

**No. 26-5154**

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

ALLAN DOUGLAS WILSON,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CLERK, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Defendant-Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
Civil Action No. 26-17 (UNA)

**BRIEF OF APPELLANT ALLAN DOUGLAS WILSON**

Allan Douglas Wilson  
Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellant  
1321 Upland Drive, STE 21311  
Houston, Texas 77043  
(713) 363-3006  
wilson.allan.d@gmail.com

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iii

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT..... 5

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW..... 5

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 7

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 11

ARGUMENT..... 15

    I. The District Court Erred by Failing to Conduct a Fact-Specific Functional Immunity Analysis..... 15

    II. The Selective Recognition of SCOTUS Case No. 25-6039 Establishes Discriminatory and Conspiratorial Conduct Not Subject to Quasi-Judicial Immunity..... 19

    III. Justice Thomas's Denial of Documented Communications, While Acting in a Capacity Indistinguishable from Clerk Staff, Defeats Any Claim of Judicial Immunity and Establishes a Conspiracy Under 42 U.S.C. § 1985..... 21

    IV. The Real-Controversy Doctrine Requires Adjudication: Absolute Privilege Cannot Attach to Destruction of a Certiorari Petition Where No Judicial Function Was Performed ..... 24

    V. The District Court Failed to Adjudicate Appellant's Damages Claims, Which Survive Any Immunity Determination..... 25

    VI. The Six-Month Loss of the Certiorari Petition Irrevocably Prejudiced Appellant's Supreme Court Proceedings, Compounding Original Rights Violations Not Denied by the Government and Justifying the Full Damages Prayer..... 27

    VII. Dismissal With Prejudice Was an Abuse of Discretion Where Substantive Claims Were Not Adjudicated and Leave to Amend Was Not Granted..... 32

    VIII. The District Court's Opinion Presents an Appearance of Non-Independent Adjudication That Warrants Vacatur and Remand..... 33

    IX. Partial or Alternative Relief Is Warranted to Preserve Non-Immunity Claims..... 34

CONCLUSION..... 36

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 38

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) .....	20
Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007) .....	20
Castro v. United States, 540 U.S. 375 (2003) .....	33
Dennis v. Sparks, 449 U.S. 24 (1980) .....	23
Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219 (1988) .....	5, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 36
Griffin v. Breckenridge, 403 U.S. 88 (1971) .....	22
Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9 (1991) .....	21
Semtek Int'l Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 531 U.S. 497 (2001) .....	31
Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459 (D.C. Cir. 1993) .....	17, 18, 19, 24
Tower v. Glover, 467 U.S. 914 (1984) .....	23

### CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. I .....	16
U.S. Const. amend. V .....	16
U.S. Const. amend. XIV .....	16

**STATUTES**

18 U.S.C. § 1503 (Obstruction of Justice) ..... 11, 33, 36  
18 U.S.C. § 1702 (Destruction of Federal Mail) ..... 11, 19, 33, 36  
28 U.S.C. § 2679(d) (Westfall Act) ..... 18  
42 U.S.C. § 1985 (Civil Rights Conspiracy) ..... 6, 11, 13, 21, 24, 22, 33, 36

**RULES**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) ..... 33, 35  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) ..... 5, 12  
D.C. Cir. R. 28 ..... 5

## **JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia exercised jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. The district court issued a Memorandum Opinion and Order dismissing the action with prejudice on February 9, 2026. Plaintiff-Appellant timely filed a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) on February 12, 2026. This Court has jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291 as an appeal from a final judgment of the district court. The clerk's briefing order of record sets the Appellant Brief and Appendix due on June 29, 2026.

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

I. Whether the district court erred as a matter of law by applying absolute immunity categorically to all pleaded claims without conducting the fact-specific functional analysis required by *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988), and its progeny, particularly where the alleged conduct involved complete destruction or loss of an entire certiorari filing without any judicial review having occurred.

II. Whether the district court misapprehended the factual record by ignoring the critical distinction between Case No. SCOTUS 24-7506 (dispatched the same day and properly docketed) and Case No. SCOTUS 25-6039, the filing for which was lost or destroyed entirely, a pattern constituting selective recognition of filings that cannot be attributed to inadvertent administrative error and defeats any claim of routine quasi-judicial immunity.

III. Whether Associate Justice Clarence Thomas's denial of receipt of petition and denial of documented telephone communications with the Appellant, while functionally acting as a spokesperson for the Clerk's Office in denying access to justice and invoking judicial immunity for the Clerk's conduct, constitutes evidence of a conspiracy under 42 U.S.C. § 1985 that the district court was required to analyze independently.

IV. Whether a real controversy exists under Article III such that the federal courts are required to adjudicate Appellant's claims, given that absolute privilege cannot logically attach to the destruction of a certiorari petition where no judicial function was performed, no petition was received by any justice for review, and the petitioner's follow-up communications went officially unanswered.

V. Whether the district court abused its discretion by failing to adjudicate Appellant's prayer for damages, including direct out-of-pocket losses and prejudgment interest, even on the assumption that some immunity applied, and whether dismissal with prejudice was improper without leave to amend.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### *A. Factual Background: The Simultaneous Dispatches of May 9, 2025.*

Plaintiff-Appellant Allan Douglas Wilson is a pro se litigant who sought to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for writs of certiorari in connection with two underlying matters. On May 9, 2025, at approximately 4:12 PM, Appellant caused to be mailed via Letterstream, a professional mailing service, two separate certiorari submissions addressed to the Office of the Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States, 1 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20543.

The first submission pertained to Supreme Court Case No. 24-7506. That filing was received by the Clerk's Office, properly docketed, and eventually adjudicated. Appellant subsequently confirmed docketing of that matter through follow-up contact with the Clerk's Office and through the case coordinator assigned to that proceeding.

The second submission pertained to Supreme Court Case No. 25-6039. That submission consisted of a box containing eleven copies of a corrected certiorari petition comprising over 1,300 pages of court documents, transmitted by U.S. First Class Mail. This mailing is documented by the sworn Affidavit of Mailing submitted as Exhibit 'A' to the complaint, executed under penalty of perjury in Cebu City, Philippines on January 1, 2026. The Affidavit further establishes, by reference to the appended Mail Service Disruption Report, that no reported disruptions in mail service would have precluded delivery during, before, or after the specified mailing date.

The Clerk's Office confirmed receipt of only one of the two dispatched boxes. The second box, containing the the corrected submission for Case No. 25-6039, was never acknowledged as received. A follow up letter accompanying a complete copy of the filing was sent to the same address on July 18, 2025, and was also never acknowledged as received by the Court. Despite multiple documented attempts to contact the Clerk's Office by telephone, web form, and mailed correspondence, as evidenced by phone records attached as Exhibit 'C' and Letterstream service records attached as Exhibit 'D', no acknowledgment of the missing materials was ever provided, no substantive response to Appellant's inquiries was returned, and no official correspondence was ever issued confirming, denying, or explaining the disposition of the filing and related correspondence.

On November 25, 2025, after the Supreme Court Clerk was served with the District case claiming damages for loss and destruction of the Appellant's filing and denial of due process, a copy of Case No. 25-6039 was discreetly docketed from the District filing's exhibits with a backdated receipt date of March 13, 2025, indicating that the certiorari petition was docketed over eight(8) months after the receipt date on file. The petition was docketed by the Clerk in an attempt to moot any claims of impropriety and was filed without notification to the petitioner before being quickly dismissed without stated reasons.

The docketed petition misrepresented as an original document by the clerk in November 2025 was actually a proof of mailing downloaded by the Petitioner from Letterstream mail service and included as an exhibit in District case No. 26-17 (UNA). After being named as Defendant in the

District case, the Clerk printed the proof of mailing from exhibits and stamped the copy 'ORIGINAL' before scanning and docketing it with an invented date of receipt based on previous correspondence.

The extent of the cover-up including coordinated denials from the Clerk of Court, Associate Justice, and receiving personnel, along with misrepresentation of the docketed petition and fabricated date of receipt suggests the involvement of resources beyond those of the Clerk's Office.

***B. The Critical Distinction: Selective Recognition of Case Filings.***

The fact that Case No. 24-7506, dispatched by the same mailing service on the same day and to the same address, was received, docketed, and adjudicated, while Case No. 25-6039 was entirely lost or destroyed and remained unacknowledged along with all surrounding communications is not consistent with inadvertent administrative error. For the follow-up correspondence to also go missing and remain unacknowledged reveals intention by the Clerk's Office to make submissions disappear before they are docketed. Both the filings and follow-up correspondence were transmitted through the same professional mailing service and addressed to the same Clerk's Office. The differential treatment of simultaneous submissions under the same conditions constitutes a pattern of selective recognition of filings, namely the acceptance of one while the entirety of another is caused to disappear from the record along with related correspondence, a pattern of actions that is not reasonably protected under quasi-judicial immunity.

Appellant submits that this factual distinction was entirely ignored by the originating court. The district court's Memorandum Opinion makes no reference whatsoever to other filing that was sent the same day, or to the significance of the Clerk's Office docketing one filing while failing to acknowledge the existence of the other. This omission is significant because it goes to the core of whether the loss of the Case No. 25-6039 filing was the product of routine administrative process or of selective, discriminatory, and potentially conspiratorial conduct.

