party filed a complaint against the judge with the FBI. To hold otherwise would invite litigants to file complaints solely to obtain a judge's disqualification,

which would severely hamper the orderly administration of judicial proceedings. Id.

As to Newsome's allegations regarding campaign contributions, Chief Justice Moyer has previously held that the mere fact that an attorney or litigant has made a contribution to the political campaign of a judge is not grounds for disqualification. See *In re Disqualification of Burnside,* 113 Ohio St.3d 1211, 206-Ohio-7223, ¶ 8; *In re Disqualification of Osowik,* 117 Ohio St.3d 1237, 2006-Ohio-7224, ¶ 5-6.

Accordingly, the affidavit of disqualification is denied. The case may proceed before Judge West.

Dated this 17 day of July, 2010.

_____

ERIC BROWN
Chief Justice

The Supreme Court of Ohio
65 SOUTH FRONT STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-3431

PRESORTED
FIRST CLASS

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
02 1M
0004291827
$ 00.357
JUL 20 2010
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 43215

Denise V. Newsome
P.O. Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250

FAU-631 45250

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC vs.
DENISE V. NEWSOME;
Common Pleas Case No. A-0901302; Ohio Supreme Court Case No. 10-AP-069

JUDGEMENT ENTRY ON DEFENDANT'S 7/27/10 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The affidavit of disqualification in this case on July 13, 2010 was denied by entry dated July 17, 2010. On July 27, 2010, defendant Denise Newsome filed a motion for reconsideration. I have reviewed Newsome's latest filing, and I conclude that it does not contain any substantive allegations that were not previously considered. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in my initial decision, the motion for reconsideration is denied. The case may proceed before Judge West.

Dated this 2 day of August, 2010.

_____
ERIC BROWN
Chief Justice

APPENDIX "2"

Copies to: Kristina D. Frost, Clerk of the Supreme Court
Hon. John A. West
Hamilton County Clerk of Courts
Denise V. Newsome

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC vs.
DENISE V. NEWSOME;
Common Pleas Case No. A-0901302; Ohio Supreme Court Case No. 10-AP-069

JUDGMENT ENTRY ON DEFENDANT'S 8/11/10 MOTION FOR FINAL ENTRY AND STAY

The affidavit of disqualification by Denise Newsome in this case on July 13, 2010 was denied by entry dated July 17, 2010. On July 27, 2010, Newsome filed a motion for reconsideration, which I denied on August 2, 1010.

Newsome has now filed a motion for the court to issue a final judgment entry so she can exercise her right to appeal to the United States Supreme Court. She also seeks a stay of these proceedings while the matter is appealed.

R.C. 2701.03(E) provides that if the chief justice "determines that the interest, bias, prejudice, or disqualification alleged in the affidavit does not

APPENDIX "3"

exist, the chief justice * * * shall issue an entry denying the affidavit of disqualification." In accordance with R.C. 2701.03(E), I issued an entry on July 17, 2010 denying Newsome's affidavit of disqualification. Likewise, I issued another entry on August 2, 2010 denying Newsome's motion for reconsideration. Thus, contrary to Newsome's assertion, final entries have been issued in this case and there are no issues left to be resolved.

As to Newsome's motion to stay, R.C. 2701.03 does not authorize the chief justice to stay affidavit-of-disqualification proceedings while the affiant files an appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

For the reasons stated above, Newsome's motions are denied. The case may proceed before Judge West.

Dated this 18 day of August, 2010.

_____

ERIC BROWN
Chief Justice

Copies to: Kristina D. Frost, Clerk of the Supreme Court
Hon. John A. West
Hamilton County Clerk of Courts
Denise V. Newsome

VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME

Mailing: Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: 513/680-2922

October 25, 2010

VIA U.S. REGISTERED MAIL
Supreme Court of the United States
ATTN: Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

RE: ***Emergency*** *Motion To Stay;* ***Emergency*** *Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein*
Lower Court Action: *Stor-All Alfred LLC v. Denise V. Newsome;* Hamilton County (Ohio) Court of Common Pleas; Case No. A0901302

Dear Justice Roberts:

Enclosed is your October 9, 2010 letter which Newsome believes may have been returned to her in an effort by the Clerk's Office attempt to "Obstruct Justice" in these proceedings. A copy of William K. Suter's/Danny Bickell's October 14, 2010 letter is attached to aid you in understanding the Clerk's efforts to prevent pleading from being filed. This letter is being submitted to you via ***"Registered Mail"*** due to *time-sensitive requests* and to assure your receipt in that it (*as well as the October 9, 2010 Cover Letter directed to your attention*) is being used in an Appendix to support the ***Petition for Extraordinary Writ*** to be filed with this Court in its *original jurisdiction* on this week.

Please be advised that on October 9, 2010, Newsome submitted to your attention pursuant to Rules 22, 23, 30 of the Supreme Court of the United States as well as other governing statutes/laws her *"Emergency Motion to Stay; Emergency Motion for Enlargement of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* which addressed the following issues:

I. AFFIDAVIT OF DISQUALIFICATION
II. SUPREMACIST/TERRORIST/KU KLUX KLAN ACT
III. **IRREPARABLE INJURY/HARM**
IV. THREATS TO COUNSEL/APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
V. UNFIT FOR OFFICE
VI. FINDING OF FACT/CONCLUSION OF LAW
VII. DUE PROCESS OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO U.S. CONSTITUTION
VIII. EQUAL PROTECTION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO U.S. CONSTITUTION
IX. U.S. OFFICE OF PRESIDENT/EXECUTIVE OFFICE;

APPENDIX "4"

in that this matter ***involves a sitting United States President (Barack H. Obama), his Administration and SPECIAL Interests Groups/BIG MONEY***!

> This is a classic case of a *"David vs. GOLIATH!"* Moreover, a classic case that will reveal how a sitting President/his Administration and SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS rely upon their **BIG MONEY** and **POWERFUL INFLUENCE** in the political and judicial arena to ***BULLY indigent*** litigants/citizens and engage in CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs for purposes of obtaining an **UNDUE** and unlawful/illegal **ADVANTAGE** over the weak/poor. *Then one may wonder where our children may be learning their* ***BULLYING*** *techniques and criminal behavior from.*

In the interest of justice and to retain documentation to support this Court's knowledge of filing, you are being provided with the *October 9, 2010* letter the Clerk's Office failed to provide you along with this filing. This filing was accompanied by the referenced pleading, "Filing Fee" of $300.00 (i.e. which is being resubmitted with Petition for Extraordinary Writ) and "CD."

If William K. Suter (Clerk of the Court) /Danny Bickell failed to provide you with the October 9, 2010 filing, as required by the Rules of this Court, Newsome apologize

for having to contact you directly under such circumstances; however, it is important that her rights are protected. It **is NOT** in the duties/function of Mr. Suter/Mr. Bickell to determine such matters and they may have clearly USURPED authority and compromised these proceedings in their handling of this matter – i.e. *in so doing have* ***deprived*** *Newsome* ***equal*** *protection of the laws,* ***equal*** *privileges and immunities and* ***due process*** *of laws*! Justice Roberts, you may want to inquire into Clerk's handling of this matter because such acts *may* constitute violations and be criminal offense(s) pursuant to: 18 USC § 241 - ***Conspiracy against rights;*** 18 USC § 242 - ***Deprivation of rights under color of law;*** 18 USC § 371 - ***Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud*** United States; 18 USC § 372 - ***Conspiracy to impede***; 18 USC § 1341 - ***Frauds and swindles***; 18 USC § 1513 - ***Retaliating against a witness, victim,. . .***; 18 USC § 1701 - ***Obstruction of mails generally;*** 18 USC § 1702 - ***Obstruction of correspondence;*** 18 USC § 1703 - *Delay or destruction of mail . . .*; 42 USC § 1983 - ***Civil action for deprivation of rights***; 42 USC § 1985 - ***Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights***; as well as other statutes/laws governing said acts.

Newsome further request that the United States Supreme Court based on information Newsome has received from research regarding *Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz' ["Baker Donelson"]* past/present relationships to this Court advise her of *CONFLICT OF INTEREST* (if any). See information attached hereto. Information that Baker Donelson *has* ***scrubbed*** *from the Internet since Newsome has gone PUBLIC*!

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Should you have questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at **513/680-2922** or **601/885-9536.**

Sincerely,

Vogel Newsome

Vogel Denise Newsome

Enclosures: (1) October 9, 2010 original letter submitted to the attention of Chief Justice John G. Roberts
(2) October 14, 2010 letter from William K. Suter/Danny Bickell
(3) Baker Donelson Information

NOTE: Enclosures will be **APPENDIX "H"** of ***Petition for Extraordinary Writ***

VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME

Mailing: Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: 513/680-2922

October 9, 2010

VIA U.S. PRIORITY MAIL – **Tracking No. 2306 1570 0001 0443 9658**
Supreme Court of the United States
ATTN: Chief Justice John G. Roberts
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

RE: ***Emergency*** *Motion To Stay;* ***Emergency*** *Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein*
Lower Court Action: *Stor-All Alfred LLC v. Denise V. Newsome;* Hamilton County (Ohio) Court of Common Pleas; Case No. A0901302

Dear Justice Roberts:

Pursuant to the Ohio Supreme Court Rule 22, please find the "ORIGINAL" and two (2) copies of Newsome's *"**Emergency** Motion To Stay; **Emergency** Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* in regards to the lower court action. Also enclosed, please find **Money Order No. *1828278292*** in the amount of $300.00 for payment in advance of the required filing fee. From the Docket of the lower court action, it appears that Judge John Andrew West ("Judge West") is looking to carry out his next action (over Newsome's OBJECTIONS – through filing of Affidavit of Disqualification) on *Friday,* ***October 22, 2010***. See **EXHIBIT "51".**

This matter *involves a* ***sitting President of the United States (Barack Obama)***. Newsome submits the advance payment for purposes of securing costs and to AVOID additional attacks that she has suffered as a DIRECT and PROXIMATE result of President Obama and his Administration's RETALIATION against her for exercising her First and Fourteenth Amendment Rights as well as other rights secured/guaranteed under the United States Constitution and other laws. *This is a case of* ***EXTRAORDINARY*** *and* ***EXCEPTIONAL*** *circumstances which requires the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention.* Newsome is not sure whether or not the Justices of this Court have witnessed or experienced what she shares in this instant filing and that to be brought on Appeal.

> This is a classic case of a *"David vs. GOLIATH!"* Moreover, a classic case that will reveal how a sitting President/his Administration and SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS rely upon their **BIG MONEY** and **POWERFUL INFLUENCE** in the political and judicial arena to ***BULLY indigent*** litigants/citizens and engage in CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs for purposes of obtaining an **UNDUE** and unlawful/illegal **ADVANTAGE** over the weak/poor. *Then one may wonder where our children may be learning their* ***BULLYING*** *techniques and criminal behavior from.*

Newsome apologize for the need to submit such a VOLUMINOUS pleading; however, again, *this matter involves a sitting President of the United States (Barack Obama)* and the Exhibits attached supports the facts and legal conclusions set forth in the Motion for purposes of sustaining the relief sought. Newsome knew that mere allegations alone would not be wise and the importance of providing the documentation and/or evidence to sustain allegations and issues raised.

The Appeal action Newsome seeks will be brought in this Court's ***"Original"*** *jurisdiction* (if permissible) and is associated with a lawsuit that was brought ***against*** Newsome by Plaintiff Stor-All Alfred LLC ("Stor-All"). Stor-All's insurance provider is Liberty Mutual Insurance Company ("Liberty Mutual"). Liberty Mutual is a major client of a HUGE law firm (***Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz***) which from Newsome's research has a GREAT DEAL of political and judicial clout (i.e. ties to Judges/Justices and role in JUDICIAL Nominations and more)[1] – i.e. see **EXHIBITS "22", "35", "59", "18", "79",** and **"80"** respectively. Talking about the ***"fox guarding the hen house"*** *– this is a classic example.* Furthermore, it sheds additional light that Newsome believes is of PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest as to *who is really running the White House as well as the United States Government* – i.e. who may be the minds and forces behind the decisions being made and wars in Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan; as well as the state of the economy today!

From Newsome's research she was able to find information to support that Baker Donelson and Liberty Mutual are TOP/KEY FINANCIAL Contributors and/or Advisors for President Barack Obama and his Administration (i.e. for instance see **EXHIBIT "24"**). Newsome further believes that the **recent attacks on her** by President Obama and his SPECIAL INTEREST Groups (Baker Donelson, Liberty Mutual and others) *may also be because he may blame her for the reason his POPULARITY with the public has fallen and/or his rating in the POLLS are so poor* because Newsome is exercising her Constitutional Rights and informing the PUBLIC/WORLD of the Corruption (i.e. *as WikiLeaks' Leader (Julian Assange) felt the need to do and has now himself come under attack*) in the United States Government and the Cover-Up of criminal/civil wrongs that have been targeted towards Newsome as well as other citizens. In fact, as early as about

[1] Current and former Baker Donelson attorneys and advisors include, among many other highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as: ***Chief of Staff to the President of the United States;*** **U.S. Senate Majority Leader**; **U.S. Secretary of State**; **Members of the United States Senate**; **Members of the United States House of Representatives**; Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control for the U.S. Department of the Treasury; **Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts**; Chief Counsel, Acting Director, and Acting Deputy Director of U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services within the United States Department of Homeland Security; Majority and Minority Staff Director of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; a member of President's Domestic Policy Council; Counselor to the Deputy Secretary for the United States Department of HHS; ***Chief of Staff of the Supreme Court of the United States***; **Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States**; Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade for the U.S. Department of Commerce; Ambassador to Japan; Ambassador to Turkey; Ambassador to Saudi Arabia; Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman; **Governor of Tennessee**; **Governor of Mississippi**; Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee; Commissioner of Finance & Administration (Chief Operating Officer), State of Tennessee; Special Counselor to the Governor of Virginia; **United States Circuit Court of Appeals Judge**; **United States District Court Judges**; **United States Attorneys**; ***and Presidents of State and Local Bar Associations***.

March 2010 [via Email **"2010 & 2012 NOVEMBER ELECTIONS – It's Time to Clean House (Send Obama A Message)"**], it was Newsome who released (i.e. to President Obama/his Administration, *the Media, Church Organizations, Foreign Leaders/Countries*) a PowerPoint Presentation entitled: *"NOVEMBER 2010/2012 ELECTIONS - Vote For Change: It's Time To Clean House - Vote* ***OUT*** *The Incumbents/CAREER Politicians - Where have our CHRISTIAN Morals/Values Gone?"* This presentation is attached to instant filing at **EXHIBIT "166."** Newsome's Email Databases comprises of over 15,000 and is growing. With the November 2010 Elections fast approaching, Newsome believes it is time to submit this PowerPoint presentation and instant filing to the PUBLIC and FOREIGN NATIONS/LEADERS.

For this Court and the PUBLIC/WORLD to understand what the TRUE reasons may be for the RECENT resignations[2] in the Obama Administration and the RETALIATION leveled against Newsome for exercising her Constitutional Rights, in this instant filing she provides the July **13**, 2010 Email entitled, ***"U.S. PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: THE DOWNFALL/DOOM OF THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION – Corruption/Conspiracy/Cover-Up/Criminal Acts Made Public"*** attached to Motion at **EXHIBIT "25."** It was shortly AFTER this email (that was also sent to United States Secretary of Agriculture Thomas Vilsack – Shirley Sherrod's boss) that Sherrod's job was terminated – she was forced to resign by the Obama Administration. See **EXHIBIT "4"**. It was **AFTER** Newsome's email and in RETALIATION that she believes President Obama and his Administration came out and had her Bank Account(s) UNLAWFULLY/ILLEGALLY seized – i.e. requesting that the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue ("KYDOR") carry out such criminal/civil wrongs against Newsome for exercising her rights. On approximately July 17, 2010 (i.e. approximately *FOUR days* ***AFTER*** *the July 13, 2010 email*), the KYDOR executed a *"Notice of Levy"* that it knew was SHAM/BOGUS against Newsome. See **EXHIBIT "27"**. Such knowledge may be confirmed in its failure to provide Newsome with copy of the "Notice of Levy" served and *CONSPIRED with bank to EMBEZZLE/STEAL, through fraudulent and criminal activities, monies to which it was not entitled.* In fact, the KYDOR **compromised** the statute KRS §131.130 *by* ***REWRITING*** *and* ***ALTERING*** *wording* to accomplish its goals and alleging reason for levy being that Newsome owed "Child Support" when Newsome has **NO** children. Newsome further believes that the KYDOR's ***MALICIOUS*** ***acts*** were knowingly done *to get around the required court ORDER before such action could be taken.* The record evidence will support that KYDOR, United States Attorney General Eric Holder and **President Obama** were *timely, properly and adequately notified* through Newsome's **August 12, 2009 Complaint** against the KYDOR, that said agency was engaging in unlawful/illegal practices. See **EXHIBIT "26"**. Newsome also provides the CORRECT wording of the KRS §131.130 at **EXHIBIT "28"** *that the KYDOR compromised.*

[2] Chief of Staff Rahm Emanual, Senior Advisor David Axelrod and NOW White House National Security's General Jim Jones.

