

22-5220
No: 22-_____

ORIGINAL

original


IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PALANI KARUPAIYAN; Petitioner

v.


JATINDER SINGH;
NICK JOE; individually and in his official capacity as employer of
Jatinder Singh;
NICK DOE'S TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS;
KHALID MAHMOOD; JOHN DOE, individually and in his official
capacity as employer of Khalid Mahmood;
JOHN DOE'S LIMO BUSINESS

----Respondents



PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit (21-3163 & 22-1159 Consolidated)

Palani Karupaiyan.
Pro se, Petitioner,
Email: palanikay@gmail.com
212-470-2048(m)



I QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1) USCA failed to vacate the Sua sponte order of dismissing the complaint is error
- 2) Lower Courts dismissing/denying petitioner's Intellectual property damage claim(s) is error.
- 3) Lower Courts dismissing/denying the color/ ethnical discrimination under 42 U.S.C § 1988 (vindication of Civ. rights), Civil Rights Act of 1866 is error.
- 4) **Lower Court should not deny the Petitioner's property damages is error.**
- 5) **Lower Court denying claims under 26 U.S.C § 7201 - Attempt to evade or defeat tax, 18 U.S.C § 1956 - Laundering of monetary instruments, Money Laundering Control Act of 1986, Insurance fraud and unemployment fraud is error.**
- 6) Lower Court fail to apply Rule 8(f) "*All pleadings shall be so construed as to do substantial justice*" when applying Federal law(s) or state law(s) **or both together.**

II PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

III RELATED CASE(S)

None

IV TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

I QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
II PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....	i
III RELATED CASE(S).....	i
IV TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
V INDEX OF APPENDIX.....	iii
VI TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv

VII PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	1
VIII OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
IX JURISDICTION.....	1
X CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
XI STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
Dist Court ruling.....	5
USCA-3's Ruling.....	8
XII REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	11
1) USCA failed to vacate the Sua sponte order of dismissing the complaint is error.....	11
2) Lower Courts dismissing/denying petitioner's Intellectual property damage claim(s) is error.....	11
3) Lower Courts dismissing/denying the color/ ethnic discrimination under 42 U.S.C § 1988 (vindication of Civ. rights), Civil Rights Act of 1866 is error.....	13
i) Petitioner's color/ethnicity violation should survive Under 42 U.S.C § 1981 and 42 U.S.C § 1982.....	15
ii) New Jersey Law against discrimination (NJLAD) should survive with Section 1988.....	15
4) Lower Court should not deny the Petitioner's property damages is error...	18
i) Petitioner's property damage(s) claims should survive under Section 1982.....	18
ii) Properties damages and Skin Injury claims should survive under State Law (Supplemental jurisdiction) when one or more federal claims survived.	18
5) Lower Court denying claims under 26 U.S.C § 7201 - Attempt to evade or defeat tax, 18 U.S.C § 1956 - Laundering of monetary instruments, Money	

Laundrying Control Act of 1986, Insurance fraud and unemployment fraud is error..... 19

 i) 26 U.S. Code § 7201 - Attempt to evade or defeat tax/payroll tax evasion should survive with False Claims Act and/or NJ False Claim Act, Section 1988. 21

 2) 18 U.S. Code § 1956 - Laundrying of monetary instruments, Money Laundrying Control Act of 1986 should survive with False Claims Act, Section 1988 21

 ii) Insurance Fraud claim and unemployment fraud should survive under Section 1988, False Claim act, NJ-False Claim act, New Jersey Insurance Fraud Prevention Act..... 22

6) Lower Court fail to apply Rule 8(f) “All pleadings shall be so construed as to do substantial justice” when applying Federal law(s) or state law(s) or both together..... 23

XIII CONCLUSION 24

V INDEX OF APPENDIX

a) USCA 3rd Circuit Opinion1a

b) USCA 3rd Circuit’s entry of Judgment4a

c) Dist Court Sua Sponte dismissal order6a

d) Order denied for SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING..... 10a

e) Order denying for amend the rehearing 12a

f) Petitioner’s Skin Injury exhibit 13a

VI TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Brazier v. Cherry</i> , 293 F. 2d 401	17
<i>Conley v. Gibson</i> , 355 US 41 - Supreme Court 1957.....	23
<i>Deramus v. Shapiro Schwartz, LLP</i> , No. 19-4683, 2020.....	6, 14
<i>Doe v. Mercy Cath. Med. Ctr.</i> , 850 F.3d 545, 567 (3d Cir. 2017).....	10
<i>Dubai Islamic Bank v. Citibank, N.A.</i> , 126 F. Supp. 2d 659, 668 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).....	6
<i>Dun & Bradstreet Software Servs. v. Grace Consulting, Inc.</i> , 307 F.3d 197, 206 (3d Cir. 2002).....	9, 11
<i>Estelle</i> , 429 U.S., at 106, 97 S.Ct. 285.....	23
<i>FMC Stores Co. v. Borough of Morris Plains</i> , 495 A. 2d 1313 - NJ: Supreme Court 1985.....	24
<i>Fries v. Barnes</i> , 618 F.2d 988, 989 (2d Cir.1980).....	11
<i>McRae v. Norton</i> , No. 12-1537, 2012	6
<i>Parratt v. Taylor</i> , 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981).....	7
<i>Salahuddin v. Cuomo</i> , 861 F. 2d 40 - Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit 1988.....	11
<i>Schreane v. Seana</i> , 506 F. App'x 120, 122 (3d Cir. 2012).....	5
<i>Sullivan v. Little Hunting Park, Inc.</i> , 396 US 229.....	18
<i>Sullivan v. Little Hunting Park, Inc.</i> , 396 US 229 - Supreme Court 1969.....	15
<i>Texas & N. O. R. Co. v. Railway Clerks</i> , 281 U. S. 548, 569-570.....	16, 24
<i>Texas & Pacific R. Co. v. Rigsby</i> , 241 U. S. 33, 39	16, 24
<i>Tillman, supra</i> , at 439-440, 93 S.Ct. 1090	15

Statutes

17 U.S.C. § 102(a).....	12
17 U.S.C. § 501(b).....	7
17 U.S.C. §§ 201(a).....	12
18 U.S.C. § 1956	9, 19
26 U.S.C. § 7201	5, 8, 19, 23
28 U.S.C. § 1367	10
28 U.S.C. § 1915	7
28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)	5
28 U.S.C. § 7201	6
28 U.S.C. § 7401	6
42 U.S.C § 1981	15
42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	9
<i>42 U.S.C. § 1988</i>	passim
Civil Rights Act of 1866.....	3, 8, 15
Copyright Act of 1976.....	4, 7, 12
<i>Hindu Succession Act, 1956 and amended</i>	10
Judiciary Act of 1789	4
Money Laundering Control Act of 1986.....	5, 6

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.