

**EXHIBIT**

**E**

No. 22-7648

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR, *Petitioner*

v.

James N. Hatten, et al, *Respondents*

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Prohibition  
To The United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

## **MOTION FOR REHEARING**

**William M. Windsor, Pro Se,**  
**and Founding Member of the American Association of Non-Lawyers**  
5013 S Louise Ave #1134  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108  
352-661-8472  
WindsorInSouthDakota@yahoo.com

## **MOTION FOR REHEARING**

Petitioner William M. Windsor (“Windsor” or “Petitioner”), Pro-Se, hereby files this Motion for Rehearing pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

1. From March 2006 to the present, federal judges have acted in a corrupt manner and have committed a variety of felonies to damage Windsor.

2. On May 15, 2023, a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Writ of Prohibition was filed with this Court by Pro-Se Windsor. [U.S. Supreme Court DOCKET – Case No. 22-7648.] The Factual Background and arguments therein are referenced and incorporated herein.

3. In June 2023, Jake called for Justice Clarence Thomas to say the Petition was docketed and would be considered by all nine of the justices. He explained that Windsor’s was one of about 180 to be considered from the 8,000 or so submitted. He was unaware of any Pro-Se party who ever had their request granted by the Supreme Court. Windsor found one in 1971.

4. This Court’s Docket later showed the Petition was to be considered in “Conference” on September 26, 2023. [U.S. Supreme Court DOCKET – Case No. 22-7648.]

5. On October 2, 2023, this Court's online Docket indicates that the Petition was denied. [U.S. Supreme Court DOCKET – Case No. 22-7648.]

6. Windsor has never received a letter. All the Clerk's Office would finally say by telephone is that a letter was sent with one word: DENIED.

### **ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITY**

7. Windsor seeks to have this Court rehear this Petition for substantial grounds not previously presented.

### **THE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAVE VIOLATED THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE IN DENYING THIS PETITION.**

8. The justices of The United States Supreme Court have violated their oaths of office in denying this Petition.

9. The Supreme Court website provides the oaths of office that are required: [<https://www.supremecourt.gov/about/oath/oathsofoffice.aspx>]

10. 5 U.S.C. § 3331 provides the oath that is now taken by all federal employees, including members of the Supreme Court:

11. As noted in Article VI, all federal officials must take an oath in support of the Constitution:

12. "...all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."

13. The Constitution does not provide the wording for this oath, leaving that to the determination of Congress. From 1789 until 1861, this oath was, "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States." During the 1860s, this oath was altered several times before Congress settled on the text used today, which is set out at 5 U. S. C. § 3331. This oath is now taken by all federal employees, other than the President:

"I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

14. The Judicial Oath, found at 28 U.S.C. § 453, is also taken by each justice of the Supreme Court.

15. The origin of the second oath is found in the Judiciary Act of 1789, which reads "the justices of the Supreme Court, and the district judges, before they proceed to execute the duties of their respective offices" to take a second oath or

affirmation. From 1789 to 1990, the original text used for this oath (1 Stat. 76 § 8)

was:

“I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear or affirm that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.”

15. In December 1990, the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 replaced the phrase “according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution” with “under the Constitution.” The revised Judicial Oath, found at 28 U. S. C. § 453, reads:

“I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_ under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.”

16. Upon occasion, appointees to the Supreme Court have taken a combined version of the two oaths, which reads:

“I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_ under the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well

and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

17. The questions presented to this Court in this Petition were:
  - I. Is a federal court order void when jurisdiction is never determined? If so, every order of the DISTRICT COURT and 11TH CIRCUIT are invalid, and this Court’s task is simple.
  - II. Does a federal court judge lack jurisdiction to place restrictions on the operation of state courts?
  - III. Is a federal court order placing restrictions on the operation of state courts a void order?
  - IV. Did the 11TH CIRCUIT err by denying appeals of William M. Windsor (“WINDSOR”) that incorporate the jurisdiction issue and the state court authority issue?
  - V. Did the DISTRICT COURT and the 11TH CIRCUIT err by denying In Forma Pauperis status to WINDSOR?
  - VI. Are there exceptional circumstances that require this Court to issue a Writ?
18. Extensive information was presented to this Court.
19. Windsor’s Petition was unopposed, so Windsor’s claims were uncontroverted. But the justices of The Supreme Court ignored it.
20. The oaths of office taken require each justice to “defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic” and “bear true faith and allegiance to the same....” The justices of The Supreme Court have failed to defend the Constitution against a domestic enemy – the federal

judges in Atlanta, Georgia. By refusing to address this Petition, the justices of The Supreme Court have allowed federal courts to operate corruptly and ignore all laws, rules, and facts. The justices of The Supreme Court are allowing federal judges to treat the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as if they are null and void. The justices of The Supreme Court have failed to defend the Constitution.

21. This error must be corrected by having this Court rehear the Petition. This Court has no choice but to defend the Constitution by granting the Petition.