Newsome believes it is of GREAT importance to note that within an approximate **one-year** period there have been criminal actions brought against judges and/or their aides in legal actions to which Newsome is a litigant. For instance:

a) In the lower court (Hamilton County) matter, Judge West's Bailiff (Damon Ridley) was recently **INDICTED** and found guilty by a jury for "Attempted Bribery." Ridley being known to take bribe(s) in exchange of getting cases dismissed. See **EXHIBIT "6."**

b) In Mississippi a judge (Bobby DeLaughter) has been **INDICTED** and has pled guilty – i.e. OBSTRUCTING justice and lying to federal agent. See **EXHIBIT "11".** The record evidence will support that the employment matter that Judge DeLaughter presided over regarding Newsome was one that she also requested the intervention of the United States Department of Justice on. To no avail. Leaving Judge DeLaughter to be able to go on and become a CAREER criminal hiding behind his robe! The record evidence will support that the MAJORITY of the Ohio Supreme Court Justices are recipients of HUGE campaign contributions from Liberty Mutual and/or its lawyers' law firms. See **EXHIBIT "54"**. Furthermore, Newsome find it hard to believe and a reasonable person/mind also that the United States Supreme Court's recent ruling in ***Citizens United v Federal Election Commission***, 558 U.S. 50 (2010) provides Justices/Judges with a license for CRIMINAL STALKING, HARASSMENT, THREATS, INTIMIDATION DISCRIMINATION and/or PREJUDICES, etc. leveled against Newsome or other citizens – i.e. acts which is of PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest and/or impacts the public-at-large.

c) A Louisiana judge (G. Thomas Porteous) is presently up before the Senate for **IMPEACHMENT** proceedings. See **EXHIBIT "12"**. The record evidence will support that Newsome notified the United States Department of Justice about Judge Porteous as early as 2004. See **EXHIBIT "34".** To no avail. Leaving Judge Porteous to go on and become a CAREER criminal hiding behind his robe!

Newsome believes this is information the PUBLIC/WORLD needs to know because President Obama and his Administration are CONSTANTLY up in the face of Foreign Leaders SCOLDING them for the corruption in their government when there is a "BEAM/LOG" in the United States' eyes for the same practices.

Newsome seeks the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention in this matter because the record evidence will support that although she has REPEATEDLY followed required prerequisites in pursuit of justice, President Obama/his Administration and others are determined to deprive her of **equal** protection of the laws, **equal** privileges and immunities under the laws and **due process** of laws. Furthermore, how just as in the instant lawsuit out of which this Appeal is brought, TOP/KEY Financial Contributors and/or SPECIAL INTEREST groups of President Barack Obama, ***FIRST*** *go after Newsome and contact her EMPLOYERS for purposes of getting her terminated so that they can have an UNDUE and UNLAWFUL/ILLEGAL advantage in*

legal actions – i.e. stalking Newsome from state-to-state and employer-to-employer/job-to-job. See **EXHIBIT "13"**. Furthermore, actions are taken to FINANCIALLY devastate Newsome – i.e. as in this instant lawsuit by getting her employment terminated and then attacking her financially (committing criminal/fraudulent acts) by executing sham legal process as the *"Notice of Levy."* The record evidence will even support the VICIOUS attacks of President Obama's TOP/KEY Financial Contributors' lawyers' attacks on attorneys that Newsome has retained; that later result in Newsome being abandoned and having to litigate claims *pro se* – i.e. as in this instant lawsuit. Realizing the CONFLICT OF INTEREST that existed because of Newsome's employment with Wood & Lamping and working directly with a former attorney of one of the law firm's (Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin) representing Plaintiff Stor-All. Therefore, to keep Newsome from retaining Wood & Lamping in representing her in any legal matter Stor-All would bring, its insurance provider (Liberty Mutual) and counsel thought *it was necessary to see to it that Newsome's employment with Wood & Lamping was terminated **BEFORE** filing the MALICIOUS Forcible Entry and Detainer action against her* – i.e. action brought against Newsome in which Stor-All *was **already** in possession* of storage unit and property ***WITHOUT** legal authority* (i.e. ***WITHOUT** court order*)!

Again, this is a legal matter of EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances which require the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention and expertise and addresses the following issues as set forth in the "TABLE OF CONTENTS":

Newsome, is not sure whether the Justices of this Court have ever seen anything like the criminal/civil wrongs complained of herein and one that *involves a sitting United States President and his Administration attempting to OBSTRUCT justice and rely upon its BIG MONEY and POLITICAL ties to impede and influence legal proceedings.* Moreover, a sitting President and his Administration who REFUSES to prosecute crimes reported by Newsome. Crimes which have been prosecuted on behalf of other citizens for similar legal wrongs; nevertheless, Newsome is deprived **EQUAL** protection of the laws, **EQUAL** privileges and immunities and **DUE PROCESS** of laws. A President and his Administration that deprives Newsome rights provided under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA").

Newsome is presently unemployed due to the CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs leveled against her. The record evidence will also support how the United States Government has gone to great extremes to see that Newsome is BLACKLISTED in retaliation of her having brought legal action against government agency(s). Therefore, Newsome sets forth the EMERGENCY relief she presently seeks until legal issues may be resolved – i.e. beginning at Page 279 of this instant filing. *Temporary relief Newsome prays can be granted* ***by November 5, 2010****, in that the laws governing said matters makes allowances for same – i.e. considering her present unemployment status which is NO FAULT of Newsome! Relief Newsome seeks is further permissible for purposes of MITIGATING damages.*

Newsome further reminds the United States Supreme Court that it appears that the next scheduled action in the lower court matter (in which she seeks a stay) is for ***Friday, October 22, 2010***.

Newsome further request that the United States Supreme Court based on information Newsome has received from research regarding Baker Donelson's past/present relationships to this Court advise her of an CONFLICT OF INTEREST (if any). See **EXHIBIT "22".** Information that Baker Donelson *has* ***scrubbed*** *from the Internet since Newsome has gone PUBLIC*!

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Should you have questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at **513/680-2922** or **601/885-9536.**

Sincerely,

Vogel Denise Newsome

Enclosures
cc: Judge John Andrews West
U.S. President Barack Obama - **TRACKING NO. 2306 1570 0001 0443 6275**
Michael E. Lively (Counsel for Stor-All/**Liberty Mutual**)
David Meranus (Counsel for Stor-All)
Public/Media (via E-mail)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

October 14, 2010

Vogel D. Newsome
P.O. Box 14731
Cincinnati, OH 45250

RE: Vogel Denise Newsome

Dear Ms. Newsome:

In reply to your submission, received October 12, 2010, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.

Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court.

You may seek review of a decision only by filing a timely petition for writ of certiorari. The papers you submitted are not construed to be a petition for writ of certiorari. Should you choose to file a petition for writ of certiorari, you must submit the petition within the 90 day time limit allowed under Rule 13 of the Rules of this Court. A Copy of the Rules of this Court and a sample petition for a writ of certiorari are enclosed.

Your papers are herewith returned.

Your money order is the amount of $300 is also returned.

Sincerely,
William K. Suter, Clerk
By Danny Bickell
Danny Bickell
(202) 479-3024

Enclosures

LexisNexis®

Print Close Window

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

BAKER DONELSON
BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
Size of Organization: 550
Year Established: 1888
Main Office: Memphis, Tennessee
Web Site: http://www.bakerdonelson.com

Telephone: 901-526-2000
Telecopier: 901-577-2303

Law Firm Snapshot

Martindale-Hubbell has augmented a firm's provided information with third-party sourced data to present a more comprehensive overview of the firm's expertise.

Profile Visibility
#42 in weekly profile views out of 233,261 total law firms Overall

LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell PeerReviewRated

Bar Register Practice Areas

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, is ranked by The National Law Journal as one of the 100 largest law firms in the country. Through strategic acquisitions and mergers over the past century, the Firm has grown to include more than 550 attorneys and public policy and international advisors. Baker Donelson has offices located in five states in the southern U.S. as well as Washington, D.C., plus a representative office in London, England.

Current and former Baker Donelson attorneys and advisors include, among many other highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as: Chief of Staff to the President of the United States; U.S. Senate Majority Leader; U.S. Secretary of State; Members of the United States Senate; Members of the United States House of Representatives; Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control for the U.S. Department of the Treasury; Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; Chief Counsel, Acting Director, and Acting Deputy Director of U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services within the United States Department of Homeland Security; Majority and Minority Staff Director of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; a member of President's Domestic Policy Council; Counselor to the Deputy Secretary for the United States Department of HHS; Chief of Staff of the Supreme Court of the United States; Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States; Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade for the U.S. Department of Commerce; Ambassador to Japan; Ambassador to Turkey; Ambassador to Saudi Arabia; Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman; Governor of Tennessee; Governor of Mississippi; Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee; Commissioner of Finance & Administration (Chief Operating Officer), State of Tennessee; Special Counselor to the Governor of Virginia; United States Circuit Court of Appeals Judge; United

States District Court Judges; United States Attorneys; and Presidents of State and Local Bar Associations.

Baker Donelson represents local, regional, national and international clients. The Firm provides innovative, results-oriented solutions, placing the needs of the client first. Our state-of-the-art technologies seamlessly link all offices, provide instant information exchange, and support clients nationwide with secure access to our online document repository.

Baker Donelson is a member of several of the largest legal networks that provide our attorneys quick access to legal expertise throughout the United States and around the world.

USPS QUEEN CITY FINANCE UNIT
CINCINNATI, Ohio
452029998
3816070202 -0095
10/25/2010 (800)275-8777 10:49:19 AM

Sales Receipt

Product Description	Sale Qty	Unit Price	Final Price
WASHINGTON DC 20543			$1.22
Zone-4 First-Class			
Large Env			
2.30 oz.			
Expected Delivery: Wed 10/27/10			
Restricted Delivery			$4.50
~~ Registered			$10.60
Insured Value :		$0.00	
Article Value :		$0.00	
Label #:		RB987082172US	
Issue PVI:			======== $16.32
Total:			$16.32

Registered No. RB987082172US

Date Stamp

Reg. Fee	$10.60		
Handling Charge	$0.00	Return Receipt	
Postage	$1.22	Restricted Delivery	$4.50
Received by			

CINCINNATI OH QUEEN CITY STA 0202 OCT 25 2010 10/25/10 USPS 45201

To Be Completed By Post Office

Customer Must Declare Full Value $ $0.00

Domestic insurance up to $5,000 is included based upon the declared value. International indemnity is limited. (See Reverse).

OFFICIAL USE

To Be Completed By Customer (Please Print) All Entries Must Be in Ballpoint or Typed

FROM
D. Newsome
P.O. Box 14731
Cincinnati, OH 45250

TO
Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

WASHINGTON DC 20543

PS Form 3806, Receipt for Registered Mail Copy 1 - Customer
May 2007 (7530-02-000-9051) (See Information on Reverse)
For domestic delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com ®

Bill#: 1000502812562
Clerk: 08

All sales final on stamps and postage
Refunds for guaranteed services only
Thank you for your business
****
****
HELP US SERVE YOU BETTER

Go to: https://postalexperience.com/Pos

TELL US ABOUT YOUR RECENT
POSTAL EXPERIENCE

YOUR OPINION COUNTS
****
****

Customer Copy

IN THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC Plaintiff/Appellee	))	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	
DENISE V. NEWSOME Defendant/APPELLANT	)	

EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY;
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME and
OTHER RELIEF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO CORRECT THE LEGAL WRONGS/ INJUSTICES REPORTED HEREIN

DENISE V. NEWSOME
Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: (513) 680-2922 or
(601) 885-9536
Defendant/APPELLANT

Honorable John Andrew West, JUDGE
Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas
1000 Main Street – Room 595
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone: (513) 946-5785
Facsimile: (513) 946-5784

Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA
Attn: David Meranus, Esq.
2900 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone: (513) 579-1414
Facsimile: (513) 579-1418

Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA
Attn: Michael E. Lively, Esq.
Post Office Box 6491
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
Phone: (513) 961-6200
Facsimile: (513) 961-6201
COUNSEL FOR Plaintiff/APPELLEE STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

STATUTES

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT **DESCRIPTION**

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

[1] "Equal Employment Opportunity Commission."

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

[2] "Department of Labor."

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

TABLE OF EXHIBITS – *Cont'd*

IN THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC Plaintiff/Appellee	))	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	
DENISE V. NEWSOME Defendant/APPELLANT	)	

EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY; EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME and OTHER RELIEF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO CORRECT THE LEGAL WRONGS/ INJUSTICES REPORTED HEREIN

COMES NOW PETITIONER/DEFENDANT, Vogel Denise Newsome ("Petitioner/Defendant" and/or "Newsome"), ***AFTER first*** seeking relief through the Ohio Supreme Court, and files this her *"**Emergency** Motion To Stay; **Emergency** Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* ("*EMTS & MFEOTWOC*") regarding a DECISION set to be rendered on or about **Friday, October 22, 2010** (See **EXHIBIT "51"** attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein). by the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas before the Honorable Judge John Andrews West – i.e. to which Newsome has filed a timely *"Affidavit of Disqualification."* With knowledge of Newsome's filing of *Affidavit of Disqualification*, Judge West attempted to move forward with hearing on said Affidavit and Motion to Dismiss on ***Tuesday, September 28, 2010 at 2:15 p.m***. before

attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein) out of which this instant appeal arises that requires the United States Supreme Court's IMMEDIATE intervention to protect the Constitutional rights of Newsome that affects those of other citizens of the United States as well.

109) Newsome believes that "EMERGENCY Injunctions and/or Restraining Orders" as well as preparation of other legal documents known to the United States Supreme Court will need to be issued to assure that Newsome is provided information governed under the "Freedom Of Information Act" that President Obama, his Administration and other Conspirators/Co-Conspirators are involved in for purposes of OBSTRUCTING justices and/or OBSTRUCTING the Administration of Justice.

XVI. RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, for the above and forgoing reasons, Newsome prays that the United States Supreme Court exercise jurisdiction and GRANTS the staying of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas proceedings and afford Newsome justice under the laws. Newsome further prays that the United States Supreme Court grants an ENLARGMENT OF TIME to be determined by it due to the EXTREME and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances which exists in this matter. Newsome is further requesting Motion to Stay and Enlargement of Time for the following reasons and those known to the United States Supreme Court (which Newsome may not be aware of) which will aid in the EQUAL protection of the laws, EQUAL privileges and immunities of the law and DUE PROCESS of laws:

i) In the interest of justice, grant a permanent injunction enjoining the following government agency(s); persons, businesses, law firms:

a) The United States Executive Office (White House)/President Barack H. Obama;
b) United States Senate;
c) United States House of Representatives;
d) United States Department of Justice;

e) United States Department of Labor;

f) United States Department of Treasury;

g) United States Department of Education;

h) Ohio Supreme Court;

i) Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas;

j) Hamilton County Municipal Court;

k) State of Louisiana;

l) State of Mississippi

m) Commonwealth of Kentucky;

n) State of Ohio;

o) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);

p) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);

q) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);

r) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);

s) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky);

t) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals;

u) Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue;

v) GMM Properties;

w) Spring Lake Apartments LLC;

x) Stor-All Alfred, LLC;

y) Floyd West & Company;

z) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

aa) Christian Health Ministries;

bb) Entergy Corporation/Entergy New Orleans, Inc.;

cc) Wood & Lamping, LLP;

dd) Page Kruger & Holland;

ee) Mitchell McNutt & Sams;

ff) Liberty Mutual Insurance Company;

gg) Schwartz, Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA;

hh) Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA;

ii) Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz;

jj) Brunini Grantham Grower & Hewes;

kk) Baria Fyke Hawkins & Stracener (a/k/a Hawkins Stracener & Gibson PLLC);

ll) JP Morgan Chase Bank NA;

mm) PNC Bank NA;

nn) and others that the United States Supreme Court may be aware of that Newsome may have missed – i.e. based on the facts and evidence contained in this instant filing and/or record of those listed herein.

their subdivisions/departments/branches, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any further employment violations and criminal/civil wrongs addressed of herein and/or known to them that is prohibited by Title VII.

ii) In the interest of justice, that the United States Supreme Court enter EMERGENCY Order(s)/Judgment(s) for permanent injunction enjoining the following government agency(s); persons, businesses, law firms:

a) Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz PC
165 Madison Avenue – 20th Floor
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
Managing Shareholder: Robert Mark Glover

b) Liberty Mutual Group, Inc.
175 Berkeley Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
Chairman Emeritus: Gary L. Countryman

c) Entergy Corporation
639 Loyola Avenue – 26th Floor
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113
Chairman: J. Wayne Leonard

d) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center)
2020 Gravier Street – 5th Floor
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112
Officer: Mark Juneau, MD

e) Christian Health Ministries
400 Poydras Street – Suite 2950
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
Chairperson: John D. Decker

f) Floyd West & Company and/or Burns & Wilcox LTD
30833 Northwestern Highway – Suite 220
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334
Director: Alan J. kaufman

g) Public Storage
701 Western Avenue
Glendale, California 91201
Vice President: B. Wayne Hughes, Jr.

h) Stor-All Alfred LLC
253 Womstead Drive
Grayson, Kentucky 41143
President/Director: Steve Womack

i) JP Morgan Chase Bank NA
270 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017
President: David Jackson

j) PNC Bank NA
249 5th Avenue – P1-POPP-21-1
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222
Chairman/Chief Executive Officer: James E. Rohr

k) Mitchell McNutt & Sams PA
105 South Front Street
Tupelo, Mississippi 38804
Shareholder: L.F. Sams, Jr.

l) Hawkins Stracener & Gibson PLLC
129B South President Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
Member: W. Eric Stracener

m) Baria Law Firm
544 Main Street
Bay St. Louis, Mississippi 39520
Member: David Baria

n) Butler Snow O'Mara Stevens & Cannada PLLC
Renaissance at Colony Park
1020 Highland Colony Parkway – Suite 1400
Ridgeland, Mississippi 39157
Firm Chair: Donald Clark, Jr.

o) Wood & Lamping LLP
600 Vine Street – Suite 2500
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Partner: C. J. Schmidt III

p) Liberty Mutual Insurance Group Law Offices
36 East Seventh – Suite 2420
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Attorneys: Molly G. Vance and Raymond Henry Decker, Jr.

q) Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin
2900 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Member: Debbe A. Levin

r) Markesbery & Richardson Co. LPA
2368 Victory Parkway, Suite 200
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
Member: Glen A. Markesbery

s) Jones Walker Waechter Poitevent Carrére & Denégre LLP
201 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70170

t) Locke Liddell & Sapp LLP
2200 Ross Avenue – Suite 2200
Dallas, Texas 75201
Chair: Jerry K. Clements

u) Justice For All Law Center LLC
1500 Lafayette Street – Suite 140-A
Gretna, Louisiana 70053
Member: Michelle E. Scott-Bennett

v) Abioto Law Center PLLC
70 South 4th Street
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
Member: Wanda Abioto

w) Brandon Isaac Dorsey
Attorney At law PLLC
11 Northtown Drive – Suite 125
Jackson, Mississippi 39211

x) Richard Allen Rehfeldt
Attorney at Law
460 Briarwood Drive – Suite 500
Jackson, Mississippi 39206

y) Page Kruger & Holland PA
10 Canebrake Boulevard – Suite 200
Jackson, Mississippi 39215
Shareholder: Thomas Y. Page

z) Brunini Grantham Grower & Hewes PLLC
The Pinnacle Building – Suite 100
190 East Capitol Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
Member/Partner: Charles L. McBride, Jr.

aa) DunbarMonroe PA
270 Trace Colony Park – Suite A
Ridgeland, Mississippi 39157
Member/Partner: G. Clark Monroe II

bb) Steen Dalehite & Pace LLP
401 East Capitol Street – Suite 415
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
Member/Partner: Lanny R. Pace

cc) Wyatt Tarrant & Combs LLP
PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street – Suite 2800
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
Managing Partner: William H. Hollander

dd) Brian Neal Bishop
Wallace Boggs PLLC
300 Buttermilk Parkway – Suite 100
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky 41017

ee) James Moberly West
Martin & West PLLC
157 Barnwood Drive

Edgewood, Kentucky 41017

ff) Gailen Wayne Bridges, Jr.
Attorney-At-Law
732 Scott Street
Covington, Kentucky 41011

gg) Hinds County (Mississippi) Board of Supervisors
316 South President Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39286
Attention: Clerk of Hinds County Board of Supervisors

hh) Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue
501 High Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40620
Commissioner: Thomas B. Miller

ii) Commonwealth of Kentucky
c/o Governor's Office
700 Capitol Avenue – Suite 100
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Governor: Steve Beshear

jj) State of Ohio
c/o Governor's Office
Riffe Center, 30th Floor
77 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Governor: Ted Strickland

kk) State of Mississippi
c/o Governor's Office
400 High Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
Governor: Haley Barbour

their subdivisions/departments/branches, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any further conspiracies and/or criminal/civil wrongs leveled against Newsome addressed herein and/or known to them that is prohibited by statutes and laws of the United States and the States in which they reside and/or conduct business.

iii) In the interest of justice, Newsome request the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) and take the proper action to have the cases regarding Newsome in the following Courts "REOPENED" (if closed) and the record(s) "CERTIFIED:"

a) Ohio Supreme Court;

b) Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas;

c) Hamilton County Municipal Court;

d) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);

e) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);

f) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);

g) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);

h) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky); and

i) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

iv) In the interest of justice, Newsome request the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) and take the proper action to have the cases/charges brought by Newsome in the following Government/Administrative Agencies "REOPENED" (if closed) and the record(s) "CERTIFIED:"

a) Executive Office of the United States/White House;

b) United Stated Department of Justice;

c) United States Department of Labor;

d) United States Department of Treasury;

e) United States Department of Education; and

f) United States Legislature/Congress.

v) In the interest of justice, issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment to have the United States Department of Labor make available to Newsome ALL records regarding charges/cases brought by Newsome filed against:

a) Floyd West & Company;

b) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

c) Christian Health Ministries;

d) Entergy Services, Inc./Entergy New Orleans;

e) Mitchell McNutt & Sams; and

f) Wood & Lamping.

vi) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) for purposes of DETERRING and PREVENTING further conspiracies leveled against Newsome and the ***birthing/breeding*** of more CAREER CRIMINALS (i.e. CRIMINAL BULLIES) for purposes of mitigating damages and pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1986.

> *U.S. v. Jimenez Recio*, 123 S.Ct. 819 (2003) - Essence of a conspiracy is an agreement to commit an unlawful act.
>
> Agreement to commit an unlawful act, which constitutes the essence of a conspiracy, *is a* ***distinct evil*** that may exist and be punished whether or not the substantive crime ensues. *Id.*
>
> Conspiracy ***poses a threat to the public*** over and above the threat of the commission of the relevant substantive crime, both because *the combination in crime* ***makes more likely*** *the commission* ***of other*** *crimes*

and because it **decreases the probability** that *the individuals involved* ***will depart from their path of criminality***. *Id.*

vii) Based upon the United States Department of Labor's failure to follow rules governing charges filed, Newsome is requesting that, in the interest of justice and under the laws governing jurisdiction to CORRECT legal wrongs made know, that the United States Supreme Court issue the proper Order(s)/Judgment(s) to the following former employers requiring the "OPENING" (if closed) and "CERTIFICATION" of employment records regarding Newsome. This request is made in good faith in that Newsome is entitled to said relief for purposes of mitigating damages until legal actions are resolved for the following employers and those this Court has become aware of through this instant filing:

a) Floyd West & Company;

b) Louisiana State University Medical Center (a/k/a Louisiana State University Health Science Center);

c) Christian Health Ministries;

d) Entergy Services, Inc/Entergy New Orleans;

e) Mitchell McNutt & Sams;

f) Page Kruger & Holland; and

g) Wood & Lamping.

viii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s) to ***Wood & Lamping LLP*** to reinstate Newsome's employment *for purposes of mitigating damages* until legal matters are resolved; however, instructing that in the interest, safety and wellbeing of Newsome she is not required to return to place of employment – i.e just returned to receipt of payroll and benefits restored to which she is entitled. *Newsome presently seeks back pay/front pay in the amount in the amount of approximately* ***$88,888.53***[112] ***by November 5, 2010***. Newsome request that Wood & Lamping be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,882.85*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. Newsome further seeks this Court's intervention in that the injunctive relief sought herein is that in which she was entitled to; however, was deprived of by the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division's and EEOC's efforts to COVER-UP employment violations in its role in CONSPIRACIES leveled against Newsome – See Page 263 above and **EXHIBIT "145"** at Page 18 attached hereto.

Section 706(f)(2) of Title VII ***authorizes*** *the Commission to seek temporary injunctive relief* ***before*** *final disposition of a charge*

[112] Pay is calculated up until October 5, 2010, to allow restoration of pay and employee benefits.

> *when a preliminary investigation indicates that* ***prompt*** *judicial action is necessary to carry out the purposes of Title VII.*
>
> *Temporary or preliminary relief* ***allows a court*** *to stop retaliation before it occurs* ***or continues***. ***Such relief is appropriate if there is a substantial likelihood that the challenged action will be found to constitute unlawful retaliation, and if the charging party*** and/or EEOC ***will likely suffer irreparable harm because of retaliation***. Although courts have ruled that financial hardships are not irreparable, other **harms that accompany loss of a job may be irreparable**. - - For example, in one case forced retirees showed irreparable harm and qualified for a preliminary injunction *where they lost work and future prospects for work consequently suffering emotional distress, depression, a contracted social life, and other related harms.*

Newsome believes that the record evidence as well as the FALSE/MALICIOUS information posted on the INTERNET by the United States Government Agencies will support unlawful/illegal acts infringing upon her Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights and other protected rights for purposes of BLACKLISTING her and to see that Newsome ***is NOT*** employable. Thus, supporting the immediate relief sought herein.

ix) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment(s) to ***Mitchell McNutt & Sams*** to pay Newsome *back pay and front pay in the amount of* ***$182,101.34***[113] *by November 5, 2010, for purposes of mitigating damages until legal matters are*. Newsome request that MM&S be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,515.53*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. The record evidence supports MM&S admission of subjecting Newsome to ***Discriminatory*** practices and a ***Hostile Work Environment***. See **EXHIBIT "83"** attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein. Newsome further seeks this Court's intervention in that the injunctive relief sought herein is that in which she was entitled to; however, was deprived of by the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division's, EEOC's and OSHA's efforts to COVER-UP employment violations in its role in CONSPIRACIES leveled against Newsome – See Page 263 above and **EXHIBIT "145"** at Page 18 attached hereto.

> *Section 706(f)(2) of Title VII* ***authorizes*** *the Commission to seek temporary injunctive relief* ***before*** *final disposition of a charge when a preliminary investigation indicates that* ***prompt*** *judicial action is necessary to carry out the purposes of Title VII.*

[113] Pay is calculated up until October 5, 2010.

> *Temporary or preliminary relief* ***allows a court*** *to stop retaliation before it occurs or* ***continues***. ***Such relief is appropriate if there is a substantial likelihood that the challenged action will be found to constitute unlawful retaliation, and if the charging party*** and/or EEOC ***will likely suffer irreparable harm because of retaliation***. Although courts have ruled that financial hardships are not irreparable, other **harms that accompany loss of a job may be irreparable**. - - For example, in one case forced retirees showed irreparable harm and qualified for a preliminary injunction *where they lost work and future prospects for work consequently suffering emotional distress, depression, a contracted social life, and other related harms*.

Newsome believes that the record evidence as well as the FALSE/MALICIOUS information posted on the INTERNET by the United States Government Agencies will support unlawful/illegal acts infringing upon her Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights and other protected rights for purposes of BLACKLISTING her and to see that Newsome ***is NOT*** employable. Thus, supporting the immediate relief sought herein.

x) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment(s) to ***Page Kruger & Holland*** to pay Newsome *back pay and front pay in the amount of* ***$168,321.38***[114] *by November 5, 2010, for purposes of mitigating damages until legal matters are resolved.* Newsome request that PKH be required to continue to pay her BI-WEEKLY from November 5, 2010, ***in the amount of $1,560.99*** (i.e. to be adjusted according to annual pay raises on anniversary date of employment) forward until legal matters are resolved. The record evidence supports PKH's admission of subjecting Newsome to ***Discriminatory*** practices and ***Retaliation*** *because of its learning of lawsuit filed by her and knowledge of Newsome's engagement in PROTECTED activities.* See **EXHIBIT "61"**attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein. PKH terminating Newsome's employment upon learning of her engagement in protected activities and for purposes of providing opposing counsel and their clients with an undue and unlawful/illegal advantage. ***NEXUS can be established*** *between PKH being contacted, Newsome's termination of employment and her attorney's (Brandon Dorsey) request to withdraw. Newsome's termination occurring on or about May 15, 2006* (See **EXHIBIT "61"**), *and withdrawal of counsel set for May 18, 2006* (See **EXHIBIT "131"**). Newsome further seeks this Court's intervention in that the injunctive relief sought herein is that in which she is entitled to as a matter of law.

xi) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Kenton County Circuit Court to return monies **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of approximately* ***$16,250.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally released to opposing parties (GMM*

[114] Pay is calculated up until October 5, 2010.

Properties and its counsel Gailen Bridges) in or about October 2008. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to GMM Properties awarding Newsome monies **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of* ***$18,480.00*** *(i.e. which encompasses the amount of rent and storage from October 2008 to present/October 2010*. Furthermore, ordering that GMM Properties *is to continue to pay Newsome the* ***amount of $770.00*** *until the conclusion of all legal matters pending and/or to be brought for good-faith purposes and the mitigating of damages/injuries and irreparable harm sustained*.

xiii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Spring Lake Apartments LLC awarding Newsome monies **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of* ***$40,320.00*** *(i.e. which encompasses the amount of rent and storage from February 2006 to present/October 2010*. Furthermore, ordering that Spring Lake Apartments LLC *is to continue to pay Newsome the* ***amount of $720.00*** *until the conclusion of all legal matters pending and/or to be brought for good-faith purposes and the mitigating of damages/injuries and irreparable harm sustained*.

xiv) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Wanda Abioto to return monies owed Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of* ***$4,000.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xv) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Richard Allen Rehfeldt to return monies owed Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of* ***$700.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xvi) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Brian Bishop to return monies owed Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of* ***$1,500.00*** *for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally*

retained. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer.

xvii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue to return monies owed Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of **$600.00** for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained through the use of SHAM LEGAL PROCESS*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer. The record evidence supports that on or about July 17, 2010, said Agency executed process for purposes of FRAUD and obtaining monies from Newsome's bank account(s) to which it was not entitled. Moreover, that said Agency did KNOWINGLY, WILLINGLY and MALICIOUSLY rewrite, tamper and compromise the Kentucky Revised Statute 131. 130(11) for the purposes of fulfilling role in conspiracies leveled against Newsome, FRAUD and other reasons known to it. See **EXHIBITS "27"** and **"28"** respectively attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein. The record evidence will further support that the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue KNEW that it was engaging in criminal acts in that Newsome timely, properly and adequately notified it of violations and her right to sue said Agency through her August 12, 2008 Complaint submitted to the attention of Commissioner Thomas Miller and United States Attorney General Eric Holder – with a copy to United States President Barack Obama. See **EXHIBIT "26"** attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full herein.

xviii) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to United States Department of the Treasury to return monies owed Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of **$1,800.00** for monies embezzled and unlawfully/illegally retained through the use of ABUSE OF POWER and Sham Legal Process*. Returning of monies is sought in good faith for purposes of mitigating damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer. The record evidence supports a NEXUS between the unlawful/illegal acts of said Agency and the CONSPIRACIES that have been leveled against Newsome. Moreover, that said Agency embezzled said monies on behalf of the United States Department of Education ***WITHOUT*** *legal authority and/or just cause*.

xix) That the United States Supreme Court issue Order(s)/Judgment to Stor-All Alfred LLC to pay monies to Newsome **by November 5, 2010,** *in the amount of **$5,500.00** for costs associated with replacing property unlawfully/illegally stolen through the use of SHAM LEGAL PROCESS, ABUSE OF POWER, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE and other reasons known to it*. Reward of monies is sought in good faith for

purposes of ***mitigating*** damages/injuries that Newsome has already sustained and continues to suffer. The record evidence supports a NEXUS between the unlawful/illegal acts of Plaintiff Stor-All, its counsel and/or representatives and the CONSPIRACIES that have been leveled against Newsome. The record evidence supports that there is sufficient facts, evidence and legal conclusions to support that Plaintiff Stor-All and other Conspirators/Co-Conspirators knew and/or should have known that they were engaging in criminal/civil wrongs; nevertheless, KNOWINGLY and WILLINGLY with MALICIOUS intent proceeded to engage in unlawful/illegal acts.

xx) That the United States Supreme Court request the United States Congress to create a "SPECIAL/INFERIOR Court" to handle ALL of the pending lawsuits and/or lawsuits filed on behalf of Newsome in the following Courts:

a) Ohio Supreme Court;
b) Hamilton County (Ohio) Court of Common Pleas;
c) United States District Court/Eastern Division (New Orleans Division);
d) United States District Court/Southern Division (Jackson, Mississippi);
e) United States District Court/Northern Division (Dallas, Texas);
f) United States District Court/Eastern Division (Covington, Kentucky);
g) Kenton County Circuit Court (Kenton County, Kentucky)
h) United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals; and
i) Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue.

xxi) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) requiring that the following Government Agencies/Courts **"CERTIFY"** record(s) regarding Complaints/Charges filed by Newsome – i.e. *providing a DEADLINE of* ***November 23, 2010*** *and to make the record available for review in the Cincinnati, Ohio Offices of the*:

a) United States Department of Justice; and
b) United States Department of Labor.

Said Government Agencies/Courts are to also provide this Court and Newsome with their *Findings of Fact* and *Conclusion of Laws* regarding the Complaints/Charges filed by Newsome **by November 23, 2010**.

xxii) That the United States Supreme Court issue the applicable Order(s)/Judgment(s) requiring the United States Legislature and/or United States Congress to **"CERTIFY"** records regarding July 14, 2008 "*Emergency Complaint and Request for Legislature/Congress Intervention; Also Request for Investigations, Hearings and Findings"* submitted by Newsome and to provide this Court and Newsome with the status of said Complaint and the *Findings of Fact* and *Conclusion of Laws* of said Complaint ***on November 30, 2010***.