***C. Justice Thomas's Denial of Communications and Invocation of Judicial Immunity.***

Appellant placed thirteen documented telephone calls to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office following the non-acknowledgment of the Case No. 25-6039 submission. Appellant left voicemail messages each time the call was unanswered and spoke with the case coordinator assigned to those proceedings on two occasions regarding the status of the filing for Case No. 24-7506 and the absence of any response to prior inquiries regarding the missing submission. These calls are documented by the phone records attached as Exhibit 'C'.

Notwithstanding this documentation, Associate Justice Clarence Thomas represented in a communication addressed to Appellant, constituting in effect an official response on behalf of the Court and the Clerk's Office, stating that there had been no communication between Appellant and the Clerk's Office since April. Justice Thomas, who appeared to be instructed by another party, denied that the documented calls had occurred, denied that any case coordinator had spoken with Appellant regarding either matter, and invoked judicial immunity for the Clerk's conduct in declining to acknowledge or respond to Appellant's follow-up inquiries.

Justice Thomas's assertions were factually false with respect to communications that occurred and are documented in phone records (Exhibit 'C'). More significantly, Justice Thomas was not acting in any adjudicative or judicial capacity when issuing these representations. He was not deciding a motion, issuing an order, or performing any function integral to the disposition of a case. He was, instead, acting as a de facto spokesperson for the Clerk's Office, denying documented access to a petitioner who had sought confirmation of his filing's receipt, and invoking judicial immunity for the Clerk's Office's failure to process or acknowledge a certiorari petition that no judge had ever effectively reviewed.

***D. District Court Proceedings.***

Appellant filed a civil complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia asserting claims for destruction of federal mail in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1702, obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. § 1503, denial of constitutional access to the courts under the First and Fifth Amendments, civil rights conspiracy under 42 U.S.C. § 1985, and conduct outside the scope of official duties sufficient to defeat quasi-judicial immunity. Appellant further prayed for compensatory damages of \$154,563.63 (prejudgment interest for originally claimed damages at six percent from the date of the underlying appeal), \$218.17 for the direct cost of preparing and mailing the lost submission, punitive damages, attorneys' fees, and a jury trial on all issues so triable.

On February 9, 2026, the district court dismissed the action with prejudice on absolute immunity grounds. The Memorandum Opinion characterized Appellant's claims as arising from a failure to properly receive, process, and acknowledge mail, failing to distinguish between properly handling submissions and making them disappear along with all associated correspondence. It further failed to address the selective recognition of simultaneous filings, Justice Thomas's denials of receipt of petition and documented communications, and failed to mention any of the claimed damages or the sworn evidentiary record. On February 12, 2026, Appellant filed a timely Motion for Reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), supported by a Plagiarism Analysis Report identifying substantial duplication between the Memorandum Opinion and a prior decision issued six days earlier, calling into question whether the complaint was independently reviewed or forced into a framework for dismissal.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The district court's dismissal rests on compounding legal errors that independently require vacatur and remand.

1. The court applied absolute immunity without performing the fact-specific functional analysis required by *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988). The question is not whether the Clerk's Office generally performs quasi-judicial functions, but whether the specific conduct alleged, namely the complete destruction or loss of Case No. 25-6039 without any judicial review, bore any resemblance to a function integral to the judicial process. The court performed no such analysis.
2. The court entirely ignored the most relevant facts in the record: that a submission dispatched on the same day to the same address was properly received while the other entirely disappeared. The direct implication is irreconcilable with inadvertent administrative error and forecloses categorical immunity as a matter of law, considering that follow-up communications were ignored with impunity.
3. Justice Thomas's complicit denial of Appellant's documented telephone contacts, issued while functionally acting as a spokesperson for the Clerk's Office rather than in any adjudicative capacity, constitutes evidence of a conspiracy to deny access to courts that required independent analysis under 42 U.S.C. § 1985. A judicial officer invoking immunity on behalf of non-judicial personnel, while denying documented facts to avoid potential cause of action, is not acting within the scope of any judicial function and cannot claim the protections of absolute immunity.

4. A real controversy requiring adjudication exists. Absolute privilege does not logically apply where no judicial function was performed: no petition was presented to any justice for review, no order was issued, no docket entry for Case No. 25-6039 was ever created from the original submission, it was filed from a printed image of the mailing submitted as exhibit in the District case, and the petitioner's follow-up communications were met with official denials of facts established by documentary evidence. The case is not abstract or hypothetical; Appellant has suffered direct, quantifiable injury.
5. The court's failure to address the damages prayer, including the \$218.17 direct loss claim and the prejudgment interest claim of \$154,563.63, is an independent basis for reversal. Even on the assumption that some immunity applied to some conduct, the court was required to analyze whether the damages claims survived, and a dismissal with prejudice that forecloses the full damages prayer without any merits analysis constitutes an abuse of discretion.
6. A foundational misapprehension pervades the district court's analysis. The court ruled that the failures described in the complaint, specifically the non-receipt, non-processing, and non-acknowledgment of the Case No. 25-6039 submission with related documents, constituted conduct within the ordinary scope of the Clerk's duties and therefore fell within the ambit of quasi-judicial immunity. That characterization is incorrect in both fact and law. The petition mailed on May 9, 2025, was not improperly processed after receipt or informally declined following administrative review; it was destroyed or lost without any acknowledgment of its existence, without any administrative or judicial review of its contents, and without any official response to multiple documented follow-up communications from Appellant. The destruction of a lawfully transmitted filing before it is received, logged, reviewed, or presented to any justice is not a consequence of the Clerk's duties; it is the antithesis of those duties. The proper scope

of a court clerk's official functions encompasses the receipt, processing, and ministerial handling of submitted materials. It does not encompass the physical destruction or suppression of a filing, the official denial of its transmittal, or the sustained refusal to acknowledge repeated inquiries in writing and by telephone from the petitioner whose submission has disappeared. The district court's conflation of these categorically distinct acts with the lawful exercise of quasi-judicial function is the foundational error from which the dismissal improperly proceeds.

7. In appellate proceedings related to the original matter underlying this action, government appellees have relied on summary affirmance as a procedural mechanism to avoid merits examination of their conduct. Summary affirmance is a dispositional tool available only where the issues raised on appeal have already been substantively addressed in the district court proceedings below. That predicate is wholly absent in the present matter. The district court made no merits determination on any of Appellant's substantive claims; it applied categorical immunity without the functional analysis required by *Forrester* and without engaging the specific factual allegations that distinguish this case from ordinary administrative error. Any affirmance of the district court's order on summary grounds is accordingly legally improper, because the claims presented on this appeal were never adjudicated below in any form capable of supporting a summary disposition. The stare decisis consequences of affirming this dismissal are constitutionally significant. A decision affirming categorical immunity for completely disregarding a certiorari petition, without functional analysis, without engagement with the selective-recognition evidence, and without adjudication of the damages claims, would establish as binding precedent that a clerk's office may cause a litigant's filing to disappear without acknowledgment, deny documented follow-up communications, and invoke absolute immunity as a complete bar to judicial accountability. The resulting precedential principle would sanction,

under color of judicial immunity, a self-serving government agenda in which the denial of a petitioner's constitutional right of access to the courts goes unredressed for undisputed violations that the government has declined to contest on the merits, while government actors hide behind the American flag and the protections of a doctrine that was never designed to immunize the destruction of filed legal materials. The due process guarantees of the Fifth Amendment and the constitutional right of access to the courts cannot be so easily forfeited, and this Court should decline to issue a ruling that, as a practical matter, would make those guarantees a nullity wherever a clerk's office chooses not to receive a petition.

Appellant respectfully requests that this Court vacate the dismissal and remand for independent functional immunity analysis, adjudication of the selective-recognition and conspiracy claims, and consideration of the full damages prayer.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED BY FAILING TO CONDUCT A FACT-SPECIFIC FUNCTIONAL IMMUNITY ANALYSIS, PARTICULARLY WHERE THE ALLEGED CONDUCT RESULTED IN THE COMPLETE LOSS OF A CERTIORARI PETITION THAT RECEIVED NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.**

#### ***A. Absolute Immunity Is a Functional, Not a Categorical, Doctrine.***

The Supreme Court has long established that absolute immunity for judicial and quasi-judicial officers is a functional doctrine, not a status-based one. The foundational principle is that the relevant inquiry is the nature of the function performed, not the identity of the actor who performed it. *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 229 (1988). Accordingly, the proper analytical framework requires a court to examine the specific conduct alleged and determine whether that conduct, by its nature, is integral to the judicial process, not whether the defendant holds a position associated with judicial duties.

The D.C. Circuit has applied this functional analysis consistently. In *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460-61 (D.C. Cir. 1993), the court extended quasi-judicial immunity to a clerk's receipt and processing of filings because those acts were integral to the judicial function. Crucially, however, *Sindram* did not hold that all acts performed by court staff are immune; it held that acts integral to the judicial process are immune. The operative question is always whether the specific act challenged is of that character. Where no judicial function was initiated (where the filing was lost or destroyed before any justice reviewed it), there is no judicial process to which the conduct is integral.

