18-1095

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
FEB 0 4 2019
STEICE OF THE CLERK

CHARLES G. KINNEY,

Petitioner,

v

FRANCES ROTHSCHILD; et al., Respondents,

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals #18-15805 (11/8/18 denial of right to proceed with appeal) [1 of 2]

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Calif. (San Francisco) #3:17-cv-07366-VC

PETITION AND APPENDIX FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES KINNEY
Petitioner in pro se
5826 Presley Way
Oakland, CA 94618
charleskinney@hotmail.com
Telephone: 510-654-5133
Fax: 510-594-0883

QUESTION PRESENTED

It is *rare* for a federal statute to say it "voids" a court judgment, but that is *exactly* what 11 U.S.C. Sec. 524(a)(1) does. If that decision determines a 2010 Chapter 7 "no asset" discharged-debtor still has some "personal liability" to a listed-unsecured creditor, that judgment, order or sanction is void regardless of the rationale used to justify it. Since the statute "voids" the decision, there is no need for a collateral attack; it is not a *defacto* appeal; and the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine does not apply.

11 U.S.C. Sec. 524(a)(2) <u>prohibits</u> listed unsecured creditors from employing any means to obtain any judgment, order or sanction which determines (e.g. presumes) a discharged Chapter 7 "no asset" debtor still has "personal liability" to a creditor.

For over 8 years, listed unsecured-creditor David Marcus has filed attorney fee motions on behalf of his client, discharged Chapter 7 "no asset" debtor Clark, based on pre-petition contracts, with help from contract attorney Eric Chomsky. Their *goal* was to shift pre- and post-petition attorney's fees incurred by Clark onto listed-creditors Kinney and Kempton, co-buyers of Clark's house in 2005.

Dockets show that state and federal courts keep issuing decisions that *concede* debtor Clark is *still liable* to creditor Marcus for legal work (and Marcus keeps filing attorney's fee "cost" motions to shift those fees onto Kinney), contrary to law.

Bosse requires all courts to follow the law. Why is this court ignoring Kinney's constitutional rights?



PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The parties to this proceeding are those appearing in the caption to this petition.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTEDi
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGSii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iii
INDEX TO APPENDICES v
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1
OPINIONS BELOW 26
JURISDICTION
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 27
STATEMENT OF THE CASE 27
SUMMARY OF LOWER COURT PROCEEDINGS
STATEMENT OF FACTS 28
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Certiorari Should Be Granted Because The Cou

Certiorari Should Be Granted Because The Courts are <u>Compelling Silence</u> About Ongoing Violations of Federal Law Which Violates Kinney's First Amendment Rights, and Other Laws as to Kinney; And The Method and Application of







DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