See **EXHIBIT "38"** (BRIEF Only and supporting "PROOF OF MAILING/RECEIPTS") attached hereto. *Emergency Complaint* was submitted to the attention of the following for handling:

Original To:

a) Senator Patrick Leahy;

Copies To:

b) Representative John Conyers;

c) President Barack Obama (i.e. then United States Senator);

d) Senator John McCain; and

e) Representative Debbie Wasserman-Schultz.

xxiii) In the interest of justice, that the United States Supreme Court based upon the facts, evidence and legal conclusions contained herein REPORT and/or INITIATE the appropriate actions (i.e. IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL, SUSPENSION and/or DISBARMENT) against any/all of the following members of a Legal Bar for violations of ***CANON***, ***Rules of Professional Conduct***, ***Rules of Judicial Conduct*** and/or applicable Statutes/Rules:

a) United States President Barack Obama;

b) United States Vice President Joseph Biden;

c) United States Attorney General Eric Holder;

d) United States Senator Patrick Leahy;

e) United States Representative John Conyers Jr.;

f) United States Senator William Thad Cochran;

g)

h) Judge John Andrew West;

i) Judge Nadine L. Allen;

j) Judge Gregory M. Bartlett;

k) Judge Ann Ruttle;

l) Justice Thomas J. Moyer;

m) Justice Robert R. Cupp;

n) Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger;

o) Justice Maureen O'Connor;

p) Justice Terrence O'Donnell;

q) Justice Paul E. Pfeifer;

r) Justice Evelyn Lunberg Stratton;

s) Justice W. Eugene Davis;

t) Justice John D. Minton, Jr.;

u) Judge William Barnett;

v) Judge Tom S. Lee;

w) Magistrate Judge Linda R. Anderson;

x) Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. (i.e. presently involved in IMPEACHMENT proceedings before the United States Senate – See **EXHIBIT "12"** attached hereto);

y) Magistrate Judge Sally Shushan;

z) Judge Morey L. Sear;

aa) Prosecuting Attorney Joseph T. Deters;

bb) Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Christian J. Schaefer;

cc) Attorney General Jack Conway;

dd) James Moberly West, Esq.;

ee) Gailen Wayne Bridges, Jr., Esq.;

ff) Brian Neal Bishop, Esq.;

gg) David M. Meranus, Esq.;

hh) Michael E. Lively, Esq.;

ii) Patrick B. Healy, Esq.;

jj) Molly G. Vance, Esq.;

kk) Raymond H. Decker, Jr., Esq.;

ll) C. J. Schmidt, Esq.;

mm) Thomas J. Breed, Esq.;

nn) Grover Clark Monroe II, Esq.;

oo) Benny McCalip May, Esq.;

pp) Lanny R. Pace, Esq.;

qq) Clifford Allen McDaniel II, Esq.;

rr) J. Lawson Hester, Esq.;

ss) Wanda Abioto, Esq.;

tt) Brandon Isaac Dorsey, Esq.;

uu) Richard Allen Rehfeldt, Esq.;

vv) Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett, Esq.;

ww) Allyson Kessler Howie, Esq.;

xx) Renee Williams Masinter, Esq.;

yy) Amelia Williams Koch, Esq.;

zz) Jennifer F. Kogos, Esq.;

aaa) L. F. Sams Jr., Esq.;

bbb) Thomas Y. Page, Esq.;

ccc) Louis J. Baine, Esq.; and

ddd) Attorneys/Judges/Justices who become known to the United States Supreme Court through the handling of this matter.

xxiv) In the interest of justice and if the laws permit, Newsome requests the ***Granting*** *of Motion to Stay* and ***Granting*** *Enlargement of Time* to prepare to bring the appropriate action in the United States Supreme Court's ***"ORIGINAL"*** jurisdiction if permissible by law due to the EXCEPTIONAL and EXTREME circumstances addressed in this instant filing – i.e. ***Granting*** *Stay of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas lawsuit (Case No. A0901302) out of which this instant filing arises.*

xxv) ALL costs associated, expended and/or to be expended in the litigation of this action;

xxvi) Any and all applicable relief known to the United States Supreme Court to correct legal wrongs and injustices complained of herein;

Respectfully submitted this **9th** day of **October, 2010.**

Vogel Denise Newsome

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the forgoing pleading was MAILED via U.S. Mail first-class to:

Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin, LPA
Attn: David Meranus, Esq.
2900 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Markesbery & Richardson Co., LPA
Attn: Michael E. Lively, Esq.
Attn: Patrick B. Healy, Esq.
Post Office Box 6491
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

VIA E-MAIL & PRIORITY MAIL – **2306 1570 0001 0443 6275**
ATTN: Barack H. Obama – U.S. President
Executive Office of the President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500-0005

Dated this **9TH** day of **October, 2010.**

Vogel Denise Newsome

Print Close Window

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

BAKER DONELSON
BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
Size of Organization: 550
Year Established: 1888
Main Office: Memphis, Tennessee
Web Site: http://www.bakerdonelson.com

Telephone: 901-526-2000
Telecopier: 901-577-2303

Send Email

Law Firm Snapshot

Martindale-Hubbell has augmented a firm's provided information with third-party sourced data to present a more comprehensive overview of the firm's expertise.

Profile Visibility
#42 in weekly profile views out of 233,261 total law firms Overall

LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell PeerReviewRated FOR ETHICAL STANDARDS AND LEGAL ABILITY 2010

Bar Register Practice Areas

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, is ranked by The National Law Journal as one of the 100 largest law firms in the country. Through strategic acquisitions and mergers over the past century, the Firm has grown to include more than 550 attorneys and public policy and international advisors. Baker Donelson has offices located in five states in the southern U.S. as well as Washington, D.C., plus a representative office in London, England.

Current and former Baker Donelson attorneys and advisors include, among many other highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as: Chief of Staff to the President of the United States; U.S. Senate Majority Leader; U.S. Secretary of State; Members of the United States Senate; Members of the United States House of Representatives; Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control for the U.S. Department of the Treasury; Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; Chief Counsel, Acting Director, and Acting Deputy Director of U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services within the United States Department of Homeland Security; Majority and Minority Staff Director of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; a member of President's Domestic Policy Council; Counselor to the Deputy Secretary for the United States Department of HHS; Chief of Staff of the Supreme Court of the United States; Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States; Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade for the U.S. Department of Commerce; Ambassador to Japan; Ambassador to Turkey; Ambassador to Saudi Arabia; Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman; Governor of Tennessee; Governor of Mississippi; Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee; Commissioner of Finance & Administration (Chief Operating Officer), State of Tennessee; Special Counselor to the Governor of Virginia; United States Circuit Court of Appeals Judge; United

APPENDIX "6"

States District Court Judges; United States Attorneys; and Presidents of State and Local Bar Associations.

Baker Donelson represents local, regional, national and international clients. The Firm provides innovative, results-oriented solutions, placing the needs of the client first. Our state-of-the-art technologies seamlessly link all offices, provide instant information exchange, and support clients nationwide with secure access to our online document repository.

Baker Donelson is a member of several of the largest legal networks that provide our attorneys quick access to legal expertise throughout the United States and around the world.

martindale.com
Lawyer Locator

Lawyer Locator
Search Lawyer Locator
By Lawyer
By Location/Area of Practice
By Industry/Practice Groups
By Firm
By Corporate Law Departments
By US Government
By US Law Faculty
Join the Legal Network
Request a Listing
About Lawyer Locator

Legal Articles
Dispute Resolution
Experts and Services
Legal Personnel
Legal Careers
Professional Resources
Customer Service

LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell

FEEDBACK

Add the Lawyer Locator and Article Search to your web site
LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell

More resources...
lawyers.com
Practice Development Center
Counsel to Counsel Forums
corporate.martindale.com
eAttorney
LexisNexis™

Search the Lawyer Locator

New Search

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

201 St. Charles Avenue, Suite 3600
New Orleans, Louisiana 70170-1000
(Orleans Parish)
Telephone: 504-566-5200
Email: Contact Us
Web Site: http://www.bakerdonelson.com

Firm Credentials

BAR REGISTER

Bar Register Practice Areas: Commercial Litigation; Construction Law; Health Care Law; Labor and Employment Law; Oil and Gas Law.

Statement of Practice:
Antitrust; Appellate Defense; Bankruptcy and Creditors' Rights; Business Torts; Commercial Litigation; Construction; Corporate and Business Transactions; eBusiness/Technology; Eminent Domain; Employee Benefits and Executive Compensation; Employment and Civil Rights; Environmental, Health and Safety; Equipment Leasing; Estate Planning/Probate; Financial Services and Transactions; Government Investigations and Litigation; Health Law; Immigration; Insurance Defense Coverage; Intellectual Property; International; Labor and Employment; Litigation; Media Law; Oil and Gas Litigation; Products Liability; Professional Liability; Public Policy - Federal; Public Policy - State; Real Estate; Taxation - Federal and State/Local; Transportation.

Year Established: 1888

Firm Profile:

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz was ranked in 2003 as the fastest growing law firm in the U.S. by The National Law Journal and is one of the 200 largest law firms in the country. Through strategic acquisitions and mergers over the past century, the firm has grown to include over 370 attorneys and public policy advisors in ten offices across the southeastern United States, as well as a representative office in Beijing, China. In the United States, Baker Donelson has offices in Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville, Chattanooga and Johnson City, Tennessee as well as Birmingham, Alabama; Jackson, Mississippi; Washington, DC; New Orleans and Mandeville, Louisiana and Atlanta, Georgia.

Current and former Baker Donelson attorneys and public policy advisors include, among many other highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as Chief of Staff to the President of the United States; the U.S. Senate Majority Leader; the U.S. Secretary of State; a member of the United States Congress; the Federal Aviation

APPENDIX "7"

- LawCommerce.com[SM]
- LawyerLocator.Co.Uk
- Anwalt24.de
- martindale.co.il

Legend

This attorney or firm has articles published on martindale.com

Administrator; Chief of Staff at the Supreme Court of the United States and Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States; the Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade for the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Ambassador to Turkey; the Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman; Chief Operating Officer and Commissioner of Finance and Administration for the State of Tennessee; the Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee, the Governor of Mississippi, and the Chairman of the Alabama Securities Commission.

Baker Donelson represents local, regional, national and international clients across numerous industries in regard to a myriad of complex issues. The Firm's service philosophy is grounded in the commitment to provide innovative, results-oriented solutions while placing the needs of its clients first. Baker Donelson understands the constantly evolving and changing nature of the law and political conditions around the world, and is highly dedicated to providing the necessary continuing education to maintain the thought leadership and sophistication of the attorneys and public policy advisors within the Firm. By investing in and using state-of-the-art Web technologies, collaborative systems and the latest knowledge management tools, Baker Donelson provides efficient, streamlined service to its clients and in so doing maintains a competitive advantage in the legal services industry.

Baker Donelson is a member of TerraLex, one of the largest global networks of independent law firms. TerraLex is comprised of more than 10,000 attorneys in 145 firms in 93 countries. The network's goal is to enable member firms to better serve their clients' international interests by providing clients quick access to lawyers with the right expertise and depth of jurisdictional knowledge in countries around the world.

The Firm also is a member of the Harmonie Group, an organization of independent firms capable of providing litigation defense services to corporations, insurance carriers, captive insurance companies, risk retention groups, purchasing groups and third-party administrators. The Harmonie network, with over 3,000 lawyers from more than 50 firms, provides clients with access to defense firms and attorneys throughout the United States that handle complex and difficult high-stakes litigation.

For more information about Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, visit www.bakerdonelson.com.

For additional business information about this firm, Click here to view this firm's ranking in key AMERICAN LAWYER MEDIA lists and surveys.

View articles about this firm from *Corporate Board Member* magazine

Firm Size: 370

Other Office Addresses: Links to Other Offices
Memphis, Tennessee Office: 20th Floor, First Tennessee Building, 165 Madison Avenue, 38103. Telephone: 901-526-2000. Telecopier: 901-577-2303.
Nashville, Tennessee Office: Commerce Center, Suite 1000, 211 Commerce Street, 37201. Telephone: 615-726-5600. Telecopier: 615-726-0464.
Chattanooga, Tennessee Office: 1800 Republic Centre, 633 Chestnut Street, 37450-1800. Telephone: 423-756-2010. Telecopier: 423-756-3447.
Knoxville, Tennessee Office: 2200 Riverview Tower, 900 South Gay Street, 37902. Telephone: 865-549-7000. Telecopier: 865-525-8569.

Johnson City, Tennessee Office: SunTrust Bank Building, 207 Mockingbird Lane, P.O.

VOGEL DENISE NEWSOME

Mailing: Post Office Box 14731
Cincinnati, Ohio 45250
Phone: 513/680-2922

October 9, 2010

VIA U.S. PRIORITY MAIL – **Tracking No. 2306 1570 0001 0443 9658**
Supreme Court of the United States
ATTN: Chief Justice John G. Roberts
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

RE: ***Emergency*** *Motion To Stay;* ***Emergency*** *Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein*
Lower Court Action: *Stor-All Alfred LLC v. Denise V. Newsome;* Hamilton County (Ohio) Court of Common Pleas; Case No. A0901302

Dear Justice Roberts:

Pursuant to the Ohio Supreme Court Rule 22, please find the "ORIGINAL" and two (2) copies of Newsome's *"**Emergency** Motion To Stay; **Emergency** Motion For Enlargement Of Time and Other Relief The United States Supreme Court Deems Appropriate To Correct The Legal Wrongs/Injustices Reported Herein"* in regards to the lower court action. Also enclosed, please find **Money Order No. *1828278292*** in the amount of $300.00 for payment in advance of the required filing fee. From the Docket of the lower court action, it appears that Judge John Andrew West ("Judge West") is looking to carry out his next action (over Newsome's OBJECTIONS – through filing of Affidavit of Disqualification) on *Friday*, ***October 22, 2010***. See **EXHIBIT "51".**

This matter *involves a* ***sitting President of the United States (Barack Obama)***. Newsome submits the advance payment for purposes of securing costs and to AVOID additional attacks that she has suffered as a DIRECT and PROXIMATE result of President Obama and his Administration's RETALIATION against her for exercising her First and Fourteenth Amendment Rights as well as other rights secured/guaranteed under the United States Constitution and other laws. *This is a case of* ***EXTRAORDINARY*** *and* ***EXCEPTIONAL*** *circumstances which requires the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention.* Newsome is not sure whether or not the Justices of this Court have witnessed or experienced what she shares in this instant filing and that to be brought on Appeal.

> This is a classic case of a *"David vs. GOLIATH!"* Moreover, a classic case that will reveal how a sitting President/his Administration and SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS rely upon their **BIG MONEY** and **POWERFUL INFLUENCE** in the political and judicial arena to ***BULLY indigent*** litigants/citizens and engage in CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs for purposes of obtaining an **UNDUE** and unlawful/illegal **ADVANTAGE** over the weak/poor. *Then one may wonder where our children may be learning their* ***BULLYING*** *techniques and criminal behavior from.*

APPENDIX "8"

Newsome apologize for the need to submit such a VOLUMINOUS pleading; however, again, *this matter involves a sitting President of the United States (Barack Obama)* and the Exhibits attached supports the facts and legal conclusions set forth in the Motion for purposes of sustaining the relief sought. Newsome knew that mere allegations alone would not be wise and the importance of providing the documentation and/or evidence to sustain allegations and issues raised.

The Appeal action Newsome seeks will be brought in this Court's ***"Original"*** *jurisdiction* (if permissible) and is associated with a lawsuit that was brought ***against*** Newsome by Plaintiff Stor-All Alfred LLC ("Stor-All"). Stor-All's insurance provider is Liberty Mutual Insurance Company ("Liberty Mutual"). Liberty Mutual is a major client of a HUGE law firm (***Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz***) which from Newsome's research has a GREAT DEAL of political and judicial clout (i.e. ties to Judges/Justices and role in JUDICIAL Nominations and more)[1] – i.e. see **EXHIBITS "22"**, **"35"**, **"59"**, **"18"**, **"79"**, and **"80"** respectively. Talking about the ***"fox guarding the hen house"*** – *this is a classic example*. Furthermore, it sheds additional light that Newsome believes is of PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest as to *who is really running the White House as well as the United States Government* – i.e. who may be the minds and forces behind the decisions being made and wars in Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan; as well as the state of the economy today!

From Newsome's research she was able to find information to support that Baker Donelson and Liberty Mutual are TOP/KEY FINANCIAL Contributors and/or Advisors for President Barack Obama and his Administration (i.e. for instance see **EXHIBIT "24"**). Newsome further believes that the **recent attacks on her** by President Obama and his SPECIAL INTEREST Groups (Baker Donelson, Liberty Mutual and others) *may also be because he may blame her for the reason his POPULARITY with the public has fallen and/or his rating in the POLLS are so poor* because Newsome is exercising her Constitutional Rights and informing the PUBLIC/WORLD of the Corruption (i.e. *as WikiLeaks' Leader (Julian Assange) felt the need to do and has now himself come under attack*) in the United States Government and the Cover-Up of criminal/civil wrongs that have been targeted towards Newsome as well as other citizens. In fact, as early as about

[1] Current and former Baker Donelson attorneys and advisors include, among many other highly distinguished individuals, people who have served as: ***Chief of Staff to the President of the United States;*** **U.S. Senate Majority Leader**; **U.S. Secretary of State**; **Members of the United States Senate**; **Members of the United States House of Representatives**; Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control for the U.S. Department of the Treasury; **Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts**; Chief Counsel, Acting Director, and Acting Deputy Director of U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services within the United States Department of Homeland Security; Majority and Minority Staff Director of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; a member of President's Domestic Policy Council; Counselor to the Deputy Secretary for the United States Department of HHS; ***Chief of Staff of the Supreme Court of the United States***; **Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States**; Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade for the U.S. Department of Commerce; Ambassador to Japan; Ambassador to Turkey; Ambassador to Saudi Arabia; Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman; **Governor of Tennessee**; **Governor of Mississippi**; Deputy Governor and Chief of Staff for the Governor of Tennessee; Commissioner of Finance & Administration (Chief Operating Officer), State of Tennessee; Special Counselor to the Governor of Virginia; **United States Circuit Court of Appeals Judge**; **United States District Court Judges**; **United States Attorneys**; ***and Presidents of State and Local Bar Associations***.

March 2010 [via Email **"2010 & 2012 NOVEMBER ELECTIONS – It's Time to Clean House (Send Obama A Message)"**], it was Newsome who released (i.e. to President Obama/his Administration, *the Media, Church Organizations, Foreign Leaders/Countries*) a PowerPoint Presentation entitled: *"NOVEMBER 2010/2012 ELECTIONS - Vote For Change: It's Time To Clean House - Vote* ***OUT*** *The Incumbents/CAREER Politicians - Where have our CHRISTIAN Morals/Values Gone?"* This presentation is attached to instant filing at **EXHIBIT "166."** Newsome's Email Databases comprises of over 15,000 and is growing. With the November 2010 Elections fast approaching, Newsome believes it is time to submit this PowerPoint presentation and instant filing to the PUBLIC and FOREIGN NATIONS/LEADERS.