***B. The Destruction or Loss of Case No. 25-6039 Occurred Before Any Judicial Function Was Performed.***

The immunity framework for court clerks developed by Sindram and related decisions presupposes that the conduct at issue arises within the context of an ongoing judicial function: the receipt, processing, and transmittal of materials to a reviewing body. That presupposition fails entirely here. Case No. 25-6039 did not exist in any official sense. No docket entry was created. No clerk acknowledged receipt of the corrected submission. No justice was presented with the petition for consideration. The filing was lost or destroyed at the threshold, before the judicial process commenced.

Under Forrester, immunity attaches only to acts that are integral to the judicial process. An act that extinguishes the judicial process before it begins is not integral to it; it defeats it. The destruction or concealment of a certiorari petition and related correspondence that no justice ever reviewed is antithetical to the judicial function, not an exercise of it. The district court made no finding that any judicial function had in fact been performed in connection with Case No. 25-6039, because none had. In the absence of any judicial function being initiated or performed, the threshold condition for quasi-judicial immunity is not satisfied.

***C. The Westfall Act Requires a Scope-of-Employment Determination That Was Not Conducted.***

The Westfall Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d), provides immunity for federal employees acting within the scope of their employment. Immunity does not attach to acts performed outside that scope. The

official duties of a court clerk are defined by law to include the receipt, processing, and filing of documents, not the destruction or suppression of submitted materials. An act that violates 18 U.S.C. § 1702 by causing the taking or destruction of mail matter cannot simultaneously constitute authorized official conduct within the scope of employment. The district court conducted no scope-of-employment analysis. Remand to conduct that analysis is required.

**II. THE SELECTIVE RECOGNITION OF SCOTUS CASE NO. 25-6039, AS COMPARED TO THE SIMULTANEOUS AND PROPERLY ACKNOWLEDGED FILING OF CASE NO. 24-7506, ESTABLISHES DISCRIMINATORY AND CONSPIRATORIAL CONDUCT THAT CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED TO INADVERTENT ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR AND THEREFORE FALLS OUTSIDE QUASI-JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.**

***A. The Simultaneous Dispatches Eliminate the Administrative Error Rationale for Immunity.***

On May 9, 2025, Appellant caused two separate certiorari filings to be transmitted to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office via the same professional mailing service, on the same date, to the same address, using identical procedures. Case No. 24-7506 was received, docketed, and adjudicated in the ordinary course. Case No. 25-6039 disappeared entirely, without acknowledgment, without docket entry, and without any official explanation.

Courts have extended quasi-judicial immunity to honest administrative mistakes on the theory that personal liability would be detrimental to the performance of essential judicial functions. See *Sindram*, 986 F.2d at 1461. That rationale applies only where the conduct is plausibly consistent with routine administration. Where one of two simultaneously dispatched filings is properly received while the other vanishes entirely, routine error is not a plausible explanation. The

differential treatment supports the inference that the loss of Case No. 25-6039 was not accidental, and the immunity rationale accordingly does not apply.

***B. The District Court's Failure to Address the Simultaneous Filing of Case No. 24-7506 Constitutes a Misapprehension of the Factual Record.***

The district court's Memorandum Opinion makes no reference to the other documents that were received from the mailing of the same day comprising Case No. 24-7506. This omission reflects a fundamental mischaracterization of the complaint's factual basis. Under *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), and *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007), a court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. The complaint's allegations establish that the two filings were treated differently without any basis consistent with normal administrative procedure, supporting the plausible inference of selective, discriminatory, or coordinated conduct. The court's failure to engage with those allegations, or to explain why the differential treatment of simultaneous filings was consistent with routine administration, independently warrants reversal.

***C. The Absolute Absence of Any Official Response Regarding Case No. 25-6039 Confirms That No Judicial Function Was Exercised Over That Matter.***

The absence of any official acknowledgment, docket entry, or correspondence regarding Case No. 25-6039, even in response to multiple documented follow-up inquiries, establishes that the matter was not processed in the ordinary course of judicial administration. A clerk's office performing its quasi-judicial function receives, logs, and notifies parties of receipt or deficiency. None of these ministerial steps were taken with respect to Case No. 25-6039. The absence of these predicate

steps confirms that no quasi-judicial function was performed from which immunity could arise. There was no filing to be immune from mishandling; there was a filing that was prevented from entering the judicial process at all.

**III. ASSOCIATE JUSTICE THOMAS'S DENIAL OF DOCUMENTED COMMUNICATIONS, WHILE ACTING AS A DE FACTO SPOKESPERSON FOR THE CLERK'S OFFICE AND INVOKING JUDICIAL IMMUNITY ON BEHALF OF THAT OFFICE, DEFEATS ANY CLAIM OF ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY AND ESTABLISHES A COGNIZABLE CONSPIRACY CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1985.**

***A. The Documented Communications Establish That Justice Thomas's Denials Were Factually False.***

As set out in the Statement of the Case, Appellant placed two documented telephone calls to the Clerk's Office, both documented in Exhibit 'C', and spoke with the case coordinator on each occasion. Justice Thomas subsequently represented, in what purported to be an official response on behalf of the Court, that there had been no communication between the Appellant and the Clerk's Office since April. That representation directly contradicted the documented telephone records. It was not an administrative misstatement; it was a categorical denial of communications established by objective documentary evidence. Under the pleading standards applicable at the dismissal stage, Appellant's sworn and documented account must be accepted as true.

***B. Justice Thomas Was Not Acting in Any Judicial Capacity When Denying Access to Justice and Invoking Immunity on Behalf of the Clerk's Office.***

Absolute judicial immunity attaches to acts performed in a judicial capacity: ruling on motions, issuing orders, making adjudicative determinations. *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 9-10 (1991). It

does not attach to acts that are administrative or executive in character. Forrester, 484 U.S. at 229-30. The relevant inquiry is not whether the actor is a judge but whether the act challenged is judicial in nature.

Justice Thomas was not adjudicating any motion, deciding any petition, or performing any act integral to the resolution of a pending judicial proceeding when he denied Appellant's documented communications and invoked judicial immunity on the Clerk's behalf. He was performing an administrative function: communicating with a litigant about the status of a filing and deflecting inquiry into the Clerk's Office's handling of that filing. This is precisely the type of administrative act that Forrester holds is not entitled to absolute judicial immunity. The fact that the actor holds a judicial office does not transform an administrative communication into a judicial act.

***C. The Coordinated Denial of Documented Facts Establishes a Cognizable Conspiracy Claim Under 42 U.S.C. § 1985.***

Section 1985 of Title 42 proscribes conspiracies to deprive persons of the equal protection of the laws or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, and conspiracies to obstruct the course of justice in the federal courts. 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2), (3). To state a claim under Section 1985, a plaintiff must allege: (1) a conspiracy; (2) an act in furtherance of that conspiracy; (3) an injury to person or property or deprivation of a legal right. *Griffin v. Breckenridge*, 403 U.S. 88, 102-03 (1971).

The complaint alleged a conspiracy among Clerk's Office personnel and Associate Justice Thomas to deny Appellant's constitutional right of access to the Supreme Court. The specific factual predicate for this allegation is: (a) the Clerk's Office failed to acknowledge receipt of Case No. 25-6039 despite documented transmittal; (b) Appellant contacted the Clerk's Office twice by telephone and spoke with the case coordinator, seeking information about the missing filing; (c) Justice Thomas denied that any such communications occurred, while representing himself as speaking on behalf of the Court and the Clerk's Office; (d) Justice Thomas invoked judicial immunity for the Clerk's Office's conduct in refusing to acknowledge or respond to the missing filing; and (e) no official response regarding Case No. 25-6039 was ever provided, effectively denying Appellant's access to the Court on that matter.

The Supreme Court has recognized that a private person who conspires with a judicial officer to deprive another person of federal rights cannot invoke the judicial officer's immunity. *Tower v. Glover*, 467 U.S. 914, 920 (1984); *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24, 27-28 (1980). Where, as here, the judicial officer is himself alleged to be a co-conspirator, having denied documented facts and invoked immunity in furtherance of the conspiracy, neither participant in the alleged conspiracy can shield the conspiracy from examination by invoking the judicial immunity doctrine. The immunity doctrine is a defense to individual acts; it does not immunize a coordinated scheme to deny a litigant access to the courts.

The district court made no reference to Section 1985, to the conspiracy allegations, or to the distinction between individual quasi-judicial conduct and coordinated obstruction of access to the

courts. The court's silence on these claims constitutes a failure to adjudicate them, not an implicit rejection, and requires remand for independent analysis.

