

FILED U.S.

06-50 JUL 10 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Mary E. Bonner Johnson,
Petitioner,

vs.

Richard W. Woodcock,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Paul E. Lacy
Counsel of Record
The Law Office of Paul E. Lacy, Ltd.
P.O. Box 767
Stillwater, MN 55982-0767
(651) 439-8090

Counsel for Petitioner

56

Questions Presented

1. Whether the Court erred in denying the existence of personal jurisdiction over Woodcock.
2. Whether the additional evidence should have been allowed while the case was still pending before the court of first impression, and no opinion had issued.
3. Whether the Court erred in denying the request to transfer the matter, if no personal jurisdiction was properly found to exist.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

06-52 JUL 12 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

MICHAEL SKAKEL,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ Of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of Connecticut**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

HUBERT J. SANTOS
HOPE C. SEELEY
SANTOS & SEELEY P.C.
51 RUSS STREET
HARTFORD, CT 06106
(860) 249-6548

THEODORE B. OLSON
Counsel of Record
DAVID DEBOLD
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-5306
(202) 955-8500

*Counsel for Petitioner
Michael Skakel*

52

QUESTION PRESENTED

In *Stogner v. California*, 539 U.S. 607 (2003), this Court held that a state law authorizing a prosecution that the passage of time had previously barred violates the Constitution's Ex Post Facto Clause. This Court's cases have held that the Due Process Clause prevents the judicial branch from achieving, through a legal interpretation both unexpected and indefensible by reference to the law previously expressed, that which the legislative branch may not achieve under the Ex Post Facto Clause. *Bowie v. City of Columbia*, 378 U.S. 347, 354 (1964); *Rogers v. Tennessee*, 532 U.S. 451, 461 (2001). In order to authorize a prosecution of petitioner, the Connecticut Supreme Court needed to overrule two of its prior unanimous decisions under which the limitations period had expired almost 20 years before the case was brought.

The question presented is whether a State violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment when its highest court unexpectedly overrules its own binding interpretation of one of its statutes in order to authorize a criminal prosecution that the passage of time had previously barred.

No. _____ 06-57 JUL 10 2006

In The OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of the United States

MR. JEFFREY F. JONES,

Petitioner,

v.

THE HONORABLE JANET R. BURNSIDE,
JUDGE,

and

THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. MOYER,
CHIEF JUSTICE,

Respondents.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The Supreme Court Of Ohio**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RICHARD G. JOHNSON
Counsel of Record

RICHARD G. JOHNSON CO., L.P.A.
220 Crittenden Court Building
955 West St. Clair Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44113-1210
216/696-1000

Attorney for the Petitioner

[dated: 7/10/06]

53

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

This is a judicial disqualification Case, which presents the substantive due process issue of whether a party to state court litigation is entitled to a fair and impartial judge – one who has not received significant campaign contributions from an opposing party. Here, the Trial Court received at least \$8,300 in campaign contributions from the Defendant Baker & Hostetler LLP, its Ohio PAC, and its partners, without disclosing the same to the Plaintiff in a multimillion dollar legal malpractice case (she refused to recuse herself, after the Plaintiff discovered this). The Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court, who refused to disqualify the Trial Court, and who refused to recuse himself from the proceedings, received at least \$26,900 from the same. As such, this Case also presents the procedural due process issue of whether a litigant in the Ohio Supreme Court is entitled to have a disqualification procedure to challenge justices thereof. Ohio, like all other forty-nine states as well as the federal courts, has a Code of Judicial Conduct modeled after the ABA's Model Code of Judicial Conduct. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the per capita annual income in Ohio was \$21,003.

1. Whether the failure of the State of Ohio (and all thirty-eight other states that elect their judges) to adopt ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 3(E)(1)(e) (1999), which provides for disqualification and recusal related to campaign contributions by parties and their lawyers over a certain threshold, or its failure to adopt any other like standard, violates the Petitioner's Fourteenth Amendment substantive due process right to a fair and impartial trial judge and chief justice.

2. Whether the failure of the State of Ohio to provide a procedural mechanism or process for disqualifying an Ohio Supreme Court justice, when it provides a method for seeking disqualification of all other types of judges, violates the Petitioner's Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process right to be heard on his substantive due process right to a fair and impartial chief justice.

FILED

06-54 JUL 10 2006

No. 06- OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

THE HERTZ CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

PRISCILLA CATES, individually and as guardian
of the person of BOBBY RAY CATES,
an incapacitated person,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BLAZENA PSURNY*
WESSON H. TRIBBLE
3050 Post Oak Boulevard
Suite 1350
Houston, TX 77056
(713) 622-0444

* *Counsel of Record*

Attorneys for Petitioner

201989



COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

54

i

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

This diversity action involves a conflict of laws question as to whether The Hertz Corporation's ("Hertz" or "petitioner") liability for the negligence of its lessee, Matthew Creamer ("Creamer"), is governed by Texas or Florida law. The Fifth Circuit resolved the conflict of laws issue in favor of Florida law. The Fifth Circuit affirmed Priscilla Cates' ("Cates" or "respondent") judgment against Creamer, vacated the summary judgment for Hertz granted on grounds that Texas had the most significant relationship to the parties and occurrence, and remanded to the district court for determination of Hertz's liability under Florida law for the judgment entered against Creamer under Texas law.