For this Court and the PUBLIC/WORLD to understand what the TRUE reasons may be for the RECENT resignations[2] in the Obama Administration and the RETALIATION leveled against Newsome for exercising her Constitutional Rights, in this instant filing she provides the July **13**, 2010 Email entitled, ***"U.S. PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: THE DOWNFALL/DOOM OF THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION – Corruption/Conspiracy/Cover-Up/Criminal Acts Made Public"*** attached to Motion at **EXHIBIT "25."** It was shortly AFTER this email (that was also sent to United States Secretary of Agriculture Thomas Vilsack – Shirley Sherrod's boss) that Sherrod's job was terminated – she was forced to resign by the Obama Administration. See **EXHIBIT "4"**. It was **AFTER** Newsome's email and in RETALIATION that she believes President Obama and his Administration came out and had her Bank Account(s) UNLAWFULLY/ILLEGALLY seized – i.e. requesting that the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Revenue ("KYDOR") carry out such criminal/civil wrongs against Newsome for exercising her rights. On approximately July 17, 2010 (i.e. approximately *FOUR days* ***AFTER*** *the July 13, 2010 email*), the KYDOR executed a *"Notice of Levy"* that it knew was SHAM/BOGUS against Newsome. See **EXHIBIT "27"**. Such knowledge may be confirmed in its failure to provide Newsome with copy of the "Notice of Levy" served and *CONSPIRED with bank to EMBEZZLE/STEAL, through fraudulent and criminal activities, monies to which it was not entitled.* In fact, the KYDOR **compromised** the statute KRS §131.130 *by* ***REWRITING*** *and* ***ALTERING*** *wording* to accomplish its goals and alleging reason for levy being that Newsome owed "Child Support" when Newsome has **NO** children. Newsome further believes that the KYDOR's ***MALICIOUS*** ***acts*** were knowingly done *to get around the required court ORDER before such action could be taken*. The record evidence will support that KYDOR, United States Attorney General Eric Holder and **President Obama** were *timely, properly and adequately notified* through Newsome's **August 12, 2009 Complaint** against the KYDOR, that said agency was engaging in unlawful/illegal practices. See **EXHIBIT "26"**. Newsome also provides the CORRECT wording of the KRS §131.130 at **EXHIBIT "28"** *that the KYDOR compromised.*

[2] Chief of Staff Rahm Emanual, Senior Advisor David Axelrod and NOW White House National Security's General Jim Jones.

Newsome believes it is of GREAT importance to note that within an approximate **one-year** period there have been criminal actions brought against judges and/or their aides in legal actions to which Newsome is a litigant. For instance:

a) In the lower court (Hamilton County) matter, Judge West's Bailiff (Damon Ridley) was recently **INDICTED** and found guilty by a jury for "Attempted Bribery." Ridley being known to take bribe(s) in exchange of getting cases dismissed. See **EXHIBIT "6."**

b) In Mississippi a judge (Bobby DeLaughter) has been **INDICTED** and has pled guilty – i.e. OBSTRUCTING justice and lying to federal agent. See **EXHIBIT "11".** The record evidence will support that the employment matter that Judge DeLaughter presided over regarding Newsome was one that she also requested the intervention of the United States Department of Justice on. To no avail. Leaving Judge DeLaughter to be able to go on and become a CAREER criminal hiding behind his robe! The record evidence will support that the MAJORITY of the Ohio Supreme Court Justices are recipients of HUGE campaign contributions from Liberty Mutual and/or its lawyers' law firms. See **EXHIBIT "54"**. Furthermore, Newsome find it hard to believe and a reasonable person/mind also that the United States Supreme Court's recent ruling in ***Citizens United v Federal Election Commission***, 558 U.S. 50 (2010) provides Justices/Judges with a license for CRIMINAL STALKING, HARASSMENT, THREATS, INTIMIDATION DISCRIMINATION and/or PREJUDICES, etc. leveled against Newsome or other citizens – i.e. acts which is of PUBLIC/WORLDWIDE interest and/or impacts the public-at-large.

c) A Louisiana judge (G. Thomas Porteous) is presently up before the Senate for **IMPEACHMENT** proceedings. See **EXHIBIT "12"**. The record evidence will support that Newsome notified the United States Department of Justice about Judge Porteous as early as 2004. See **EXHIBIT "34".** To no avail. Leaving Judge Porteous to go on and become a CAREER criminal hiding behind his robe!

Newsome believes this is information the PUBLIC/WORLD needs to know because President Obama and his Administration are CONSTANTLY up in the face of Foreign Leaders SCOLDING them for the corruption in their government when there is a "BEAM/LOG" in the United States' eyes for the same practices.

Newsome seeks the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention in this matter because the record evidence will support that although she has REPEATEDLY followed required prerequisites in pursuit of justice, President Obama/his Administration and others are determined to deprive her of **equal** protection of the laws, **equal** privileges and immunities under the laws and **due process** of laws. Furthermore, how just as in the instant lawsuit out of which this Appeal is brought, TOP/KEY Financial Contributors and/or SPECIAL INTEREST groups of President Barack Obama, ***FIRST*** *go after Newsome and contact her EMPLOYERS for purposes of getting her terminated so that they can have an UNDUE and UNLAWFUL/ILLEGAL advantage in*

legal actions – i.e. stalking Newsome from state-to-state and employer-to-employer/job-to-job. See **EXHIBIT "13"**. Furthermore, actions are taken to FINANCIALLY devastate Newsome – i.e. as in this instant lawsuit by getting her employment terminated and then attacking her financially (committing criminal/fraudulent acts) by executing sham legal process as the "*Notice of Levy."* The record evidence will even support the VICIOUS attacks of President Obama's TOP/KEY Financial Contributors' lawyers' attacks on attorneys that Newsome has retained; that later result in Newsome being abandoned and having to litigate claims *pro se* – i.e. as in this instant lawsuit. Realizing the CONFLICT OF INTEREST that existed because of Newsome's employment with Wood & Lamping and working directly with a former attorney of one of the law firm's (Schwartz Manes Ruby & Slovin) representing Plaintiff Stor-All. Therefore, to keep Newsome from retaining Wood & Lamping in representing her in any legal matter Stor-All would bring, its insurance provider (Liberty Mutual) and counsel thought *it was necessary to see to it that Newsome's employment with Wood & Lamping was terminated* ***BEFORE*** *filing the MALICIOUS Forcible Entry and Detainer action against her* – i.e. action brought against Newsome in which Stor-All *was* ***already*** *in possession* of storage unit and property ***WITHOUT*** ***legal authority*** (i.e. ***WITHOUT*** ***court order***)!

Again, this is a legal matter of EXTRAORDINARY and EXCEPTIONAL circumstances which require the Supreme Court of the United States' intervention and expertise and addresses the following issues as set forth in the "TABLE OF CONTENTS":

Newsome, is not sure whether the Justices of this Court have ever seen anything like the criminal/civil wrongs complained of herein and one that *involves a sitting United States President and his Administration attempting to OBSTRUCT justice and rely upon its BIG MONEY and POLITICAL ties to impede and influence legal proceedings.* Moreover, a sitting President and his Administration who REFUSES to prosecute crimes reported by Newsome. Crimes which have been prosecuted on behalf of other citizens for similar legal wrongs; nevertheless, Newsome is deprived **EQUAL** protection of the laws, **EQUAL** privileges and immunities and **DUE PROCESS** of laws. A President and his Administration that deprives Newsome rights provided under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA").

Newsome is presently unemployed due to the CRIMINAL/CIVIL wrongs leveled against her. The record evidence will also support how the United States Government has gone to great extremes to see that Newsome is BLACKLISTED in retaliation of her having brought legal action against government agency(s). Therefore, Newsome sets forth the EMERGENCY relief she presently seeks until legal issues may be resolved – i.e. beginning at Page 279 of this instant filing. *Temporary relief Newsome prays can be granted* ***by November 5, 2010****, in that the laws governing said matters makes allowances for same – i.e. considering her present unemployment status which is NO FAULT of Newsome! Relief Newsome seeks is further permissible for purposes of MITIGATING damages.*

Newsome further reminds the United States Supreme Court that it appears that the next scheduled action in the lower court matter (in which she seeks a stay) is for ***Friday, October 22, 2010***.

Newsome further request that the United States Supreme Court based on information Newsome has received from research regarding Baker Donelson's past/present relationships to this Court advise her of an CONFLICT OF INTEREST (if any). See **EXHIBIT "22"**. Information that Baker Donelson *has* ***scrubbed*** *from the Internet since Newsome has gone PUBLIC*!

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Should you have questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at **513/680-2922** or **601/885-9536.**

Sincerely,

Vogel Denise Newsome

Enclosures
cc: Judge John Andrews West
U.S. President Barack Obama - **TRACKING NO. 2306 1570 0001 0443 6275**
Michael E. Lively (Counsel for Stor-All/**Liberty Mutual**)
David Meranus (Counsel for Stor-All)
Public/Media (via E-mail)

07/09/10 – USPS MAILING RECEIPTS (Obama/Holder)



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **0309 1830 0000 0661 8023**
Class: **Priority Mail®**
Service(s): **Delivery Confirmation™**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 4:28 am on July 20, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20500.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Delivered, July 20, 2010, 4:28 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20500**
- **Notice Left, July 13, 2010, 11:09 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20500**
- **Arrival at Unit, July 13, 2010, 10:18 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, July 10, 2010, 8:12 pm, CINCINNATI, OH 45235**
- **Acceptance, July 10, 2010, 1:54 pm, CINCINNATI, OH 45234**

Notification Options

Track & Confirm by email

Get current event information or updates for your item sent to you or others by email. Go >



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **0309 1140 0001 9264 2721**
Class: **Priority Mail®**
Service(s): **Delivery Confirmation™**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 11:14 am on July 15, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20530.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Delivered, July 15, 2010, 11:14 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Notice Left, July 15, 2010, 10:40 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Arrival at Unit, July 15, 2010, 8:35 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, July 10, 2010, 8:12 pm, CINCINNATI, OH 45235**
- **Acceptance, July 10, 2010, 1:55 pm, CINCINNATI, OH 45234**

Notification Options

Track & Confirm by email

Get current event information or updates for your item sent to you or others by email. Go >

APPENDIX "9"

07/26/10 – USPS MAILING RECEIPTS (Obama & Holder)



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **0309 1140 0001 9264 1892**
Service(s): **Delivery Confirmation™**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 4:17 am on August 03, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20500.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Delivered, August 03, 2010, 4:17 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20500**
- **Notice Left, August 02, 2010, 10:01 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20500**
- **Arrival at Unit, August 02, 2010, 8:31 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, July 27, 2010, 9:26 pm, WASHINGTON, DC 20066**

Notification Options

Track & Confirm by email

Get current event information or updates for your item sent to you or others by email. Go >



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **0309 1140 0001 9264 1922**
Service(s): **Delivery Confirmation™**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 11:25 am on July 29, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20530.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Delivered, July 29, 2010, 11:25 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Notice Left, July 29, 2010, 10:48 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Sorting Complete, July 29, 2010, 10:01 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Arrival at Unit, July 29, 2010, 8:56 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, July 27, 2010, 9:28 pm, WASHINGTON, DC 20066**

Notification Options

Track & Confirm by email

Get current event information or updates for your item sent to you or others by email. Go >

08/11/10 – USPS MAILING RECEIPTS (Obama & Holder)



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **2306 1570 0001 0442 2421**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 4:17 am on August 23, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20500. The item was signed for by M NALDO.

Additional information for this item is stored in files offline.

Restore Offline Details > (?) Return to USPS.com Home >

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **2306 1570 0001 0442 2421**
Class: **Priority Mail®**
Service(s): **Signature Confirmation™**
Status: **Notice Left**

We attempted to deliver your item at 12:25 pm on August 15, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20500 and a notice was left. You may pick up the item at the Post Office indicated on the notice, go to www.usps.com/redelivery, or call 800-ASK-USPS to arrange for redelivery. If this item is unclaimed after 15 days then it will be returned to the sender. Information, if available, is updated periodically throughout the day. Please check again later.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Notice Left, August 15, 2010, 12:25 pm, WASHINGTON, DC 20500**
- **Arrival at Unit, August 15, 2010, 10:29 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, August 11, 2010, 9:55 pm, COLUMBUS, OH 43218**
- **Acceptance, August 11, 2010, 6:43 pm, COLUMBUS, OH 43216**



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Home | Help | Sign In

Track & Confirm | FAQs

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: **2306 1570 0001 0442 2469**
Class: **Priority Mail®**
Service(s): **Signature Confirmation™**
Status: **Delivered**

Your item was delivered at 12:01 pm on August 13, 2010 in WASHINGTON, DC 20530 to JUSTICE 20530 PU . The item was signed for by M POWER.

Track & Confirm
Enter Label/Receipt Number.
Go >

Detailed Results:

- **Delivered, August 13, 2010, 12:01 pm, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Notice Left, August 13, 2010, 10:49 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20530**
- **Arrival at Unit, August 13, 2010, 9:12 am, WASHINGTON, DC 20022**
- **Processed through Sort Facility, August 11, 2010, 9:55 pm, COLUMBUS, OH 43218**
- **Acceptance, August 11, 2010, 6:43 pm, COLUMBUS, OH 43216**

Notification Options

RICHARD CORDRAY
OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

* 5 5 5 *

December 27, 2010

Newsome, V D
Po Box 14731
Cincinnati OH 45250-0731

Re: PERSONAL INCOME TAX
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION
Account No: 52

Dear Sir or Madam:

The above new account(s) has been certified to the Ohio Attorney General's Office. Full payment of $ 1,625.36 must be received within 10 days. You may have other accounts with this office.

If you have not yet done so, payment can be made by one of the following methods:

1. The Internet at http://www.ohioattorneygeneral.gov/business/pay
2. Make a phone payment at **(888) 301-8885.**
3. Mail a certified check or money order made payable to the Ohio Treasurer of State with the account number written on the check, attach the voucher, mail to the address on the voucher.

Interest, fees, and penalty will apply. Collection efforts may include liens, attachments, foreclosures, garnishments, sheriff's sales, cancelled or denied liquor permits and your account being turned over to an attorney for litigation, when applicable.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter, please contact an Account Representative at **(888) 301-8885.** Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Darla Reardon

Darla Reardon
Chief, Revenue Recovery Services

LTTR41
Attachment

[redacted]

Revenue Recovery/Collections Enforcement
150 East Gay Street 21st FL • Columbus, Ohio 43215 • PHONE 614.466.8360 • FAX 614.752.9070 • www.ag.state.oh.us

APPENDIX "10"

RICHARD CORDRAY
OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Newsome, V D
Po Box 14731
Cincinnati OH 45250-0731

Personal banking checks may take up to 14 days to clear the banking deposit process. Any payment check, money order, cashiers check, wire transfer or other form of payment that you send to us for less than full payment due that is marked paid in full or contains a similar notation or that you otherwise tender in full satisfaction of a disputed amount must be sent to Ohio Attorney General, 150 East Gay Street 21st Floor, Columbus, OH 43215. We reserve all our rights regarding these payments (e.g. If it is determined there is no valid dispute or any such check or document is received at any other address, we may accept the check and you will still owe any remaining balance). We may refuse to accept any such payment by returning it to you, not cashing it or cashing and refunding it or destroying it. All other payments that you make should be sent to the regular Payment address shown on the voucher at the bottom of this letter.

If you are filing a dispute, payment, all correspondence and documents must be mailed within 10 days to Ohio Attorney General, 150 East Gay Street 21st Floor, Columbus, OH 43215. Interest, fees and penalty will continue to accrue until your account is paid in full or the dispute is resolved. Collection efforts will continue and may include liens, attachments, foreclosures, garnishments, sheriffs sales, cancelled or denied liquor permits and your account being turned over to an attorney for litigation, when applicable.

All other payments should be mailed to Ohio Attorney General, PO Box 89471, Cleveland, OH 44101-6471. It is your responsibility to use the correct mailing address for proper handling of your account.

PLEASE RETURN THIS PORTION WHEN SUBMITTING YOUR PAYMENT

Newsome, V D
Po Box 14731
Cincinnati OH 45250-0731

Amount Enclosed $_____
Amount Due:$ 1,625.36
Account No 52

12-27-10 9549452

Mail to:

Ohio Attorney General
PO Box 89471
Cleveland, OH 44101-6471

V D Newsome
December 27, 2010
Attachment

Creditor: DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION Account No: 52

PERIODS ASSESSED: 2005
REASON FOR ASMT: DELINQUENT - FAILURE TO FILE
CRN: 26 DRL: TAX: PERSONAL INCOME TAX
Taxpayer No (DRL No)
Assessment No (CRN No) 26
Certification Date: 12-20-10

TAX	PENALTY	ADDITIONAL CHARGE	ADDITIONAL PENALTY	TOTAL
790.54	500.00	0.00	0.00	1,290.54
FEES	INTEREST	CINTEREST	AGINTEREST	
178.79	57.05	98.98	0.00	334.82

IF PAID WITHIN 10 DAYS * TOTAL AMOUNT DUE **1,625.36**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
JACKSON DIVISION

JONI B. TYLER, et al. — **PLAINTIFFS**

VS. — **CIVIL ACTION 3:09cv338 TSL-FKB**

JPF1, LLC, et al. — **DEFENDANTS**

RECUSAL ORDER

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a), the undersigned is compelled to disqualify himself in the above styled and numbered proceedings for the reason that the law firm of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, counsel for the defendants, is on the recusal list of the undersigned United States district judge.