**IV. A REAL CONTROVERSY EXISTS REQUIRING ADJUDICATION: ABSOLUTE PRIVILEGE CANNOT LOGICALLY ATTACH WHERE NO JUDICIAL FUNCTION WAS PERFORMED, NO PETITION WAS REVIEWED, AND THE PETITIONER'S FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATIONS WERE MET WITH OFFICIAL DENIALS OF DOCUMENTED FACTS.**

***A. The Case Presents a Genuine Dispute of Fact and Law Sufficient to Constitute a Case or Controversy Under Article III.***

Appellant suffered concrete, documented injuries: the loss of over 1,300 pages of court documents prepared at quantifiable expense; the denial of any official response to multiple follow-up inquiries; the effective prevention of Case No. 25-6039 from reaching any justice for review; and the deprivation of Appellant's constitutional right of access to the Supreme Court. These are not hypothetical or speculative injuries. They are established by sworn affidavits, phone records, and mailing service documentation that the district court declined to address.

***B. The Logic of Privilege Cannot Extend to Circumstances Where the Judicial Process Never Commenced.***

For the reasons established in Section I.B above, Case No. 25-6039 never entered any judicial process: no docket entry was created, no clerk acknowledged receipt, and no justice was presented with the petition. As a matter of structure, the immunity rationale for court clerks described in *Sindram*, 986 F.2d at 1461, is grounded in the relationship between a clerk's conduct and an ongoing judicial process. Where the clerk's conduct prevented the commencement of that process,

there is no judicial proceeding to protect. Extending absolute privilege to conduct that destroyed the filing before any judicial act was performed would transform immunity from a doctrine protecting the administration of justice into a doctrine shielding its obstruction.

***C. The Petitioner's Unanswered Follow-Up Communications Confirm the Absence of Any Official Judicial Engagement With Case No. 25-6039.***

As established in Section II.C, a clerk's office performing its quasi-judicial function receives, logs, and notifies parties of receipt or deficiency. The Clerk's Office performed none of those steps with respect to Case No. 25-6039. The complete official silence, in the face of multiple documented contacts, and the subsequent denial by Justice Thomas that any contacts had occurred, are inconsistent with the conduct of an office seeking quasi-judicial immunity for honest administrative error. They are consistent with the conduct alleged in the complaint: a coordinated effort to deny Appellant access to the Court on a matter the Clerk's Office, for reasons never disclosed, declined to process.

**V. THE DISTRICT COURT FAILED TO ADJUDICATE APPELLANT'S DAMAGES CLAIMS, WHICH SURVIVE ANY IMMUNITY DETERMINATION AND REQUIRED INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS.**

***A. The Damages Prayer Was Not Addressed in the Memorandum Opinion.***

The complaint sought four categories of monetary relief: (1) compensatory damages for prejudgment interest on original damages claimed at six percent calculated from the date of the underlying appeal, amounting to \$154,563.63 as of the date of filing; (2) compensatory damages for the direct cost of preparing and mailing over 1,300 pages of court documents lost or destroyed

by the Defendant, in the amount of \$218.17; (3) punitive damages for willful misconduct; and (4) attorneys' fees and costs. Appellant also demanded a trial by jury on all issues so triable. The Memorandum Opinion contains no analysis of any of these claims.

***B. At Minimum, the Direct Loss Claim Survives Any Immunity Determination.***

Even on the assumption, which Appellant contests, that some immunity could apply to some portion of the alleged conduct, the claim for direct out-of-pocket losses attributable to the destruction of the mailing (\$218.17) does not fall within any recognized immunity rationale. Quasi-judicial immunity protects officers from liability arising from the exercise of discretionary adjudicative functions, not from liability for physically destroying property that was lawfully delivered and entrusted to their custody. The direct loss claim is not a challenge to any adjudicative act; it is a claim for the value of property destroyed by persons acting outside the scope of any protected function.

***C. Punitive Damages Are Appropriate Where Willful Misconduct Is Established.***

The complaint alleged that the destruction or concealment of Case No. 25-6039, the denial of Appellant's documented telephone communications, and the invocation of judicial immunity to shield the Clerk's Office's conduct from scrutiny reflected a pattern of willful misconduct directed at preventing Appellant from accessing the Supreme Court on that matter. Where willful misconduct causing injury to a litigant's constitutional rights is established, punitive damages serve the dual purposes of deterrence and acknowledgment of the gravity of the constitutional

violation. The district court's failure to analyze the punitive damages claim, or to explain why it did not survive even on the assumption of partial immunity, is a further basis for remand.

***D. The Discrete Refiling of Claims as Complaint Annexes in District Court and Their Immediate Dismissal Does Not Render Appellant's Damages Claims Moot.***

To the extent that annexes to a complaint filed in district court were discretely repackaged and filed in a higher court and then dismissed on immediate review, that procedural history does not extinguish Appellant's claims for damages arising from those same events. A claim for money damages retains independent vitality and is not rendered moot by a subsequent change in the status of the underlying subject matter of the complaint. The Supreme Court has held that a case becomes moot only when it is impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief to the prevailing party. *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013). Where a concrete claim for compensatory or punitive damages remains live, federal jurisdiction is sustained regardless of intervening events affecting related proceedings. *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.*, 528 U.S. 167, 189-90 (2000). The discrete filing and dismissal of related claims in a parallel or subsequent proceeding does not retroactively eliminate the actionable injury upon which the present damages prayer is grounded. The injury, specifically the destruction or loss of the Case No. 25-6039 filing and the six-month denial of access to the Court that resulted, was complete at the time it occurred. No subsequent procedural event in any other tribunal has undone that injury or compensated Appellant for it. The damages claims therefore survive without regard to the fate of any separately filed complaint addressing the same underlying conduct.

**VI. THE SIX-MONTH LOSS OF THE CERTIORARI PETITION IRREVOCABLY PREJUDICED APPELLANT'S SUPREME COURT PROCEEDINGS, COMPOUNDS**

**THE ORIGINAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS NOT DENIED BY THE GOVERNMENT,  
AND JUSTIFIES THE FULL DAMAGES PRAYER INCLUDING PREJUDGMENT  
INTEREST.**

***A. The Destruction or Loss of Case No. 25-6039 for Approximately Six Months Denied the Supreme Court the Opportunity to Consider Appellant's Constitutional Claims at a Moment When That Review Was Operative and Timely.***

The filing for SCOTUS Case No. 25-6039 was transmitted on May 9, 2025. No docket entry was created, no acknowledgment was issued, and no official response was provided at any point during the ensuing six-month period. During that interval, the petition, and the constitutional claims it presented, was effectively suppressed. The Supreme Court could not act on a petition it did not officially possess. Whatever merits the certiorari petition may have raised, they were not placed before the Court for any consideration, not because any justice reviewed and denied them, but because the filing never entered the Court's adjudicative process.

This six-month suppression was not a neutral administrative interval. It was a period during which statutes of limitations continued to run, underlying proceedings continued to develop, and the legal landscape of the rights claims Appellant sought to vindicate continued to evolve, all without the possibility of Supreme Court intervention that the petition, if processed, might have produced. The loss or destruction of the petition during this period was not recoverable by subsequent refiling on invented terms. A certiorari petition denied after full consideration is an adjudication; a certiorari petition destroyed before consideration is the denial of the right to adjudication itself. The distinction is legally and practically irrevocable.

***B. The Underlying Rights Violations That Formed the Basis of Case No. 25-6039 Were Never Considered by the Supreme Court and Have Not Been Denied by the Government.***

The originating complaint did not assert a manufactured grievance. The certiorari petition in Case No. 25-6039 addressed substantive constitutional and legal claims arising from earlier proceedings, violations that Appellant sought to place before the Supreme Court for review. The Government, in defending the dismissal of the present civil action, did not contest the merits of the underlying rights claims that the lost petition sought to vindicate. The Government's position has been limited to the assertion of immunity for the Clerk's conduct. It has not represented that the rights violations underlying Case No. 25-6039 were without merit or that review would have been denied on the merits.

This is a legally significant omission. Where the government does not contest the substantive merits of the underlying rights violation that a lost filing sought to vindicate, and where the filing was prevented from receiving judicial consideration by the wrongful conduct of a government actor, the causal chain between the wrongful conduct and the deprivation of a remedy is established. The six-month loss of the petition is not merely a procedural irregularity; it is the mechanism by which Appellant was deprived of the specific form of relief, namely Supreme Court consideration of documented constitutional violations, to which the filing process was intended to provide access.

***C. The Six-Month Period of Suppression Directly Justifies the Prejudgment Interest Claimed and Establishes That the Physical Loss of Filings Compounds Rather Than Merely Accompanies the Original Rights Violations.***

Appellant's prayer for damages including prejudgment interest from the original claim is not an independent freestanding damages claim; it reflects prolonged injury caused by the denial of access to the courts. Each day that the certiorari petition sat lost or destroyed without acknowledgment was a day on which the original rights violation went unaddressed, unreviewed, and without the possibility of judicial correction. Prejudgment interest is the legal mechanism for capturing the time value of an unredressed injury, precisely the injury Appellant suffered during the six-month period in which Case No. 25-6039 effectively ceased to exist.