The claim was brought by Priscilla Cates, a Texas resident, against Matthew Creamer and Lamae Creamer, Florida residents, and Hertz, a Delaware corporation with a principle place of business in New Jersey, in the United States District Court, for the Northern District of Texas, Wichita Falls Division. The claim arises out of an automobile accident that occurred in Texas. The injury and the conduct causing injury, including Cates' contributory negligence, occurred in Texas. Cates asserted the application of Florida law to determine Hertz's liability for Cates' judgment against Creamer notwithstanding that (a) Cates had no prior contact with Florida; (b) Cates brought the action in Texas forum; (c) the negligence issue and Cates' recovery of damages was governed by Texas law; and (d) Cates did not present a legal authority on the application of the doctrine of depechage to personal injury actions arising out of automobile accidents involving parties of multiple states. In holding that Florida law determines Hertz's liability for Cates' judgment against

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 06-56 JUL 13 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 2006

CHRISTOPHER E. PARKER,
PRIVATE, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROLANDO R. SANCHEZ
Captain, U. S. Marine Corps.
Navy-Marine Corps Appellate
Review Activity
716 Sicard St., S.E., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20374
(202) 685-7390

Counsel of Record

56

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

When a military service member exercises his right to appeal under Article 67(a)(3), Uniform Code of Military Justice, can the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces grant review of the appealed issue pursuant to the statute, but then, using an exception to the “law of the case” doctrine, review a different issue that was never appealed per the statute, and that is detrimental and undermines that service member’s appeal?

No. 06-

06-57 JUL 18 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

RUSSELL PENNOCK and ANTOINETTE PENNOCK,
in their individual capacities and on behalf of the
ESTATE OF DANIEL PENNOCK,

Petitioners,

v.

RICHARD V. LENZI and CARMINE D. LENZI, in their individual
capacities and dba Ridge Crest Farms, MELVIN C. GELSINGER,
GALE GELSINGER, ESTHER GELSINGER, CLARENCE D.
GELSINGER, RETTEW ASSOCIATES, INC., BERKS COUNTY
CONSERVATION DISTRICT and the COMMONWEALTH
OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DANIEL E. BRANNEN JR.

Counsel of Record

7518 Old Santa Fe Trail

Santa Fe NM 87505

(505) 820-2158

THOMAS A. LINZEY

COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL

LEGAL DEFENSE FUND

675 Mower Road

Chambersburg PA 17201

(717) 709-0457

Attorneys for Petitioners

201196



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

57

i

QUESTION PRESENTED

In parents' wrongful death and survival case under state law, does a statute of limitations that extinguishes the parents' claims before they knew or could have known who caused the infections that killed their son violate their Due Process, Equal Protection, or Privileges and Immunities rights under the Fourteenth Amendment?

06-53 JUL 17 2006

NO.

~~OFFICE OF THE CLERK~~

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

JOSHUA R. MCKEEL

Petitioner

v.

THE UNITED STATES

Respondent

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To The United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOHN B. WELLS
LAW OFFICE OF JOHN B. WELLS
317 PORTSMOUTH DRIVE
SLIDELL, LA 70460-8429
985-641-1855
985-649-1536 (fax)

RICHARD H. MCWILLIAMS
LIEUTENANT, JAG CORPS,
UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE
APPELLATE DEFENSE COUNSEL
202-685-7295

58

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- I Whether the Convening Authority and the Military Judge Violated the Vicinage Provisions of the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution in Allowing the Court-Martial to Proceed in the Northern District of Florida When the Alleged Activity Occurred in the Western District of Texas
- II Whether the Military Judge Violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution in Not Dismissing the Charge and Specification When the Petitioner Relied to His Detriment on a Pre-Trial Agreement

06-59 JUL 12 2006

No. ~~OFFICE OF THE CLERK~~

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

BRENTLEY COATES,

Petitioner,

v.

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES and AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
DEFERRED PROFIT-SHARING PLAN, the HEWLETT-PACKARD
COMPANY, and the HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
DEFERRED PROFIT-SHARING PLAN,
Respondents.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United
States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OF COUNSEL:
ANDREW S. HARTLEY
3423 SAYBROOK ROAD
LEXINGTON, KY 40503
(859) 271-3731
hartleyerisalaw@msn.com

ALFRED H. SIGMAN
Counsel of Record
JANET E. BROWN
SIGMAN & BROWN
436 - 14TH STREET
SUITE 415
OAKLAND, CA 94612
(510) 839-3184
sigmanerisalaw@msn.com

Counsel for Petitioner

Becker Gallagher Legal Publishing, Inc. 800.890.5001

59

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether participants in individual account plans may obtain relief to the plan under section 502(a)(2) of ERISA when the alleged violations affected some, but not all, of the plan participants' accounts.
2. Whether a fiduciary has a duty under ERISA § 404(a)(1)(D), 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(D), to disregard the terms of the plan document where those terms require him to violate his fiduciary duties under ERISA § 404(a)(1)(A) and (B), 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(A) and (B).