Accordingly, the undersigned does hereby recuse himself in this cause.

ORDERED this 25th day of March, 2010.

/s/Tom S. Lee
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX "11"

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
JACKSON DIVISION

JOYCE WALKER **PLAINTIFF**

VS. **CIVIL ACTION 3:09cv679 TSL-JCS**

CAPTAIN D'S LLC, et al. **DEFENDANTS**

RECUSAL ORDER

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a), the undersigned is compelled to disqualify himself in the above styled and numbered proceeding for the reason that the law firm of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, counsel for defendant Captain D's LLC, is on the recusal list of the undersigned United States District Judge.

Accordingly, the undersigned does hereby recuse himself in this cause.

ORDERED this 13th day of November, 2009.

/s/Tom S. Lee
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2000E, CLOSED

U. S. District Court
Eastern District of Louisiana (New Orleans)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:99-cv-03109-GTP

Newsome v. Entergy NO Inc, et al
Assigned to: Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr
Demand: $0
Case in other court: 00-30521
Cause: 42:2000 Job Discrimination (Race)

Date Filed: 11/03/1999
Date Terminated: 03/20/2002
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 442 Civil Rights: Jobs
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

Vogel Denise Newsome

represented by **Vogel Denise Newsome**
P. O. Box 31265
Jackson, MS 39286-1265
601-885-9536
PRO SE

Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett
Justice for All Law Center, LLC
Gretna Plaza Bldg.
1500 Lafayette St.
Suite 122
Gretna, LA 70053
504-368-1711
Email: jfalc@bellsouth.net
TERMINATED: 04/03/2002
LEAD ATTORNEY

V.

Defendant

Entergy New Orleans, Inc.
TERMINATED: 01/18/2000

represented by **Allyson Kessler Howie**
Entergy Services, Inc. (New Orleans)
639 Loyola Avenue
26th Floor
P. O. Box 61000
New Orleans, LA 70113
504-576-5849
Email: ahowie@entergy.com
TERMINATED: 01/18/2000
LEAD ATTORNEY

Renee Williams Masinter
Entergy Services, Inc. (New Orleans)
639 Loyola Avenue
26th Floor

APPENDIX "12"

P. O. Box 61000
New Orleans, LA 70113
504-576-2266
Email: AMASINT@entergy.com
TERMINATED: 01/18/2000

Defendant

Entergy Services Inc represented by **Allyson Kessler Howie**
(See above for address)
TERMINATED: 06/13/2000
LEAD ATTORNEY

Renee Williams Masinter
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Amelia Williams Koch
Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz (New Orleans)
201 St. Charles Ave.
Suite 3600
New Orleans, LA 70170
504-566-5200
Fax: 504-636-4000
Email: akoch@bakerdonelson.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jennifer F. Kogos
Jones Walker (New Orleans)
Place St. Charles
201 St. Charles Ave.
Suite 5100
New Orleans, LA 70170-5100
(504) 582-8000
Email: jkogos@joneswalker.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
11/03/1999	1	COMPLAINT (1 summons(es) issued) (daf) (Entered: 11/04/1999)
11/03/1999	2	ORDER granting pla leave to proceed in forma pauperis by Magistrate Sally Shushan (daf) (Entered: 11/04/1999)
11/03/1999		Automatic Referral (Utility Event) to Magistrate Sally Shushan (daf) (Entered: 11/04/1999)
11/10/1999	3	RETURN OF SERVICE of summons and complaint upon defendant Entergy NO Inc on 11/10/99 (cca) (Entered: 11/12/1999)

11/18/1999	4	Motion by defendant Entergy NO Inc and ORDER extending time through 12/20/99 to answer pla's original cmp by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 11/19/99 (nn) (Entered: 11/23/1999)
12/01/1999	5	Response by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to defendant's ex parte motion for extension of time within which to answer, plead, or otherwise respond [4-1] (tbl) (Entered: 12/02/1999)
12/09/1999	6	MINUTE ENTRY (12/8/99): MEMO & ORDER re: dft's mtn for ext of time to file an answer to pla's cmp by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 12/8/99 (gw) (Entered: 12/09/1999)
12/20/1999	7	ANSWER by defendant Entergy NO Inc to complaint by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome [1-1] (sup) (Entered: 12/23/1999)
12/28/1999	8	MINUTE ENTRY(12/27/99): A Preliminary Telephone Conference is set 2:00 1/11/00 before mag by Magistrate Sally Shushan (nn) (Entered: 12/28/1999)
12/29/1999	9	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER granting leave to file a response to dft's ans to their original cmp by Magistrate Sally Shushan Date Signed: 1/3/00 (nn) (Entered: 01/03/2000)
01/03/2000	10	Response by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome [7-1] to dft's answer to his cmp (nn) (Entered: 01/03/2000)
01/12/2000	11	MINUTE ENTRY(1/11/00): A telephone status conf was held this date; the parties advised that they do not wish to consent to trial before the mag; pla's deposition is scheduled for 3/15/00 at 9:30am by Magistrate Sally Shushan (nn) (Entered: 01/12/2000)
01/14/2000	12	NOTICE/ORDER that a preliminary conference is scheduled by telephone before courtroom deputy at 3:15 1/25/00 by Clerk (cbn) (Entered: 01/14/2000)
01/18/2000	13	Notice of Deposition by defendant Entergy NO Inc of Vogel Denise Newsome on 3/15/00. (gw) (Entered: 01/18/2000)
01/18/2000	14	NOTICE by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome of temporary change of address (nn) (Entered: 01/20/2000)
01/18/2000	15	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER amending his original cmp by substituting Entergy Services Inc in lieu of dft Entergy New Orleans Inc Magistrate Sally Shushan Date Signed: 1/20/00 - 1 sms issd. (nn) (Entered: 01/20/2000)
01/26/2000	16	ORDER ; Preliminary Conference held 3:15 1/25/00 ; Pre-Trial Conference set 4:30 7/19/00 ; Settlement conference set 10:20 6/15/00 ; jury trial set 8:30 8/14/00 by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: (cbn) (Entered: 01/26/2000)
02/07/2000	17	RETURN OF SERVICE of summons and complaint upon defendant Entergy Services Inc on 1/26/00 (nn) Modified on 04/28/2000 (Entered: 02/07/2000)
02/08/2000	18	ANSWER by defendant Entergy Services Inc to amended complaint by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome [1-1] (nn) Modified on 04/28/2000

		(Entered: 02/09/2000)
02/09/2000	21	PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED complaint [1-1]; no new parties added (nn) (Entered: 02/29/2000)
02/11/2000	19	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for appointment of counsel to be heard before mag (nn) (Entered: 02/16/2000)
02/16/2000	20	MINUTE ENTRY(2/15/00): setting hrg on pla's motion for appointment of counsel [19-1] at 8:30 1/22/00 by telephone by Magistrate Sally Shushan (nn) (Entered: 02/16/2000)
02/28/2000	23	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER extending time for pla to respond to disc by 3/13/00; pla's deposition is rescheduled for a mutually convenient date for pla and defense counsel by Magistrate Sally Shushan Date Signed: 2/29/00 (nn) (Entered: 03/01/2000)
02/29/2000	22	MINUTE ENTRY(2/22/00): A conf was held this date; ORDER denying pla's motion for appointment of counsel [19-1] by Magistrate Sally Shushan (nn) (Entered: 02/29/2000)
03/08/2000	24	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to appeal order entered denying pla's application for appointment of attorney to be heard before Judge Sear; no hrg date (tbl) (Entered: 03/13/2000)
04/11/2000	25	MINUTE ENTRY(4/10/00): [24-1] Hrg on pla's motion to appeal order entered denying pla's application for appointment of attorney is AFFIRMED by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 4/10/00 (nn) (Entered: 04/12/2000)
04/17/2000	26	NOTICE by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome of change of address (nn) (Entered: 04/17/2000)
04/17/2000	27	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to stay execution of judgment of order denying his mtn for appointment of counsel and ORDER denying same; there is no provision in federal law for such appointment by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 4/18/00 (nn) (Entered: 04/19/2000)
04/18/2000	28	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER granting his request for information from Mag Shushan by Magistrate Sally Shushan Date Signed: 4/18/00 (nn) (Entered: 04/19/2000)
04/25/2000	29	Notice of appeal by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome from Dist. Court decision of 4/10/00 and 4/18/00 [27-1] [25-1] (nn) (Entered: 04/26/2000)
04/25/2000	30	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER granting leave to appeal in forma pauperis by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 4/16/00 (nn) (Entered: 04/27/2000)
05/02/2000	31	MOTION by defendant Entergy Services Inc to compel disc referred to Magistrate Sally Shushan to be heard before mag at 9:00 5/17/00 (nn) (Entered: 05/03/2000)
05/08/2000	32	Memo in opposition by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to motion to compel disc [31-1] filed by defendant Entergy Services Inc. (sek) (Entered: 05/08/2000)

05/12/2000		Record on Appeal sent to Circuit Court [29-1] (nn) (Entered: 05/15/2000)
05/12/2000		Notification by Circuit Court of Appellate Docket Number [29-1] 00-30521 (nn) (Entered: 05/15/2000)
05/15/2000	33	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for summary judgment referred to Magistrate Sally Shushan to be heard before mag at 9:00 5/31/00 (nn) (Entered: 05/15/2000)
05/16/2000	34	MINUTE ENTRY(5/16/00): granting dft Entergy Services' motion to compel disc [31-1] by Magistrate Sally Shushan (nn) (Entered: 05/16/2000)
05/17/2000	35	Notice of Deposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc of Vogel Denise Newsome on 6/1/00 (nn) (Entered: 05/18/2000)
05/19/2000	36	Plaintff's objections to Mag's granted motion to defendant to compel (cbn) (Entered: 05/22/2000)
05/19/2000	37	Witness and exhibit list submitted by defendant Entergy Services Inc (cbn) (Entered: 05/23/2000)
05/22/2000	38	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for protective order and staying of taking of depo to be heard before Mag Judge Shushan at 9:00 6/7/00 (pck) (Entered: 05/23/2000)
05/22/2000	39	Response by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome the 5/19/00 filing of dft's wit & exh [37-1] list (pck) (Entered: 05/23/2000)
05/23/2000	40	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion for summary judgment [33-1] filed by defendant Entergy Services Inc (cbn) (Entered: 05/24/2000)
05/30/2000	41	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER granting leave to file their response to dft's memo in opp to their mtn for summary judgment by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 6/1/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/02/2000)
06/01/2000	42	Reply by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to dft's response to their motion for summary judgment [33-1] (nn) (Entered: 06/02/2000)
06/07/2000	43	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion for protective order and staying of taking of depo [38-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (cbn) (Entered: 06/08/2000)
06/09/2000	44	MINUTE ENTRY (6/8/00): ORDERED that pla's motion for protective order staying the taking of her depo [38-1] is denied; Pla is to submit for her depo w/in 20 days of entry of this order at a time & place agreed to with counsel for Entergy by Magistrate Sally Shushan (gw) (Entered: 06/09/2000)
06/09/2000	45	MINUTE ENTRY(6/9/00): ORDER referring to Magistrate Sally Shushan the motion for summary judgment [33-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome by Judge Morey L. Sear (nn) (Entered: 06/12/2000)
06/12/2000	46	Objections by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to Mag's order denying pla's mtn for protective order & staying of taking of deposition [44-1] (nn) (Entered: 06/12/2000)

06/12/2000	47	MINUTE ENTRY(6/12/00): Status conference set 10:20 6/15/00 is continued to be reset pending resolution of pla's mtn for summary judgment by Judge Morey L. Sear (nn) (Entered: 06/13/2000)
06/13/2000	48	Motion by defendant Entergy Services Inc and ORDER withdrawing attorney Allyson Kessler Howie and substituting attorneys Amelia Williams Koch, Jennifer A. Faroldi for same by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 6/14/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/15/2000)
06/19/2000	49	Report and Recommendation: It is recommended that pla's mtn for summary judgment be denied by Magistrate Sally Shushan Date of Mailing: 6/20/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/20/2000)
06/19/2000	50	Motion by defendant Entergy Services Inc to extend pre-trial mtn & disc deadlines and ORDER denying same as ex-parte by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 6/20/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/21/2000)
06/21/2000	51	Notice of Deposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc of Vogel Denise Newsome on 6/28/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/21/2000)
06/21/2000	52	Motion by defendant Entergy Services Inc and ORDER granting their mtn to supplement their mtn to ext pre-trial mtn & disc deadlines, extending the deadlines to 7/31/00 by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 6/22/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/23/2000)
06/23/2000	53	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for Objection to Findings/Report and Recommendation to be heard before Judge Sear at 9:15 7/19/00 (ck) (Entered: 06/26/2000)
06/26/2000	54	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to stay execution of judgment pending appeal to be heard before judge at 9:15 7/19/00 (nn) Modified on 07/20/2000 (Entered: 06/27/2000)
06/26/2000	55	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to disqualify Mag Shushan where she is bias or prejudice toward a party to be heard before judge at 9:15 7/19/00 (nn) (Entered: 06/27/2000)
07/03/2000	56	MOTION by defendant Entergy Services Inc for summary judgment to be heard before judge at 9:15 7/19/00 (jd) (Entered: 07/03/2000)
07/05/2000	57	Memo in opposition by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to motion for summary judgment [56-1] filed by defendant Entergy Services Inc (plr) (Entered: 07/05/2000)
07/05/2000	58	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to Objections to Findings/Report and Recommendation [53-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (nn) (Entered: 07/06/2000)
07/05/2000	59	Motion by defendant Entergy Services Inc and ORDER to cont the Pre-Trial Conference scheduled for 7/19/00 is granted by Judge A. J. McNamara Date Signed: 7/10/00 (gw) (Entered: 07/11/2000)
07/11/2000	60	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion to stay execution of judgment pending apeal [54-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise

		Newsome (cbn) (Entered: 07/12/2000)
07/11/2000	61	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion to disqualify Mag Shushan where she is bias or prejudice toward a party [55-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (cbn) (Entered: 07/12/2000)
07/12/2000	62	Motion by pla Vogel Denise Newsome & ORDER for leave to file resp to dft's opp to pla's petn to stay execution of jgm pending appeal by Judge Morey L. Sear (ijg) (Entered: 07/18/2000)
07/18/2000	63	Resp by pla Vogel Denise Newsome to dft's opp to pla's motion to stay execution of judgment pending appeal [54-1] (ijg) (Entered: 07/18/2000)
07/19/2000	64	MINUTE ENTRY (7/17/00): ORDERED that pla's motion to stay execution of judgment pending appeal of the denial of appointment of counsel [54-1] is granted by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 7/18/00 (gw) (Entered: 07/20/2000)
08/03/2000		Record on appeal returned from U.S. Court of Appeals [0-0] (nn) (Entered: 08/04/2000)
08/04/2000	65	Judgment from Court of Appeals remanding the matter back to District Court [29-1]; the district court's order denying appointment of trial counsel is Vacated; pla's mtn for appointment of appellate counsel is denied (JOLLY, DAVIS & BENAVIDES) Issued as mandate on 8/3/00 (nn) Modified on 08/04/2000 (Entered: 08/04/2000)
08/29/2000	66	MINUTE ENTRY (8/29/00) Hearing set 9/14/00 at 2:00 pm to determine whether pla Vogel Denise Newsome should be granted an atty to represent her in this litigation by Judge Morey L. Sear (gw) (Entered: 08/30/2000)
09/06/2000	67	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to appointment of counsel for plaintiff (cbn) (Entered: 09/08/2000)
09/14/2000	68	SMOOTH MINUTES: Reported/Recorded by Vicky Hollard; Hrg to determine whether pla should be granted an attorney to represent her in this litigation was submitted this date by Judge Morey L. Sear (nn) (Entered: 09/15/2000)
09/26/2000	69	MINUTE ENTRY (9/25/00) MEMO & ORDER: ORDERED that pla's application for appointment of trial counsel is denied by Judge Morey L. Sear (gw) Modified on 09/27/2000 (Entered: 09/27/2000)
09/29/2000	72	Petition by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to stay execution of judgment of order denying pla's mtn for appointment of counsel (nn) (Entered: 10/24/2000)
10/11/2000	70	MINUTE ENTRY (10/10/00) ORDERED that the hearing of 9/14/00 be transcribed & certified as true & correct & returned to the judge by 10/25/00 by Judge Morey L. Sear Date Signed: 10/10/00 (nn) (Entered: 10/11/2000)
10/18/2000	71	Transcript of hearing to determine whether pla should be granted an atty to represent her held 9/14/00 before Judge Sear (nn) (Entered: 10/19/2000)
10/24/2000	73	MINUTE ENTRY (10/24/00) denying pla's mtn for reconsideration of the