The district court did not address any aspect of the claimed damages. It made no finding that prejudgment interest could not accrue on a rights deprivation caused by the destruction of court filings. It made no finding that the six-month suppression period was legally irrelevant to the damages calculation. It applied absolute immunity and dismissed the entire action without engaging the damages prayer. This complete failure to analyze a quantified, documented claim for damages is an independent basis for reversal.

***D. The Irrevocable Prejudice to the Underlying Proceeding Supports the Conclusion That Absolute Privilege Cannot Apply.***

The immunity doctrine protects officers whose conduct, even if imperfect, contributed to a judicial process. It does not protect intentional conduct that irrevocably extinguished a petitioner's access to the courts before any judicial act was performed. Appellant is aware of no precedent extending absolute immunity to six months of suppression of a certiorari petition where the underlying rights violations were not denied by the government, no judicial function was performed on the affected filing, and the petitioner's documented follow-up communications were officially denied by a

judicial officer acting in an administrative capacity. These facts go materially beyond any immunity doctrine yet applied in this circuit and require adjudication on the merits rather than categorical dismissal.

***E. The Failure to Review Part Two of the Petition in SCOTUS 25-6039 Has Permitted the Destruction of Evidence With Impunity and Rendered FOIA an Ineffective Instrument.***

The certiorari petition in SCOTUS Case No. 25-6039 comprised two distinct parts. Part One addressed the merits of the underlying judicial proceedings. Part Two addressed a factually groundless determination issued by the district court in response to a motion requesting that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) preserve evidence for use in foreign judicial proceedings. That preservation request was grounded in the established principle that a federal court may exercise its equitable authority to order the preservation of documentary evidence held by a domestic agency where the evidence is material to active proceedings before a foreign tribunal and there exists a cognizable risk that the evidence will be destroyed or rendered unavailable if preservation is not ordered. The district court denied the preservation request in a ruling that Appellant submits was without factual foundation and failed to engage the legal standard governing preservation orders in aid of foreign proceedings.

The Supreme Court's inability to consider Part Two of that petition, caused directly by the destruction or loss of the Case No. 25-6039 filing, permitted the factually groundless district court determination to stand without Supreme Court review. That determination was subsequently affirmed on appeal to this Court. The consequence is concrete and ongoing: agency records that were the subject of the preservation request have been, or remain at risk of being, destroyed without judicial accountability. The CIA was not required to preserve records pending review of a ruling

that Appellant submits misapplied the governing legal standard. The affirmance of an erroneous denial of a preservation order, insulated from Supreme Court review by the destruction of the petition in which that denial was challenged, has produced a result indistinguishable from the sanctioned destruction of evidence with impunity.

The collateral consequence for Freedom of Information Act practice is equally significant. FOIA requests directed at the same agency records that were the subject of the preservation motion are rendered an ineffective instrument where the records sought are not preserved. A FOIA request can compel disclosure of records that exist; it cannot reconstitute records that have been destroyed. Where an agency is relieved of any preservation obligation by a court order, affirmed on appeal, that the requesting party had challenged in a petition that was prevented by government conduct from reaching the Supreme Court, the FOIA process provides no meaningful remedy. The government's ability to allow the destruction of records that a petitioner had sought to preserve, and that a petitioner had sought to place before the Supreme Court by means of a petition that was itself destroyed, represents a compounded deprivation of rights for which this Court's intervention on the immunity and damages questions is particularly warranted.

**VII. DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE WAS AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION WHERE SUBSTANTIVE CLAIMS WERE NOT ADJUDICATED AND LEAVE TO AMEND WAS NOT GRANTED TO A PRO SE LITIGANT.**

A dismissal with prejudice operates as a final judgment on the merits and bars relitigation of the same claims. *Semtek Int'l Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 531 U.S. 497, 505 (2001). It is appropriate only where the court has actually evaluated and resolved the substantive claims presented, or where the defects in the complaint are incurable. Where a court dismisses by applying

a threshold immunity doctrine without reaching the merits, dismissal without prejudice, or with leave to amend, is the appropriate disposition.

The district court here did not adjudicate Appellant's claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503 and 1702, did not analyze the constitutional claims under the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments, made no reference to the civil rights conspiracy claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1985, and did not address the damages prayer. Applying a terminal disposition, specifically dismissal with prejudice, to claims that were never examined on their merits is an abuse of discretion.

Courts are required to afford pro se litigants an opportunity to amend their pleadings before dismissing with prejudice, particularly where the complaint raises cognizable allegations that might be clarified or supplemented. *Castro v. United States*, 540 U.S. 375, 381-82 (2003). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) provides that leave to amend shall be freely given when justice so requires. The district court dismissed Appellant's complaint with prejudice without providing any opportunity to amend. No prejudice to the Defendant, no undue delay, and no prior amendment counsel against this relief. The record presents a first complaint dismissed without prior opportunity to amend, in a case involving documented loss of a certiorari petition and alleged criminal conduct by court personnel.

#### **VIII. THE DISTRICT COURT'S OPINION PRESENTS AN APPEARANCE OF NON-INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATION THAT WARRANTS VACATUR AND REMAND.**

Appellant's Motion for Reconsideration submitted as Appendix 'A' a Plagiarism Analysis Report documenting substantial verbatim and structural duplication between the district court's February

9, 2026 Memorandum Opinion and a prior decision, *Lewis v. United States District Court*, issued only six days earlier. The duplicated framework addresses routine administrative processing of court filings and absolute immunity in that context. As Appellant demonstrated, the analytical structure, case citations, and reasoning of the Wilson opinion substantially reproduced the Lewis framework without attribution and without engagement with the distinct claims raised in this case.

Judicial independence requires individualized consideration of the claims presented in each proceeding. When a published opinion employs an apparently copied analytical structure to resolve a claim without engaging the pleaded allegations that distinguish it from the template case (namely the simultaneous filing comparison, the Justice Thomas communications denial, and the conspiracy allegations), a legitimate question arises as to whether the adjudication was conducted on the claims actually presented. This Court's supervisory authority over district court proceedings provides an independent basis to vacate and remand for independent consideration of the distinct claims in this matter.

#### **IX. PARTIAL OR ALTERNATIVE RELIEF IS WARRANTED TO PRESERVE NON-IMMUNITY CLAIMS AND TO DEVELOP THE RECORD.**

Even if this Court were to conclude that some portion of the alleged conduct is protected by absolute or quasi-judicial immunity, the claims based on selective recognition of Case No. 25-6039, the conspiracy claim arising from Justice Thomas's denial of documented communications, and the direct loss damages claim all survive any categorical immunity determination and require independent adjudication on remand. Should the Court conclude that the factual record requires further development, the appropriate remedy is remand with instructions to permit limited

discovery on the scope-of-function and intent questions raised by the complaint. If the Court determines that the complaint contains curable deficiencies, the proper disposition is vacatur of the dismissal with prejudice and remand with leave to amend pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff-Appellant Allan Douglas Wilson respectfully requests that this Court:

(1) Vacate the district court's February 9, 2026 Memorandum Opinion and Order dismissing this action with prejudice;

(2) Remand with instructions to conduct the fact-specific functional immunity analysis required by *Forrester v. White*, and to independently adjudicate Appellant's claims arising from the selective non-recognition of SCOTUS Case No. 25-6039, the conspiracy claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1985 grounded in Justice Thomas's denial of documented communications and invocation of judicial immunity on behalf of the Clerk's Office, the statutory claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503 and 1702, and the constitutional claims under the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments;

(3) Direct the district court to adjudicate Appellant's full damages prayer in light of the irrevocable prejudice caused to the underlying Supreme Court proceedings by the six-month loss and destruction of Case No. 25-6039, during which the underlying rights violations, not denied by the Government, received no judicial consideration, including the direct loss claim of \$218.17, prejudgment interest of \$154,563.63 accrued from the date of the underlying appeal, punitive damages for willful misconduct, and legal costs, and to preserve Appellant's right to a jury trial on all issues so triable;

(4) In the alternative, remand with instructions to permit Appellant to file an amended complaint and to conduct limited discovery on the scope-of-function and intent issues bearing on the immunity determination;

(5) Direct that any dismissal entered on remand be entered without prejudice; and

(6) Grant such other relief as this Court deems just and proper, including consideration of costs allowable under applicable appellate rules.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Allan Douglas Wilson

Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellant

1321 Upland Drive, STE 21311

Houston, Texas 77043

(713) 363-3006

wilson.allan.d@gmail.com

Dated: May 22, 2026

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the date indicated above, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Brief of Appellant to be served by way of ECF through the Clerk of Court at the address of record:

Office of the Solicitor General  
United States Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001



---

Allan Douglas Wilson

Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellant

**APPENDIX**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIX**

Appendix A: Motion for Reconsideration, February 12, 2026 ..... A-1  
Appendix B: Plagiarism Analysis Report ..... A-2  
Appendix C: District Court Memorandum Opinion and Order, February 9, 2026 ..... A-3  
Appendix D: Affidavit of Mailing (Exhibit ‘A’ to Complaint) ..... A-4  
Appendix E: Phone Records Documenting Calls to Clerk's Office and Justice Thomas (Exhibit ‘C’) ..... A-5  
Appendix F: Letterstream Mailing Service Records Job Nos. 11435407 [acknowledged received]; 11591493 [unacknowledged by receiver]; 12011530 [unacknowledged by receiver] (Exhibit ‘D’) ..... A-6  
Appendix G: SCOTUS Case Nos. 24-7506 & 25-6039 Docket Confirmations ..... A-7

Note: Pursuant to D.C. Cir. Rule 30, the documents comprising this Appendix are attached hereto in the order listed above. Relevant portions of the designated record are reproduced as set forth in the separate Deferred Appendix or such other form as the Court may direct. Appellant respectfully moves the Court to accept this Appendix in its current form given Appellant's pro se status and the nature of the record, which consists primarily of documentary exhibits to the complaint and post-judgment motions filed in the proceedings below.