**THE PURPORTED ORDER DENYING THE PETITION VIOLATES**  
**28 U.S.C. § 1691. IT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SEAL OF THE COURT**  
**OR THE SIGNATURE OF A CLERK**  
**WITH THE NECESSARY CREDENTIALS.**

22. The so-called order denying this Petition is a letter, not an order, and it does not bear the seal of the clerk.

23. 28 U.S.C. § 1691 requires: "All writs and process issuing from a court of the United States shall be under the seal of the court and signed by the clerk thereof." The Order is invalid, so the Petition must be reheard.

The word "process" at 28 U.S.C. 1691 means a court order. See *Middleton Paper Co. v. Rock River Paper Co.*, 19 F. 252 (C.C. W.D. Wisconsin 1884); *Taylor v. U.S.*, 45 F. 531 (C.C. E.D. Tennessee 1891); *U.S. v. Murphy*, 82 F. 893 (DCUS Delaware 1897); *Leas & McVitty v. Merriman*,



132 F. 510 (C.C. W.D. Virginia 1904); *U.S. v. Sharrock*, 276 F. 30 (DCUS Montana 1921); *In re Simon*, 297 F. 942, 34 ALR 1404 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1924); *Scanbe Mfg. Co. v. Tryon*, 400 F.2d 598 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1968); and *Miles v. Gussin*, 104 B.R. 553 (Bankruptcy D.C. 1989).

**THIS COURT DID NOT HAVE A QUORUM TO VOTE ON  
WINDSOR'S PETITION AS THE DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED  
TO BE MAINTAINED BY THIS COURT IS INCOMPLETE.**

24. Upon information and belief, the documentation required for justices is not complete.

25. Upon information and belief, required credentials documentation is not filed as required for the justices.

26. 5 U.S.C. § 2906 reads as follows:

The oath of office taken by an individual under section 3331 of this title shall be delivered by him to, and preserved by, the House of Congress, agency, or court to which the office pertains.

27. If the Supreme Court does not have the necessary credentials on file, these justices do not have the right to rule on any matters. If there was not a quorum, the "order" denying the Petition is invalid. Windsor demands to see the credentials that were on file.

28. Upon information and belief, the required credentials are missing for Scott S. Harris dba "Clerk of Court."

29. If this is correct, any “orders” signed by Mr. Harris are invalid as he did not have the legal credentials filed that are required.

**THIS COURT VIOLATED**  
**ARTICLE III SECTION 2 OF**  
**THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.**

30. Article III Section 2 of the Constitution provides: “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....”

31. This Court’s judicial power is dependent upon the Constitution, yet this Court ignored the Constitution in denying Windsor’s Petition.

32. Windsor submits that this Court has no authority or right to ignore claims of the violation of Constitutional rights that are presented to this Court. The Constitution makes it very clear that it and only it provides judicial power. Therefore, any court that knowingly allows violations of the Constitution has no power and is functioning without jurisdiction.

33. This Court must grant the petition and declare that Windsor’s Constitutional rights have been violated. Failure to do so must be considered a violation of the Constitution by the justices of this Court.

**THIS COURT IGNORED**  
**THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS**  
**THAT EXISTS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

34. Windsor believes Federal judges have turned the United States into a police state in which they wield tyrannical power, intentionally violating the Constitution, laws, rules, and their oath.

35. The most basic so-called “guarantees” of the Constitution have been stolen from us by corrupt federal judges. We might as well be living in a Communist country where we have been shocked to hear of the violation of the rights of the citizens. It has become just as bad in the United States when this is allowed to happen and no one will do anything about it.

36. The Supreme Court may be the only hope for anyone to do anything about this, and it is The Supreme Court’s primary legal obligation to ensure that the Constitution is not being violated by federal judges.

**THIS COURT VIOLATED ITS OWN LAW**  
**BY FAILING TO PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF ANY SORT**  
**IN THE “ORDER” DENYING THE PETITION.**

37. In 2009, this Court issued an order requiring federal courts to issue

orders with an explanation.

“...courts err in disposing of claims without explanation of any sort.”  
(*Corcoran v. Levenhagen*, 558 U.S. 1 (2009), (08-10495).)

38. This Court violated its own law by issuing a one-word decision.

39. This Court has an obligation to the citizens of the United States.

**THE JUSTICES OF THIS COURT AND ALL**  
**WHO READ THE PETITION HAVE A LEGAL OBLIGATION**  
**UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 4 TO REPORT FELONIES.**

40. 18 U.S.C. § 4 states that:

“Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.”

41. Windsor has provided proof of felonies to this Court. Therefore, each of the justices of The Supreme Court has a legal obligation to report these crimes to law enforcement authorities. Each of the clerks and all who were supposed to read the Petition have the same legal obligation. This Court must do as Windsor asked and refer this matter to a Grand Jury in Atlanta, Georgia.

42. Windsor asks the people receiving this Petition for Rehearing to report these crimes. If this is not done, Windsor intends to file charges against each of

the justices and the recipients for violation of 18 U.S.C. § 4, and a verified complaint pursuant to Bivens, RICO, and more.