		m.e. of 9/26/00 [72-1] by Judge Morey L. Sear (nn) (Entered: 10/24/2000)
10/25/2000	74	NOTICE case reallotted effective November 1, 2000, to Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. by Clerk (nn) (Entered: 10/26/2000)
10/30/2000	75	Notice of appeal by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome from Dist. Court [73-1] minute entry entered 10/24/00, [69-1] minute entry entered on 9/26/00 (rg) (Entered: 10/31/2000)
10/31/2000	76	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for leave to appeal in forma pauperis & UNSIGNED ORDER. (gw) (Entered: 11/03/2000)
11/03/2000	77	ORDERED that in accordance with Rule 7201E, referring to Magistrate Sally Shushan the motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis [76-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 11/1/00 (gw) Modified on 11/28/2000 (Entered: 11/03/2000)
11/09/2000	78	MINUTE ENTRY (11/9/00) Re pla's mtn to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, pla to provide addl info provided in Form 4 of the Fed Rules of Appellate Procedure w/in 10 days of the date of this order; by Magistrate Sally Shushan (rg) (Entered: 11/13/2000)
11/20/2000	79	Response by defendant Entergy NO Inc to [78-1] the Court's 11/9/00 minute entry (rg) (Entered: 11/21/2000)
11/28/2000	80	MINUTE ENTRY (11/28/00) Pla's motion to disqualify Mag Shushan where she is bias or prejudice toward a party is DENIED [55-1]. Pla's mtn to appeal in forma pauperis is GRANTED; by Magistrate Sally Shushan (rg) (Entered: 11/29/2000)
12/06/2000		Record on Appeal sent to Circuit Court [75-1] USCA Number: 00-31299 (rg) (Entered: 12/11/2000)
12/07/2000	81	NOTICE/ORDER that a preliminary conference is scheduled by telephone before courtroom deputy at 3:00 12/14/00 by Clerk (rew) (Entered: 12/07/2000)
12/18/2000	82	ORDER: ORDERED that the Clerk close case for statistical purposes; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 12/14/00 (CASE CLOSED) (rg) (Entered: 12/19/2000)
12/19/2000	83	NOTICE by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome of change of address (rg) (Entered: 12/19/2000)
01/30/2001	84	ORDER from Court of Appeals: Pla's mtn for appointment of counsel for appeal is DENIED; (Clerk USCA) (rg) (Entered: 01/31/2001)
05/29/2001	85	Judgment from Court of Appeals affirming the decision of the District Court [75-1]; (HIGGINBOTHAM, WIENER, BARKSDALE) Issued as mandate on 5/29/01 (dw) (Entered: 06/01/2001)
05/29/2001		Record on appeal returned from U.S. Court of Appeals [0-0] (dw) (Entered: 06/01/2001)
10/15/2001		LETTER from U.S. Supreme Court regarding denial of Writ of Certiorari as

		to plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (rg) (Entered: 10/22/2001)
10/24/2001	86	Motion by defendant Entergy Services Inc and ORDER to reopen case; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 10/25/01 (rg) (Entered: 10/26/2001)
10/30/2001	87	Renotice of Hearing by defendant Entergy Services Inc setting its motion for summary judgment [56-1] at 10:00 11/21/01 (rg) (Entered: 10/31/2001)
11/13/2001	88	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER re- setting dft's motion for summary judgment [56-1] to 12/19/01 by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 11/14/01 (ck) (Entered: 11/19/2001)
11/13/2001	89	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER that the name of attorney Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett be entered as counsel of record for same by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 11/14/01 (dw) (Entered: 11/19/2001)
12/10/2001	90	Memo in opposition by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to motion for summary judgment [56-1] filed by defendant Entergy Services Inc (rg) (Entered: 12/11/2001)
03/20/2002	91	ORDER & REASONS: ORDERED that dft Entergy's motion for summary judgment is GRANTED pursuant to Rule 56 of the FRCP; [56-1] by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 3/18/02 (rg) (Entered: 03/20/2002)
03/20/2002	92	JUDGMENT: ORDERED that there be jgm in favor of dft Entergy New Orleans, Inc. and agst the pla Vogel Newsome, dismissing pla's claims w/prej; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date signed: 3/18/02 (CASE CLOSED) (rg) (Entered: 03/20/2002)
04/01/2002	93	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm; mtn to amd jgm & mtn to set aside jgm to be heard before Judge Porteous at 10:00 4/24/02 (rg) Modified on 04/16/2002 (Entered: 04/03/2002)
04/03/2002	94	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER withdrawing attorney Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett for Vogel Denise Newsome; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date Signed: 4/8/02 (rg) (Entered: 04/09/2002)
04/10/2002	95	Memorandum by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome in opposition to [94-1] the motion & order granting the withdrawal of attorney Michelle Ebony Scott-Bennett for Vogel Denise Newsome (rg) (Entered: 04/11/2002)
04/16/2002	96	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm; mtn to amd jgm & mtn to set aside jgm [93-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome & response to pla's response to mtn to w/draw filed by atty Michelle Scott-Bennett (rg) Modified on 04/17/2002 (Entered: 04/17/2002)
05/06/2002	97	ORDER & REASONS: ORDERED that pla's motion to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm; mtn to amd jgm & mtn to set aside jgm is DENIED; [93-1]; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. (rg) (Entered: 05/06/2002)
05/13/2002	98	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for reconsideration of the Court's denial of pla's mtn to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm, mtn to amd

		jgm; and mtn to set aside jgm to be heard before Judge Porteous at 10:00 6/5/02 (rg) (Entered: 05/17/2002)
05/20/2002	99	Memo in opposition by defendant Entergy Services Inc to motion for reconsideration of the Court's denial of pla's mtn to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm, mtn to amd jgm; and mtn to set aside jgm [98-1] filed by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (rg) (Entered: 05/20/2002)
06/11/2002	100	ORDER & REASONS: ORDERED that pla's motion for reconsideration of the Court's denial of pla's mtn to stay proceedings to enforce a jgm, mtn to amd jgm; and mtn to set aside jgm is DENIED. [98-1] Pla Vogel Newsome is to file no further pleadings in this Court, as set forth in this order. Pla instructed to seek further relief w/the USCA; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. (rg) (Entered: 06/11/2002)
07/10/2002	101	Notice of appeal by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome from Dist. Court [100-1] order entered on 6/11/02, [97-1] order entered on 5/6/02, [92-2] judgment entered on 3/20/02 (rg) (Entered: 07/11/2002)
07/10/2002	103	MOTION by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome for leave to appeal in forma pauperis ; no ntc of hrg. (rg) (Entered: 07/24/2002)
07/18/2002	102	AMENDED JUDGMENT: The Court's jgm signed 3/18/02, doc #92, is amended: ORDERED that there be jgm in favor of dft Entergy Services, Inc., and agst pla Vogel Newsome, dismissing pla's claims w/prej; in all other respects the jgm signed 3/18/02 remains unchanged; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. Date signed: 7/17/02 (rg) (Entered: 07/18/2002)
07/23/2002	104	Motion by plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome and ORDER for leave to appeal in forma pauperis; by Judge G. T. Porteous Jr. (rg) (Entered: 07/24/2002)
07/24/2002		Record on Appeal sent to Circuit Court [101-1] USCA Number: 02-30705 (rg) (Entered: 07/25/2002)
01/17/2003		Record on appeal returned from U.S. Court of Appeals [0-0] (rg) (Entered: 01/21/2003)
01/17/2003	105	ORDER from Court of Appeals: the mtn of appellee to dism the appeal for lack of juris is granted; the mtn of appellant to strike or deny appellee's mtn to dism the appeal for lack of juris is denied; the mtns of appellant for sanctions agst appellee are denied; [101-1] (BARKSDALE, DEMOSS, BENAVIDES) (rg) (Entered: 01/21/2003)
10/21/2003		LETTER from U.S. Supreme Court denying Writ of Certiorari as to plaintiff Vogel Denise Newsome (lg) (Entered: 10/23/2003)

BAKER DONELSON
BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC

Commission on Civil Rights Appointment

Bradley S. Clanton

May 10, 2007

(Jackson, MS/May 10, 2007) Bradley S. Clanton, of the law firm of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, has been appointed by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (USCCR) to serve as Chairman of its Mississippi Advisory Committee.

The Committee assists the USCCR with its fact-finding, investigative and information dissemination activities. The functions of the USCCR include investigating complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices; studying and collecting information relating to discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; appraising federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin, or in the administration of justice; serving as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws; submitting reports, findings and recommendations to the President and Congress; and issuing public service announcements to discourage discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Clanton, a shareholder in Baker Donelson's Jackson and Washington, D.C. offices, concentrates his practice in government litigation, securities and other fraud investigations, and litigation, election law and appeals. His appellate practice has included matters before the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Courts of Appeals, the Mississippi Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, and various other state appellate courts. His internal investigations and government litigation practice has included matters related to Securities and Exchange Commission investigations, health care fraud investigations, federal campaign finance investigations, and state and federal securities fraud class action litigation and arbitration proceedings. Previously, Mr. Clanton served as Chief Counsel to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, where his responsibilities included advising the Chairman and Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee on legislation and Congressional oversight implicating civil and constitutional rights, Congressional authority, separation of powers, proposed constitutional amendments and oversight of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

News Contact:

Johanna Burkett
901.577.2201

Related Practices

White Collar Crime and Government Investigations

Offices

Jackson

EXPAND YOUR EXPECTATIONS

APPENDIX "13"

BAKER DONELSON
BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC

Commission on Civil Rights Appointment

Bradley S. Clanton

May 10, 2007

(Jackson, MS/May 10, 2007) Bradley S. Clanton, of the law firm of Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC, has been appointed by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (USCCR) to serve as Chairman of its Mississippi Advisory Committee.

The Committee assists the USCCR with its fact-finding, investigative and information dissemination activities. The functions of the USCCR include investigating complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices; studying and collecting information relating to discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; appraising federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin, or in the administration of justice; serving as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws; submitting reports, findings and recommendations to the President and Congress; and issuing public service announcements to discourage discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Clanton, a shareholder in Baker Donelson's Jackson and Washington, D.C. offices, concentrates his practice in government litigation, securities and other fraud investigations, and litigation, election law and appeals. His appellate practice has included matters before the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Courts of Appeals, the Mississippi Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, and various other state appellate courts. His internal investigations and government litigation practice has included matters related to Securities and Exchange Commission investigations, health care fraud investigations, federal campaign finance investigations, and state and federal securities fraud class action litigation and arbitration proceedings. Previously, Mr. Clanton served as Chief Counsel to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, where his responsibilities included advising the Chairman and Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee on legislation and Congressional oversight implicating civil and constitutional rights, Congressional authority, separation of powers, proposed constitutional amendments and oversight of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

News Contact:

Johanna Burkett
901.577.2201

Related Practices

White Collar Crime and Government Investigations

Offices

Jackson

EXPAND YOUR EXPECTATIONS

HAMILTON COUNTY CLERK OF COURTS
C A S E C O S T B I L L I N G
CASE NUMBER = A 0901302

TODAY'S DATE: 12/20/2010 Page 1
TODAY'S TIME: 07:48 CMSR5153

****
T H I S I S A B I L L I N G
****

YOU ARE LIABLE FOR THE ABOVE COSTS. WILL YOU KINDLY GIVE THIS YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION AND OBLIGE. ANY ERRORS SHOULD BE REPORTED AT ONCE.

BRING THIS STATEMENT WITH YOU
OR RETURN WHEN REMITTING BY MAIL.

YOURS VERY TRULY,

PATRICIA M. CLANCY,

CLERK OF COURTS

CLERK OF COURTS
1000 MAIN ST. ROOM 315
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
ATTN: COST DESK
PHONE: (513)946-5667

*PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT A JUDGMENT LIEN WILL BE FILED
*AGAINST YOU AND SENT TO THE PROSECUTOR'S
*OFFICE FOR COLLECTION IF THIS BILL IS NOT PAID *

Please Pay This Amount ===> 4,440.00

A 0901302
DENISE V NEWSOME
PO BOX 14731
CINCINNATI OH 45250

APPENDIX "14"

CASE NUMBER : A 0901302 LAST ACTIVITY DATE: 11/18/2010

STOR ALL ALFRED LLC vs. DENISE V NEWSOME FILING DATE: 02/09/2009

FILING : H732 BEYOND JURISDICTION- OC- TAXED IN COSTS

CURRENT JUDGE : 206 JOHN ANDREW WEST ASSIGN DATE: 02/11/2009
PREVIOUS JUDGE :

DISPOSITION: 3 DISMISSAL IMAGE: DATE:11/08/2010

NOTE :

OF NOTIFICATIONS : 4 TOTAL APPLIED COSTS: 00.00
ARBITRATION : COST APPLICATION DATE :
CONSOLIDATED : LAST BILLING DATE :
GARNISHMENT : DEPOSIT MOTION FLAG : N

P A R T Y R E F E R E N C E

STATUS DATE	PARTY NBR	PARTY NAME ADDRESS	ATTORNEY NUMBER/NAME ADDRESS
A 02-09-2009	D -1	DENISE V NEWSOME PO BOX 14731 CINCINNATI OH 45250	Z9997 PRO SE
A 02-09-2009	P -1	STOR-ALL ALFRED L L C 1109 ALFRED STREET CINCINNATI OH 45214	55701 DAVID MERANUS 2900 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI OH 45202 66536 MICHAEL E LIVELY 2368 VICTORY PARKWAY STE 200 CINCINNATI OH 45206 83756 PATRICK B HEALY 2368 VICTORY PARKWAY SUITE 20 CINCINNATI OH 45206

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
91185439	F	BILL	12-20-2010		BILLED: 4440.00 DENISE V NEWSOME		
90837492	D	FF	11-18-2010		PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO NEWSOME'S OPPOSITION/OBJECTION TO NOVEMBER 8,2010, ENTRY	4.00	N
90831533	F	BILL	11-18-2010		BILLED: 4440.00 DENISE V NEWSOME		
90813309	D	FF	11-16-2010		REQUEST FOR STATUS OF: MOTION TO STAY; EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENLARGMENT OF TIME AND OTHER RELIEF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO CORRECT THE LEGAL WRONGS/INJUSTICES REPORTED HEREIN AND REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION		