Dated: May 22, 2026



Allan Douglas Wilson

Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellant

**A-1**

APPENDIX 'A'

Civil Action

No. 26-17 (UNA)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

ALLAN DOUGLAS WILSON,

Plaintiff,

and

CLERK, SUPREME COURT OF THE

UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Plaintiff Allan Douglas Wilson, proceeding *pro se*, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to reconsider and vacate its Memorandum Opinion dated February 9, 2026 (ECF No. 4), which dismissed this action with prejudice. The dismissal was based on a misapprehension of the facts, failure to address all claims presented, misapplication of immunity doctrine, and constitutional error. This Motion is supported by the attached Plagiarism Analysis Report, submitted as Appendix "A."

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

**I. STANDARD FOR RECONSIDERATION AND GROUNDS WARRANTING RELIEF**

Reconsideration is appropriate where the Court has (1) "patently misunderstood a party," (2) made "a decision outside the adversarial issues presented," (3) made "an error not of reasoning but of apprehension," or (4) where there is "a controlling or significant change in the law or facts." *Cobell v.*

**RECEIVED**

FEB 11 2026

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

*Norton*, 334 F.3d 1128, 1139 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (quoting *Above the Belt, Inc. v. Mel Bohannan Roofing, Inc.*, 99 F.R.D. 99, 101 (E.D. Va. 1983)). The Court has “broad discretion” in deciding whether to grant reconsideration. *Powell v. Symons*, 680 F.3d 301, 312 (3d Cir. 2012) but must correct clear errors affecting the integrity of adjudication.

Reconsideration is warranted because the Court’s dismissal reflects a material misapprehension of Plaintiff’s claims, failure to adjudicate substantive statutory and constitutional allegations, and reliance on an opinion whose analytical framework substantially reproduces a prior decision without attribution. Appendix “A” demonstrates that the February 9, 2026 Memorandum Opinion incorporates substantial verbatim and structural duplication from *Lewis v. United States District Court*, issued six days earlier, with supplemental authority drawn from *Windsor v. Harris*. The duplicated framework addresses routine administrative processing of filings and absolute immunity in that context.

The instant case presents multiple grounds warranting reconsideration: the Court patently misunderstood Plaintiff’s complaint, addressed only one issue while ignoring substantive constitutional and criminal claims, and committed an error of apprehension by failing to recognize the evidentiary record and factual allegations demonstrating acts beyond official duties not subject to immunity.

#### **IA. THE ORDER TO DISMISS PROPOSES NO ORIGINAL LEGAL VALUE**

The Order to Dismiss has no legal validity for reasons cited in the Plagiarism Analysis Report appended hereto. The textual and structural identity between the Wilson opinion and *Lewis*, combined with the absence of analysis addressing Plaintiff’s pleaded criminal and constitutional claims, supports the conclusion that Plaintiff’s claims were characterized to fit a preexisting immunity template rather than adjudicated on their own terms.

Plaintiff’s Complaint did not allege mere processing delay or clerical error. It alleged destruction or loss of federal mail, obstruction of justice, denial of constitutional access to the courts, conspiracy, and

conduct outside the lawful scope of official duties. Those claims were supported by sworn evidence and statutory citations. The Memorandum Opinion reframed the action as a single issue involving processing of filings and adjudicated only that narrowed issue.

Because the February 9, 2026 decision is a published judicial opinion disseminated through public legal research platforms, the reasoning it contains affects public confidence in judicial independence. A published opinion that immunizes alleged illegal conduct through adoption of a copied analytical framework without addressing pleaded statutory claims gives rise to reasonable apprehension that institutional considerations displaced fair adjudication.

#### **IB. PRETEXTUAL NARROWING OF CLAIMS TO FIT A PREEXISTING IMMUNITY FRAMEWORK**

Appendix “A” documents that the Wilson opinion reproduces the analytical structure, case citations, and reasoning of *Lewis* in substantial part. The *Lewis* decision addressed administrative processing issues. By characterizing Plaintiff’s claims as limited to processing failure, the Wilson opinion placed this action within the precise analytical confines of the copied framework.

This narrowing avoided adjudication of allegations concerning destruction of federal mail and obstruction of justice. The effect was to force claims involving alleged illegal and unconstitutional conduct into a framework designed to immunize routine administrative acts. Wilson’s claims appear to be characterized as a single issue for adjudication to fit the plagiarized decision in *Lewis* and ignored substantive claims as a pretext for dismissal. The impugned decision established immunity outside of judicial authority only by forcing claims involving illegal and unconstitutional acts by the Clerk’s office into a plagiarized framework.

Absolute immunity applies only to acts integral to the judicial process. It does not extend to conduct outside jurisdiction or outside the scope of official duties. Where alleged acts include criminal conduct,

a threshold scope-of-function analysis is required before immunity attaches. That analysis does not appear in the Memorandum Opinion.

### **IC. APPREHENSION OF BIAS AND PUBLIC CONCERN ARISING FROM A PUBLISHED DECISION**

Judicial decisions are published when made publicly available through court systems and widely disseminated through legal research databases. The February 9, 2026 Memorandum Opinion is such a published decision.

Appendix “A” demonstrates substantial unattributed duplication from prior decisions. When a published opinion employs a copied analytical structure to immunize alleged illegal acts without engaging pleaded statutory claims, it creates an appearance that adjudication was not independently conducted.

Judicial independence requires individualized consideration of claims. A published decision that appears constructed from prior immunity templates while omitting analysis of criminal and constitutional allegations reasonably contributes to apprehension that bias toward judicial officers influenced the outcome. Biases represented in a published decision are a public concern and contradict the idea of an independent judiciary. Such apprehension is a matter of public concern because published opinions contribute to the body of precedent and shape public confidence in the judiciary.

### **II. THE COURT MISAPPREHENDED THE FACTS AND FAILED TO CONSIDER ALL EVIDENCE**

The Court’s dismissal characterizes Plaintiff’s claims as arising solely from the Clerk’s “alleged ‘failure to properly receive, process, and acknowledge [his] lawfully mailed court filings.’” ECF No. 4 at 2. This description fundamentally misapprehends the nature and scope of Plaintiff’s claims as set forth in the Complaint and supporting evidence.

First, Plaintiff's Complaint alleges not a simple failure to process, but the destruction or loss of federal mail (specifically, one of two boxes containing over 1,300 pages of court documents sent via first-class U.S. Mail on May 9, 2025). ECF No. 1 at 6-7. The Complaint alleges Plaintiff sent eleven copies of a revised certiorari petition after receiving a notice requiring correction, confirmed that only one box was received, and received no acknowledgment of the missing box despite multiple attempts to contact the Clerk's office. *Id.*

Second, the Complaint includes an Affidavit of Mailing (Exhibit A), which establishes that Plaintiff properly mailed the documents through Letterstream mailing service via U.S. First Class Mail, and that there were no reported mail service disruptions during the relevant period. The affidavit evidences a subsequent mailing that also remained unacknowledged by the Clerk's office. This sworn evidence, which the Court failed to address, demonstrates that the materials were lawfully deposited in the mail and should have been received and acknowledged in both instances.

Third, the Complaint alleges multiple attempts to contact the Clerk's office and obtain confirmation of receipt, which went unacknowledged. The Court's dismissal fails to address this pattern of conduct, instead treating the matter as a single isolated incident.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), the Court must accept all factual allegations in the complaint as true and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). The Court failed to do so here, instead minimizing well-pleaded factual allegations supported by sworn evidence.

## **IIA. MISAPPREHENSION OF CLAIMS AND FAILURE TO ADJUDICATE SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

The Memorandum Opinion characterized Plaintiff's claims as arising from an alleged failure to properly receive and process filings. The Complaint, however, alleged destruction or loss of federal mail

supported by sworn affidavit, obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. § 1503, violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1702, denial of constitutional access to the courts, and conspiracy under 42 U.S.C. § 1985.

The Court did not analyze whether destruction of mail constitutes conduct outside the scope of official duties. It did not address the statutory claims cited. It did not conduct the functional analysis required under *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988), which mandates examination of the nature of the specific act performed.

Instead, the opinion applied a categorical immunity framework materially identical to that used in *Lewis*, as detailed in Appendix “A.” The absence of individualized analysis indicates that the claims were treated as interchangeable with those in *Lewis*.

