

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ELENA STURDZA
Petitioner

Vs.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES,
Respondent

VASILIOS DEMETRIOU,
Personal Representative of the Estate of
ANGELOS DEMETRIOU & ASSOCIATES,
ANGELOS DEMETRIOU,
Respondent

NATHAN LEWIN, et al,
Respondent

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

District Court No. **98-cv-02051** (HHK)
Court of Appeals No. **00-7279, 06-7069, 10-7054, 14-7038, 17-7036**
Supreme Court No. **02-5218, 10M63, 11-5304, 11-5307, 11-5645**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ELENA STURDZA
ELENA STURDZA ARCHITECT
6705 Tomlinson Terrace
Cabin John, MD 20818-1307
Tel: 301 320 4345

October 30, 2018

PRO SE
THE SUBJECT OF THIS CASE:

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ELENA F. STURDZA — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ELENA F. STURDZA
(Your Name)

6705 TOMLINSON TERRACE
(Address)

CRAIN JOHN, MD. 20818-1307
(City, State, Zip Code)

301 320 4345
(Phone Number)



No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ELENA F. STURDZA — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ELENA F. STURDZA
(Your Name)

6705 TOMLINSON TERRACE
(Address)

CAPIN JOHN, MD. 20818-1307
(City, State, Zip Code)

301 320 4345
(Phone Number)



Is a work of extreme national importance. The subject of the infringement is of an extraordinary national importance since it constitutes an innovative work of scientific useful arts arising from within the Islamic culture in ways that has never been risen before.

Poses several questions of exceptional importance. It is a criminal infringement of an extraordinary copyrighted work by a foreign state. Fired lawyer illegally rehires himself with the aid of illegally appointed Guardian.

Has no precedent in the U.S. There is no other criminal infringement by a foreign state of such a complex work combining so many trades.

Its ruling would create a precedent of national and global importance. This case law will affect the whole architectural establishment in the U.S. and its role in the whole world.

Is a world-class copyrighted work that must be fully protected as mandated by the Constitution. Article I of the Constitution delegates the Congress to encourage the progress of the science and useful arts. For the first time in history an architectural design incorporates the latest discoveries in science, medicine, technology, engineering and useful arts in a modern Islamic architectural design.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The affirmative answer to the following questions constitutes the proof that both US Courts have drastically departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings in a case that is of national and global importance.

THE "INSTANT CASE" ON REMAND TO THE DISTRICT COURT TO RULE ON
THE *MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF GUARDIAN AD LITEM*. 2002 – 2011

1. Whether the court erred when it adjudged that "The district court's May 27, 2009, and July 23, 2009, orders are not properly before the court, because the notice of appeal is untimely as to them."
2. Whether the court erred when it adjudged that "The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant's motions for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b).", and:

“Appellant’s motions for reconsideration raised no new arguments concerning the appointment, and the district court could not have granted a Rule 60(b) motion on grounds that this court had already rejected. Moreover, appellant’s allegations do not satisfy any of the specific criteria for relief in Rule 60(b) (1)-(5), or present “extraordinary circumstances” that would entitle her to relief under Rule 60(b) (6).

3. Whether the court erred when it adjudged that “Appellant has shown no error in the district court’s denial of her motion for leave to file a response to the question whether a guardian ad litem should be appointed, as she received an opportunity to speak at a hearing on the issue, and the proffered response appears to have consisted of material that was either irrelevant to the issue at hand or legally unsound.”

4. Whether the court erred when it adjudged that “the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying appellant’s motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint, or her motion for reconsideration of the district court’s denial of leave to file a supplemental complaint as of right.”, and “Because the guardian has been given the authority to “assist [appellant]’s counsel with prosecuting this case in Ms. Sturdza’s best interests,” appellant cannot unilaterally decide to file a supplemental complaint.”

5. Whether a party has the right to fire his or her Lawyer, enter Pro-se representation, file in Court important meritorious information, and correct the Court Record, his or her Lawyer refused to do.

6. Whether the Courts can declare a party “**incompetent person**”, and a “**client with diminished capacity**” only because the party wants to correct the Court Record.

7. Whether the courts drastically departed from their normal procedure when the US District Court, violating all the Laws governing the Appointment of a Guardian ad Litem, **appointed the Guardian** to a person who is not an infant, an incompetent, or a disabled, and does not fit any description of actions taken for which a Guardian should be appointed under law, and the US

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.