**THIS COURT HAS AN OBLIGATION**  
**TO START CLEANING UP AMERICA**

43. If this Court is not aware that our judicial system is corrupt, shame on you. If this Court is aware that our judicial system is corrupt and has done nothing about it, shame on you.

44. The federal courts of Georgia and Florida are filled with corruption. Windsor presents the following arguments in first person:

45. I always knew there were problems with our legal system, but I thought it was just unscrupulous lawyers. I never dreamed that federal judges were corrupt and routinely commit crimes, but they do.

46. I have charged nine federal judges in Atlanta with corruption and dishonesty, and I now need to add to that list. From my personal experience, these judges ignore the law, ignore the facts, and commit criminal acts while hiding behind their judicial robes and the "judicial immunity" that the judges have given themselves over the years. These judges don't make mistakes; they do all of this intentionally.

47. I have discovered this is widespread in the federal judiciary in America. From my experiences here, the federal judges do whatever the heck they want to do. I do not have any proof that judges have been bribed, but the thought comes to mind. With Atlanta federal District Court Judge Orinda D. Evans, I have learned that she is evil. She has a reputation that she will twist the law and the facts to decide however she wants to decide. I have seen the darkest of her sides. She is truly an evil woman.

48. In the history of the United States, only nine federal judges have been impeached. Atlanta could top that in one fell swoop.

49. Judges are supposed to tell the truth at all times, but these judges have made false statements routinely. These were material false statements made under the judges' oath of office in a federal proceeding. These judges knew statements they made were false.

50. Judges are supposed to provide due process to the parties in their courts, but I have had just about every form of due process denied. I have not been allowed to present evidence, call witnesses, cross-examine witnesses, have an impartial judge, and much more. The latest outrage is that Judge Jeffrey L. Ashton issued an injunction against me that denies my right to represent myself and dismissed my personal injury case where I was hit by an 18-wheeler and

permanently disabled. This was done without notice or the opportunity to be heard.

51. These judges routinely ignored the facts and the law and even invented their own facts. These judges have made rulings that are absolutely contrary to the law.

52. I have four grandchildren. I drove Madison's carpool once a week for several years. She was unbelievably intelligent and worldly for a seven-year-old. As we drove home one day, she told me they were studying Martin Luther King. She asked me to tell her about those times, so I did. She asked me what I did to stop the prejudice and all the problems. I told her that I was never prejudiced, but I didn't really do anything. She asked if I had ever done anything that made a big difference in the world. I said, no, unfortunately not. She quickly assured me that she would make a difference in the world. I absolutely believe that is true. Well, I hope I can do something vitally important to every American with my efforts to expose corruption in the federal courts. We are all in trouble. Madison and I want to help.

53. I want to assure each of the justices of The United States Supreme Court that if you deny my Petition again, I will do everything possible to expose

you to the world. I will seek your impeachment. I will file a civil suit against you. I will file criminal charges against you, and I won't stop for as long as I live.

54. For Heaven's sake, do what is right. End the judicial corruption before it ends America.

### CONCLUSION

For all the reasons stated above, WINDSOR respectfully requests that this Court grant WILLIAM M. WINDSOR'S MOTION FOR REHEARING; inform WINDSOR of the vote of each Justice that purportedly DENIED his Petition; issue writs of mandamus and/or prohibition for the remedies requested in WILLIAM M. WINDSOR'S PETITION; order the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division to vacate all orders in *Windsor v. Hatten, et al*, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT; order that federal courts must abide by the Constitution and must not deny a Pro-Se party the right to represent himself or herself in legal proceedings; order the United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit to vacate all orders in response to Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT; order all Georgia federal courts to comply with the Georgia Constitution on applications for In Forma Pauperis; issue a Writ of Prohibition to prevent the exercise of unlawful jurisdiction by federal courts over state court matters with which it is not vested by law; order that required credentials documentation of each



Justice is provided to WINDSOR; establish a Supreme Court precedent that makes it clear federal courts have no jurisdiction over state courts; ask the House and Senate Judiciary Committees to investigate the federal judiciary in Georgia and Florida; remand this matter to a different circuit where Windsor's Constitutional rights might be honored; and grant all other relief this Court finds important and as justice requires.

Respectfully submitted on October 26, 2023,

/s/ William M. Windsor

**William M. Windsor**  
5013 S Louise Ave #1134  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108  
352-661-8472  
WindsorInSouthDakota@yahoo.com

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, William M. Windsor, do swear that on this date, October 26, 2023, I have served the enclosed MOTION on the DEFENDANTS in the above proceeding or their counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly

addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

**Solicitor General of the United States**

Room 5614, Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001.

**RYAN K. BUCHANAN – GABRIEL A. MENDEL  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY -- ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY**

600 United States Courthouse  
75 Ted Turner Drive, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Telephone: 404-581-6000 -- Facsimile: 404-581-6181  
Email: gabriel.mendel@usdoj.gov

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 26th day of October, 2023,

/s/ William M. Windsor

**William M. Windsor**  
5013 S Louise Ave #1134  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108  
352-661-8472  
WindsorInSouthDakota@yahoo.com