### **III. THE COURT FAILED TO ADDRESS CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS AND CRIMINAL CONDUCT OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF IMMUNITY**

#### **A. Destruction of Federal Mail Is a Criminal Act Outside Official Duties**

The alleged destruction or loss of Plaintiff’s mailed certiorari petition constitutes a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1702, which makes it a federal crime to take or destroy mail matter. The destruction of federal mail is *not* within the official duties of a court clerk, whose responsibilities are limited to receiving, processing, and filing documents properly submitted to the court.

Absolute immunity does not extend to criminal acts or conduct outside the scope of official duties.

*Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 227-29 (1988) (immunity applies only to acts performed in a judicial capacity); *Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991) (per curiam) (absolute immunity does not apply to non-judicial administrative acts). Destroying mail is not a judicial function (it is a criminal act).

The Supreme Court has emphasized that absolute immunity is *functional*, not status-based: “The relevant inquiry is the *nature* of the function performed, not the identity of the actor who performed it.”

*Forrester*, 484 U.S. at 229. Destroying court filings serves no legitimate judicial function and cannot be characterized as an act “integral to the judicial process.”

#### B. Obstruction of Justice Falls Outside Immunity

Plaintiff’s Complaint alleges obstruction of justice through the willful destruction or concealment of court filings and the denial of access to the courts. ECF No. 1 at 8-9. Obstruction of justice is a criminal offense under 18 U.S.C. § 1503, and such conduct cannot be shielded by judicial immunity.

The D.C. Circuit has held that “immunity is not intended to insulate corrupt or malicious acts designed to frustrate the judicial process.” *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1461 (D.C. Cir. 1993). While the Court correctly notes that immunity extends even to erroneous acts, *id.*, it does not extend to acts that are not merely erroneous but *criminal and obstructive*.

#### C. Denial of Constitutional Rights to Due Process and Access to Courts

The Complaint alleges violations of Plaintiff’s Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to due process and access to the courts. ECF No. 1 at 8-9. The Supreme Court has long recognized that “[t]he right of access to the courts is indeed but one aspect of the right of petition.” *California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited*, 404 U.S. 508, 510 (1972).

When a court official’s conduct (whether through destruction of filings, refusal to acknowledge receipt, or conspiracy to deny access) deprives a litigant of the ability to have claims heard, constitutional injury occurs. The Court’s blanket application of immunity without addressing these constitutional claims was error of law.

#### D. Conspiracy and Coordination to Deny Constitutional Rights

The Complaint alleges a conspiracy to deny constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1985, evidenced by a pattern of coordinated conduct between court officials. The facts in the Complaint suggest a conspiracy perpetuating the denial of constitutional claims by the lower courts.

Specifically, the Complaint alleges that Associate Justice Clarence Thomas acted on behalf of the Clerk in denying receipt of the petition, suggesting coordination or conspiracy to prevent Plaintiff's access to the Court. ECF No. 1 at 7. The involvement of Associate Justice Clarence Thomas performing functions as a Clerk's Office employee was never questioned in the ruling. Thomas was apparently being instructed by another party during the phone call with Wilson denying receipt of filings. The scenario was staged to use Thomas' judicial immunity to preempt any liability of the Court Clerk in Thomas' constitutional denial of due process.

Such allegations implicate both the Clerk and judicial officers in conduct that goes beyond simple administrative error to systematic denial of constitutional rights. The Court did not address whether these coordinated actions constitute conspiracy under Section 1985, nor whether such coordination removes the conduct from the protective sphere of absolute immunity.

As Plaintiff alleged in the underlying Complaint, the pattern of conduct suggests coordination between court officials to deny Plaintiff's access to justice: (1) initial return of petition with required corrections; (2) unexplained loss of corrected submission; (3) refusal to acknowledge receipt of subsequent mailing or respond to inquiries; (4) eventual discrete filing from exhibits of subsequent action; (5) swift denial of certiorari; and (6) dismissal with prejudice of civil complaint alleging these violations. This pattern warrants closer scrutiny rather than summary dismissal.

#### **IV. IMMUNITY DOES NOT APPLY TO ACTS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF OFFICIAL DUTIES**

The Court's reliance on *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459 (D.C. Cir. 1993), and related cases is misplaced because those cases involved routine administrative errors or judgment calls in the ordinary course of processing filings. The instant case involves allegations of *intentional destruction* of mail and *obstruction of justice* (conduct that falls entirely outside the scope of a clerk's official duties).

Under the Westfall Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d), federal employees receive immunity only for acts within the scope of their employment. The Westfall Act explicitly provides that employees acting outside the scope of their employment do not receive substitution of the United States as defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(2). The alleged conduct here (destruction of federal mail and obstruction of justice) is criminal in nature and therefore falls outside the scope of official duties.

The Supreme Court has made clear that “courts must engage in a fact-specific inquiry to determine whether a challenged action is the kind of act that is properly attributable to the sovereign.” *Bender v. Williamsport Area Sch. Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 543 (1986). The Court here made no such fact-specific inquiry, instead treating all allegations as routine processing matters despite their criminal nature.

#### **V. APPEARANCE OF BIAS AND INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS**

While Plaintiff does not allege actual bias, the Court’s institutional relationship to the Defendant raises concerns about the appearance of impartiality. The Supreme Court and federal district courts are part of the same judicial system, and judges within this system have professional relationships with Supreme Court officials.

The appearance of impropriety is heightened when a district court dismisses claims against a Supreme Court official on immunity grounds without addressing the merits of criminal and constitutional allegations. This creates a reasonable apprehension of preferential treatment.

The Code of Conduct for United States Judges, Canon 2, requires that “[a] judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities.” While institutional relationships alone do not establish actual bias, the Court’s failure to address substantive allegations, combined with the institutional connections, contributes to reasonable apprehension of bias warranting reconsideration.

#### **VA. EVOLUTION OF STARE DECISIS AND PROGRESSIVE EROSION OF ACCOUNTABILITY**

The stare decisis has evolved from denied ability to compel certiorari review through the clerk's office in *Fuller v. Harris*, 258 F. Supp. 3d 204, 207 (D.D.C. 2017) to barring accountability of the Court Clerk for delays and denials of motions and petitions in *Windsor v. Harris*, 23-cv-03929, to the current denial where the Court clerk cannot even be held accountable for unilaterally throwing out complaints without prior review. The framework established by the courts through this progression has rendered the court clerk and other court staff immune for illegal acts which are also patently unconstitutional.

These three cases illustrate protection for the same court clerk that denies any accountability for all actions including illegal acts which inherently lack jurisdiction. Immunity for court staff only goes so far and although malicious court actions prejudicial to complainants have generally been tolerated by the courts, it crosses the line when illegal acts denying constitutional rights are immunized.

#### **VI. DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE WAS IMPROPER BECAUSE THE COURT FAILED TO ADJUDICATE ALL CLAIMS**

A dismissal with prejudice is appropriate only when the court has actually adjudicated the claims on the merits. *Semtek Int'l Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 531 U.S. 497 (2001). Here, the Court addressed only the issue of absolute immunity without considering:

1. Whether the alleged destruction of federal mail constitutes criminal conduct under 18 U.S.C. § 1702 outside the scope of immunity;
2. Whether the alleged obstruction of justice violates 18 U.S.C. § 1503;
3. Whether the denial of access to courts violates the First Amendment right to petition and Fifth Amendment due process;
4. The alleged coordination between the Clerk and judicial officers constituting conspiracy to deny constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1985;

5. Proper analysis of the Westfall Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d) applying to acts allegedly falling outside the scope of official duties;
6. Whether the compensatory damages sought for the 6% prejudgment interest on lost opportunity (\$154,563.63) and for the cost of destroyed materials (\$218.17) are recoverable even if immunity applies to certain claims.

Because the Court failed to address these substantive claims, the dismissal cannot be considered an adjudication on the merits. Dismissal with prejudice requires adjudication on the merits. Because the Court did not analyze the statutory and constitutional claims pleaded, dismissal with prejudice was premature. At minimum, dismissal should have been without prejudice to allow Plaintiff to pursue claims that are not barred by immunity or to amend the complaint to address any pleading deficiencies.

## **VII. THE COURT'S BROAD APPLICATION OF IMMUNITY CONFLICTS WITH SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT**

While the Court correctly states that absolute immunity extends to tasks “integral to the judicial process,” the Court’s application of this principle contradicts controlling Supreme Court authority requiring a functional analysis of the specific conduct at issue.

In *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988), the Supreme Court rejected a categorical approach to immunity, emphasizing that “the relevant inquiry is the nature of the function performed, not the identity of the actor.” *Id.* at 229. The Court must examine whether the *specific acts alleged* (destruction of mail, obstruction of justice, denial of constitutional rights) are judicial in nature.

They are not. Throwing court filings in the dumpster (which Plaintiff’s evidence suggests occurred) serves no judicial function. It is not comparable to errors in processing filings, which the cases cited by the Court appropriately shield. Rather, it is deliberate destruction of evidence and obstruction of access to courts.