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
90802756	D	FF	11-16-2010		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED IN THIS ACTION		
90740188	D	NS	11-10-2010		NOTICE OF APPEALABLE JUDGMENT SENT BY ORDINARY MAIL TO ALL PARTIES REQUIRED BY LAW.		
90734114	D	NC	11-08-2010		NOTIFICATION COST.	8.00	N
90734110	D	KDP	11-08-2010		ENTRY	3.00	N
90704308	D	FXN	11-08-2010		PLAINTIFF NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND RULE 11 SANCTIONS FILED OCTOBER 6, 2009	2.00	N
90364271	D	FXM	10-12-2010		EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY; EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME AND OTHER RELIEF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO CORRECT THE LEGAL WRONGS/INJUSTICES REPORTED HEREIN	2,188.00	N
90198569	D	FN	9-29-2010		NOTICE OF NONATTENDANCE OF DEFENDANT DENISE NEWSOME	18.00	N
89788994	D	FF	8-27-2010		JUDGMENT ENTRY ON DEFENDANT'S 8/11/10 MOTION FOR FINAL ENTRY AND STAY	2.00	N
89670966	D	EJE	8-23-2010		JUDGMENT ENTRY ON DEFENDANTS 7/27/10 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION	6.00	N
89598750	D	FF	8-13-2010		NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO FILE EMERGENCY WRIT OF CERTIORARI WITH THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT; MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS-REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT/ISSUANCE OF MANDATE AS WELL AS STAY OFPROCEEDINGS SHOULD COURT INSIST ON ALLOWING AUGUST 2,2010 JUDGMENT ENTRY TO STAND	61.00	N
89297915	D	FM	7-27-2010		MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION	84.00	N
89225869	D	FF	7-20-2010		VIA HAND DELIVERY	15.00	N
89217105	D	FF	7-20-2010		DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO NEWSOME'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OUT OF TIME SERVED JULY 10,2010	9.00	N
89189704	D	EF	7-19-2010		JOURNAL ENTRY	3.00	N
89189561	D	FF	7-15-2010		STOR ALL LLCS MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITON TO NEWSOMES MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OUT OF TIME SERVED 071010	3.00	N
89189532	D	FF	7-15-2010		STOR ALL ALFRED LLCS SECOND SUPPLEMEBTAL MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR ITS MOTION FOR ATTY FEES AND RULE 11 SANCTIONS ORIGINALLY ENTERED 100609	5.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
89131221	D	FAFF	7-15-2010		AFFIDAVIT	61.00	N
89081681	D	FXM	7-12-2010		DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OUT OF TIME MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING JUNE 7 2010 ORDER LIFTING STAY ENTERED APRIL 08 2009 AND ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT	83.00	N
89080620	D	FXN	7-12-2010		DEFENDANTS NOTICE OF NONATTENDENCE AND DEFENDANTS NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE PLTF STOR ALL ALFRED LLCS 12B6 MOTION TO DISMISS AND OR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANT NEWSOMES COUNTERCLAIM WITH AFFIDAVITS	30.00	N
88729249	D	FN	6-09-2010		NOTICE OF NONATTENDANCE OF DEFENDANT DENISE NEWSOME	5.00	N
88620798	D	FAFF	6-01-2010		AFFIDAVIT OF DISQUALIFICATION OF DEFENDANT V. DENISE NEWSOME	22.00	N
88610634	D	EORD	6-07-2010		ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT	3.00	N
88610612	D	EORD	6-07-2010		ORDER LIFTING STAY ENTERED APRIL 28, 2009	3.00	N
86535238	D	FF	12-30-2009		DEFENDANTS NOTIFICATION TO COURTS OF FILING OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT WITH THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION REGARDING WRIT OF PROHIBITION MATTER	12.00	N
85798374	D	FDEF	11-02-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE/OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ATTY FEES AND/OR RUL E11 SANCTIONS ORGINALLY ENTERED OCT 6 2009-HEARING REQUESTED; AND REQUESTED FOR SANCTIONS OF/AGAINST STOR-ALL COUNSEL	33.00	N
85783825	D	FXN	11-02-2009		DEFENDANTS NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR ATTY FEES AND OR RULE 11 SANCTIONS ORIGINALLY ENTERED 100609	4.00	N
85659163	D	FF	10-20-2009		PLAINTIFFS SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR ATTY FEES AND OR RULE 11 SANCTIONS ORIGINALLY ENTERED OCT 6 2009	4.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
85628620	D	FF	10-19-2009		DEFENDANT'S REBUTTAL TO PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS/SUMMARY JUDGMENT (SIC) AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT (SERVED OCTOBER 1, 2009); MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AN/OR RULE 11 SANCTIONS AND HEARING REQUESTS; REQUEST FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS,FEES COSTS PURSUANT TO OHIO REVISED CODE-2323.51,OHIO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 56G AND STOR-ALL'S COUNSEL BE FOUND IN CONTEMPT OF COURT. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED IN THIS ACTION.	127.00	N
85444426	D	FF	10-06-2009		PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS/SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT (SERVED OCTOBER 1, 2009); MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND/OR RULE 11 SANCTIONS AND HEARING REQUEST	15.00	N
85410447	D	FM	10-05-2009		MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC'S 12(B)(6) MOTION TO DISMISS AND/OR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANT NEWSOME'S COUNTERCLAIM WITH AFFIDFAVITS OF LESLIE SMART AND LORI WHITESIDE ATTACHED;REQUEST FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS; AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT - WITH SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT OF DENISE NEWSOME	43.00	N
85404022	D	FF	10-05-2009		DEFGENDANT'S NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC'S 12 (B)(6) MOTION TO DISMISS AND/OR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANT NEWSOME'S COUNTERCLAIM WITH AFFIDAVIT OF LESLIE SMART AND LORI WHITESIDE ATTACHED; REQUEST FOR RULE 11SANCTIONS; AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT	4.00	N
85403905	D	FF	10-05-2009		DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO BRING WRIT OF MANDAMUS PROHIBITION ACTION	11.00	N
85285562	D	FF	9-25-2009		DEFENDANTS REBUTTAL RESPONSE TO PLAITNIFF STOR ALL ALFRED LLCS MOTION TO LIFT THE COURT ORDERED STAY	10.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
85285382	D	FF	9-25-2009		DEFENDANTS REBUTTAL RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS STOR ALL ALFRED LLCS MOTION TO LIFT COURT ORDERED STAY	10.00	N
85270353	D	FXN	9-25-2009		PLAINTIFFS NOTICE OF SERVICE OF RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS DISCOVERY REQUESTS	2.00	N
85257218	D	FF	9-25-2009		DEFENDANT'S NOTIFICATION TO THE COURT(S) OF FILING OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT WITH THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION	240.00	N
85257174	D	FF	9-25-2009		DEFENDANT'S NOTIFICATION TO THE COURT(S) OF FILING OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT WITH THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION	240.00	N
85184755	D	FXM	9-21-2009		PLAINTIFF STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC'S 12(B)(6) MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANT NEWSOME'S COUNTERCLAIM WITH AFFIDAVITS OF LESLIE SMART AND LORI WHITESIDE ATTACHED	30.00	N
85136564	D	2L	9-21-2009		********* L I E N ********** 563.00 STOR-ALL ALFRED L L C		
85086287	D	FXM	9-14-2009		PLAINTIFF STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC'S MOTION TO LIFT THE COURT ORDERED STAY	4.00	N
84727994	D	2NOL	8-20-2009		****** NOTICE OF LIEN ****** 563.00 STOR-ALL ALFRED L L C		
84727993	F	BILL	8-20-2009		BILLED: 563.00 STOR-ALL ALFRED L L C		
84298214	F	BILL	7-20-2009		BILLED: 563.00 STOR-ALL ALFRED L L C		
84105672	D	FF	6-26-2009		DEFENDANT'S NOTIFICATION TO THE COURTS OF APPEAL PROCESS BEGUN TRANSFER/REMAND IS IN ERROR-COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ENGAGEMENT IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY	91.00	N
84079061	D	FF	6-26-2009		LETTER	1.00	N
83928067	D	JPR	6-18-2009		POSTAL RECEIPT RETURNED, COPY OF SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT DELIVERED TO ON / / , FILED ****NAME AND DATE NOT GIVEN/LEGIBLE****		
83879284	D	FT	6-18-2009		TRANSFERRED TO CLERK OF COURTS TRANSFERRED TO HAMILTON COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT		
83879253	F	BILL	6-18-2009		BILLED: 563.00 DAVID MERANUS		
83876071	D	MAIA	6-18-2009		CERTIFIED MAIL SERVICE ISSUED TO HAMILTON COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT [CERTIFIED MAIL NBR.: 7194 5168 6310 0454 6376]	7.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
83449199	D	FF	5-11-2009		PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MAY 5, 2009, REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND TO VACATE APRIL 29, ORDER GRANTING BIFURCATION AND REMAND; MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	6.00	N
83387827	D	FF	5-11-2009		DEFENDANT'S REBUTTAL/OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MAY 5, 2009, REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND TO VACATE APRIL 29, ORDER GRANTING BIFURCATION AND REMAND, MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	11.00	N
83387764	D	FF	5-11-2009		DEFENDANT'S REBUTTAL/OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S APRIL 24, 2009 REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND TO VACATE APRIL 17, 2009 ORDER; MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	11.00	N
83387724	D	FF	5-11-2009		LETTER FROM DENISE NEWSOME	1.00	N
83355780	D	FF	5-05-2009		LETTER FROM DENISE V NEWSOME	1.00	N
83297078	D	FDEF	5-05-2009		DEFENDANT'S REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE APRIL 29, 2009 ENTRY GRANTING BIFURCATION AND REMAND	67.00	N
83265274	D	FPLT	4-30-2009		PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS APRIL 24, 2009 REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND TO VACATE APRIL 17, 2009, ORDER; MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	4.00	N
83233560	D	EEG	4-29-2009		ENTRY GRANTING BIFURCATION AND REMAND	3.00	N
83197614	D	FXM	4-24-2009		DEFENDANTS REQUEST FOR MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW MOTION TO VACATE APRIL 17 2009 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR PARTIAL STAY	33.00	N
83179156	D	FF	4-24-2009		LETTER FROM DENISE NEWSOME	1.00	N
83175670	D	FXN	4-24-2009		DEFENDANTS NOTICE TO THIS COURT NOTIFYING OF SAID COURTS FAILURE TO PRIVIDE DEFENDANT WITH ITS RILINGS IN THIS LAWSUIT REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO BRING MANDAMUS ACTION TO COMPEL THIS COURT TO PERFORM MINISTERIAL DUTIES MANDATED BY LAW	4.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
83063784	D	EOG	4-17-2009		ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR PARTIAL STAY	3.00	N
82961701	D	FF	4-06-2009		STOR-ALL'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT NEWSOME'S MOTION TO STRIKE STOR-ALL'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT'S COUNTERCLAIM; MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	2.00	N
82793338	D	FF	3-26-2009		DEF REBUT/OPP TO PLAINTIFF MOT FOR PARTIAL STAY	12.00	N
82770890	D	FF	3-26-2009		LETTER FROM DENISE NEWSOME	2.00	N
82750321	D	FXM	3-26-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT'S COUNTERCLAIM; JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HEREON; REQUESTS FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS; AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT	71.00	N
82748827	D	FF	3-25-2009		PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND REQUEST FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS; MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	5.00	N
82707706	D	FF	3-20-2009		LETTER FROM DENISE NEWSOME	1.00	N
82690867	D	FXA	3-18-2009		PLAINTIFS ANSWER TO DEFENDANTS COUNTERCLAIM WITH JURY DEMAND	30.00	N
82681987	D	FXM	3-20-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE/RESTRAINING ORDER AGAINST DEFENDANT DENISE V. NEWSOME; REQUESTS FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS; AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED IN THIS ACTION)	66.00	N
82681871	D	FXM	3-20-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT OF AND AGAINST PLAINTIFF STOR-ALL ALFRED,LLC FOR FAILURE TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE PLEAD; AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT	42.00	N
82676158	D	FF	3-18-2009		PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S AMENDED REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2, 2009, ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS FILED MARCH 11, 2009	2.00	N
82648952	D	FXM	3-16-2009		PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR PARTIAL STAY	6.00	N
82618343	P	DEPJ	3-18-2009		JURY DEMAND DEPOSIT BY M & M	-270.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
82615678	D	FF	3-13-2009		PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S REQUEST /MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2.2009, ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL LAFRED LLC FOR LEAVE FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME FILED MARCH 10, 2009	2.00	N
82612667	D	FN	3-16-2009		NOTICE OF APPERANCE OF CO-COUNSEL	2.00	N
82610484	D	FXM	3-13-2009		PLAINTIFFS REPLY TO DEFENDANTS REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW MOTIN TO VACATE MARCH 2 2009 ENTRY GRANTING MOTIN OF STORE-ALL ALFRED LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS FILED MARCH 10 2009	4.00	N
82610464	D	FXM	3-13-2009		PLAINTIFFS MOTIN FOR PROTECTIVE/RESTRAINING ORDER AGAINST DEFENDAT DENISE V NEWSOME	7.00	N
82610136	D	FXM	3-12-2009		DEFENDANTS REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2 2009 ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STORE-ALL ALFRED LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILEMEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM BRIEF	17.00	N
82609753	D	FNFF	3-17-2009		NOTIFICATION FORM FILED.	1.00	N
82592332	D	FF	3-11-2009		NOTIFICATIN OF CLARIFICATION	2.00	N
82580443	D	FXM	3-11-2009		AMENDED DEFENANT'S REQUESST/MOTION FIR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2, 2009 ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME; AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM BRIEF	12.00	N
82534595	D	FF	3-10-2009		DEFENDANT'S REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2, 2009 ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME; AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM BRIEF	12.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
82534391	D	FF	3-10-2009		DEFENDANT'S REQUEST/MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW; MOTION TO VACATE MARCH 2,2009 ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS; AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM BRIEF	17.00	N
82530630	D	FN	3-09-2009		NOTICE OF APPERANCE AND SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL	2.00	N
82482198	D	FNFF	3-09-2009		NOTIFICATION FORM FILED.	1.00	N
82399213	D	EEG	3-02-2009		ENTRY GRANTING STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME	6.00	N
82399141	D	EEG	3-02-2009		ENTRY GRANTING MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	6.00	N
82396587	D	FF	2-26-2009		DEFENDANTS NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO STRIKE PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR 11 SANCTINS SUBMITTED BY ATTORNEYS DAVID MERANUS AND MOLLY G VANCE ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF AND REQUESTS FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	4.00	N
82347998	D	FXM	2-25-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS- SUBMITTED BY ATTORNEYS DAVID MERANUS AND MOLLY G. VANCE ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF; AND REQUEST FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	51.00	N
82322085	D	FF	2-25-2009		DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME	44.00	N
82282745	D	FNFF	2-18-2009		NOTIFICATION FORM FILED.	1.00	N
82273072	D	FM	2-19-2009		MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	2.00	N
82270513	D	FF	2-19-2009		MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	5.00	N
82249356	D	FM	2-18-2009		MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRED LLC FOR LEAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	2.00	N
82249057	D	FM	2-18-2009		MOTION OF STOR-ALL ALFRAD LLC FOR ELAVE TO FILE MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	2.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
82229450	D	FPLT	2-18-2009		PLAINTIFF'S STOR-ALL ALFRED, LLC'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	3.00	N
82228675	D	FDEF	2-18-2009		DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF MOTION TO STRIKE PLEADING (STATEMENTS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS) OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO BIFURCATE CLAIM AND REMAND TO MUNICIPAL COURT ; AND MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	3.00	N
82222055	D	FXM	2-18-2009		DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLEADING (STATEMENTS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS) OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO BIFURCATE CLAIM AND REMAND TO MUNICIPAL COURT; AND MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS	57.00	N
82187837	D	FM	2-17-2009		MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME	3.00	N
82184748	D	FXM	2-13-2009		PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO BIFURCATE CLAIM AND REMAND TO MUNICIPAL COURT	7.00	N
82174702		JPRE	2-17-2009		ELECTRONIC POSTAL RECEIPT RETURNED, COPY OF NOTICE OF TRANSFER DELIVERED TO DENISE V NEWSOME ON 02/12/09, FILED. [CERTIFIED MAIL NBR.: 7194 5168 6310 0431 5453]		
82131999		JPRE	2-17-2009		ELECTRONIC POSTAL RECEIPT RETURNED, COPY OF NOTICE OF TRANSFER DELIVERED TO DAVID MERANUS ON 02/11/09, FILED. [CERTIFIED MAIL NBR.: 7194 5168 6310 0431 4968]		
82118711		245	2-11-2009		JUDGE ASSIGNED CASE ROLLED TO WEST/JOHN/ANDREW PRIMARY		
82101994	D	MAIA	2-10-2009		CERTIFIED MAIL SERVICE ISSUED TO DENISE V NEWSOME [CERTIFIED MAIL NBR.: 7194 5168 6310 0431 5453]	7.00	N
82088187	D	2MCC	2-09-2009		*** MUNICIPAL COURT COSTS BY DEFENDANT	25.00	N
82088139	D	2MCC	2-09-2009		*** MUNICIPAL COURT COSTS BY PLAINTIFF	112.00	N
82088030	D	WXXX	2-09-2009		CERTIFIED MAIL SENT TO ATTY DAVID MERANUS #55701		
82087920	D	MAIA	2-10-2009		CERTIFIED MAIL SERVICE ISSUED TO DAVID MERANUS [CERTIFIED MAIL NBR.: 7194 5168 6310 0431 4968]	7.00	N
82084548	D	TRAN	2-09-2009		TRANSCRIPT OF ORIGINAL PAPERS FILED.	1.00	N
82084547	D	SPFT	2-09-2009		SPECIAL PROJECTS FEE PER ENTRY 2/1/02 IMAGE 147; M-0200002	50.00	N
82084546	D	POST	2-09-2009		POSTAGE: COST DESK	2.00	N
82084545	D	LAAT	2-09-2009		O.R.C. SECTION 2303.201	26.00	N

D O C K E T E N T R I E S

DOC NBR	ENT TYP	DOCK CODE	ENTRY DATE	IMAGE NUMBER	DOCKET DESCRIPTION/ DOCKET COMMENT	AMOUNT	A P
82084544	D	FCF	2-09-2009		CLASSIFICATION FORM FILED.	1.00	N
82084543	D	CMPT	2-09-2009		COURT MEDIATION PROGRAM FEE PER ENTRY 8/3/99 IMAGE 164; M-9900002.	25.00	N
82084542	D	CLRT	2-09-2009		COMPUTER LEGAL RESEARCH	3.00	N
82084541	D	CLKA	2-09-2009		CLERK FEE FOR EACH CAUSE	25.00	N
82084540	D	CCAT	2-09-2009		COURT AUTOMATION	6.00	N
82084539	D	C	2-09-2009		COURT INDEX: TAXED IN COST	14.00	N
82084538	P	TICF	2-09-2009		TAXED IN COSTS - FILING DAVID MERANUS	0.00	Y

Total Deposits :	270.00 CR
Total Costs :	4,469.00
Total Credits :	0.00
Total Money Out :	0.00
Unapplied Deposits :	270.00 CR
Unapplied Costs :	4,469.00

Account	Account Name	Amount	Amount Applied
1000-0131	CASE DEPOSIT (ISSUE) #1	270.00 CR	0.00
2000-0132	COURT INDEX	14.00	0.00
2000-0211	CLERK FEES	4,185.00	0.00
2000-0273	SPECIAL PROJECTS FUND	50.00	0.00
2000-0275	COURT MEDIATION PROGRAM	25.00	0.00
2000-0278	COMPUTERIZED LEGAL RESEARCH	3.00	0.00
2000-0279	COURT AUTOMATION	6.00	0.00
2000-0752	POSTAGE	23.00	0.00
2000-0804	O.R.C. SECTION 2303.201	26.00	0.00
2000-0998	SUNDRY	137.00	0.00
		4,199.00	0.00

Please Pay This Amount ===> 4,440.00

CNN.com

Senate removes federal judge in impeachment conviction

By **the CNN Wire Staff**
December 8, 2010 12:46 p.m. EST

Judge G. Thomas Porteous is "forever disqualified to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

(CNN) -- The U.S. Senate found Federal Judge G. Thomas Porteous of Louisiana guilty on four articles of impeachment on Wednesday, which will remove him from the federal bench.

He had been accused of accepting kick-backs and lying to the Senate and FBI.

The vote makes Porteous, 63, only the eighth federal judge in the nation's history to be impeached and convicted.

Porteous is also "forever disqualified to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States," Sen. Daniel Inouye said during Wednesday's Senate hearing.

APPENDIX "15"

CNN.com

The Senate adopted the motion barring Porteous from holding a future federal office by a vote of 94 to 2.

In March, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to impeach Porteous on corruption charges.

"Our investigation found that Judge Porteous participated in a pattern of corrupt conduct for years," U.S. Rep. Adam Schiff, D-California, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee Task Force on Judicial Impeachment.

In a statement at the time, Porteous' lawyer, Richard W. Westling, said the Justice Department had decided not to prosecute because it did not have credible evidence.

"Unfortunately, the House has decided to disregard the Justice Department's decision and to move forward with impeachment," he said. "As a result, we will now turn to the Senate to seek a full and fair hearing of all of the evidence."

Porteous, who turns 64 this year, was appointed to the federal bench in 1994. He has not worked as a judge since he was suspended with pay in the fall of 2008, Westling said.

The most recent previous impeachment of a federal judge by the House was last year.

Judge Samuel B. Kent of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas resigned after being impeached on charges of sexual assault, obstructing and impeding an official proceeding and making false and misleading statements, according to the website of the Federal Judicial Center.

Before then, Judge Walter L. Nixon of U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi was impeached in 1989 on charges of perjury before a federal grand jury. The Senate convicted him and removed him from office that year.