The Court's citation to *Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991), for the proposition that immunity cannot be overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice, is inapposite. *Mirales* involved a judge's decision in a case (an inherently judicial act). *Id.* at 11. Here, Plaintiff does not challenge a judicial decision; Plaintiff challenges the *destruction of materials that prevented any decision from being made*.

Moreover, even the cases cited by the Court acknowledge limits to immunity. *Sindram* noted that immunity protects against claims arising from the "receipt and processing" of filings, 986 F.2d at 1460, but said nothing about immunity for *destruction* of filings. There is a fundamental difference between negligent processing errors (protected) and intentional destruction (not protected).

#### **VIII. PRO SE COMPLAINTS MUST BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED**

Courts must construe *pro se* complaints liberally and hold them to "less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). This principle requires courts to interpret *pro se* pleadings to raise the strongest arguments they suggest. *Brown v. Bargery*, 207 F.3d 863, 866 (6th Cir. 2000).

The Court failed to apply this standard. Rather than construing the Complaint to raise claims of criminal conduct, constitutional violations, and acts outside the scope of immunity, the Court reduced all allegations to a simple "failure to properly receive, process, and acknowledge" filings. ECF No. 4 at 2. This characterization ignores the substantive allegations of destruction, obstruction, and denial of rights clearly set forth in the Complaint.

At minimum, before dismissing with prejudice, the Court should have provided Plaintiff an opportunity to amend the Complaint to clarify any perceived pleading deficiencies. *Castro v. United States*, 540 U.S. 375, 381-82 (2003) (noting courts should provide leave to amend before dismissal, particularly for *pro se* litigants).

## CONCLUSION

The Court's dismissal order reflects a fundamental error of apprehension regarding the nature of Plaintiff's claims and the evidence supporting them. The alleged conduct falls outside the scope of acts protected by absolute immunity. The Court failed to address substantive criminal and constitutional claims, failed to apply the functional immunity analysis required by *Forrester* and its progeny, and failed to liberally construe Plaintiff's *pro se* pleading as required by law.

The Order to Dismiss has no legal validity for reasons cited in the Plagiarism Analysis Report, fails to resolve the issues in the Complaint, and does not constitute adjudication on the merits with exercise of jurisdiction immunizing illegal and unconstitutional acts falling outside of judicial authority (referenced in *Sindram*). Although the acts cited in the Complaint are of a criminal nature, there is an obligation to address them as claimed damages in a civil proceeding.

Moreover, dismissal with prejudice was inappropriate because the Court did not actually adjudicate the claims raised. As a basic consideration, dismissal should have been without prejudice, or the Court should have provided leave to amend.

For these reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court reconsider its February 9, 2026 Memorandum Opinion, vacate the dismissal with prejudice, and either (1) set aside the motion to dismiss and allow this case to proceed, or (2) dismiss without prejudice with leave to amend.

Respectfully submitted,



Allan Douglas Wilson

Plaintiff (*pro se*)

1321 Upland Drive, STE 21311

Houston, Texas 77043 USA

(713) 363-3006

wilson.allan.d@gmail.com

DATED: February 12, 2026

**A-2**

# PLAGIARISM ANALYSIS REPORT

## Comparative Analysis of Judicial Opinions

Lewis v. United States District Court (Feb. 3, 2026) and Wilson v. Clerk, Supreme Court (Feb. 9, 2026)

This report is submitted as Appendix "A" to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. The Motion argues that substantive statutory and constitutional claims were not adjudicated. The duplication documented herein is relevant because the analytical framework used in Wilson corresponds to the framework used in Lewis, which addressed routine administrative processing of filings.

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents substantial plagiarism in *Wilson v. Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States*, Civil Action No. 26-17 (dated February 9, 2026), which reproduces extensive content from two prior judicial opinions without attribution: *Lewis v. United States District Court for the District of Columbia*, Civil Action No. 25-4533 (dated February 3, 2026, Judge Loren L. Alikhan), and *Windsor v. Harris*, Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-03929 (dated April 15, 2024, Judge Tanya S. Chutkan).

The Wilson opinion copies approximately 65% of its substantive legal analysis from Lewis (issued six days earlier by the same judge) and draws additional key citations from Windsor. The copying includes identical case citations, phraseology, sentence structure, and substantive footnotes, all without attribution. This pattern demonstrates systematic unattributed borrowing from multiple sources.

## II. BACKGROUND

Wilson was issued six days after Lewis by the same court and judge. Lewis concerned claims arising from administrative handling of filings. Wilson involved allegations that, as reflected in the Motion for Reconsideration, included destruction or loss of mailed filings, statutory violations, and constitutional claims. The Wilson opinion framed the case as involving alleged failure to properly receive and process filings and applied an absolute immunity framework identical to that used in Lewis.

## III. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION

### A. Source Document (Earlier Opinion)

**Case Name:** *Lewis v. United States District Court for the District of Columbia, et al.*

**Case Number:** Civil Action No. 25-4533 (UNA)

**Court:** United States District Court for the District of Columbia

**Judge:** Hon. Loren L. Alikhan

**Date:** February 3, 2026

### B. Derivative Document (Later Opinion)

**Case Name:** *Wilson v. Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States*

**Case Number:** Civil Action No. 26-17 (UNA)

**Court:** United States District Court for the District of Columbia

**Judge:** Hon. Loren L. Alikhan

**Date:** February 9, 2026

**Time Differential:** 6 days after Lewis

### **C. Additional Source Document**

**Case Name:** *Windsor v. Scott S. Harris, et al.*

**Case Number:** Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-03929 (UNA)

**Court:** United States District Court for the District of Columbia

**Judge:** Hon. Tanya S. Chutkan

**Date:** April 15, 2024

**Time Differential:** 22 months before Wilson; also preceded Lewis by 21 months

## **IV. DETAILED ANALYSIS OF PLAGIARIZED CONTENT**

The Wilson opinion systematically reproduces legal analysis from both Lewis and Windsor without any attribution, acknowledgment, or citation. The bulk of the copying (approximately 65% of substantive analysis) derives from Lewis, while key citations originate from Windsor. This pattern reveals unattributed borrowing from multiple judicial sources. The two source document citations comprise all major legal citations used in the Wilson dismissal aside from reference to the factual matter of complaint in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal* quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly* ( 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

### **A. Verbatim Copying of Core Legal Principles**

#### **1. Absolute Judicial Immunity Framework**

**Lewis (Source - Feb. 3, 2026):**

*"As an initial matter, courts and judges are absolutely immune from suits arising from their official actions. Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978)."*

**Wilson (Derivative - Feb. 9, 2026):**

*"As general matter, courts and judges are absolutely immune from suits arising from their official actions. Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978)."*

**Analysis:** The Wilson opinion reproduces this foundational principle with only a trivial variation ("As general matter" vs. "As an initial matter"). The identical case citations with pinpoint citations demonstrate copying beyond mere citation of controlling authority.

#### **2. Extension of Immunity to Court Staff**

**Lewis (Source):**

*"Absolute judicial immunity also extends to court staff in the performance of 'tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.' Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); see Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct., No. 10-CV-910, 2010 WL 2363678, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court staff are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the 'receipt and processing of a litigant's filings')"*

**Wilson (Derivative):**

*"This immunity extends to court staff in the performance of 'tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.' Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); see Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct., No. 10-CV-910, 2010*

*WL 2363678, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court staff are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the 'receipt and processing of a litigant's filings')*"

**Analysis:** The Wilson opinion copies the entire sentence structure, legal reasoning, case citations (including full parenthetical explanations), and even the internal quotation marks. The only difference is substituting "This immunity" for "Absolute judicial immunity also."

### 3. Complete Citation String

**Both opinions continue:**

*"aff'd sub nom., Jones v. Sup. Ct. of U.S., 405 F. App'x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam), aff'd, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011); Thomas v. Wilkins, 61 F. Supp. 3d 13, 19 (D.D.C. 2014) (dismissing claims against a court employee based on her handling of court submissions), aff'd, No. 14-5197, 2015 WL 1606933 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 23, 2015)."*

**Analysis:** This complete citation string, including subsequent history and parenthetical explanations, is identical in both opinions. The specificity of the citations (including unpublished dispositions and WestLaw citations) demonstrates copying of research and writing, not independent legal analysis.

### 4. Immunity Scope and Application

**Lewis (Source):**

*"Court staff are immune even if they err in performing those tasks. Sindram, 986 F.2d at 1461 (holding that the issuance of an erroneous order barring a litigant from access to the court was an 'integral part[] of the judicial process')."*

**Wilson (Derivative):**

*"Court staff are immune even if they err in performing those tasks, Sindram, 986 F.2d at 1461"*

**Analysis:** While Wilson truncates the parenthetical from Sindram, the core sentence and pinpoint citation remain identical, demonstrating direct copying of legal reasoning.

### 5. Citation Borrowed from Windsor (2024)

**Windsor (Source - April 15, 2024):**

*"see also Mireles, 502 U.S. at 11 ('[J]udicial immunity is not overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice.')*"

**Wilson (Derivative - Feb. 9, 2026):**

*"and this immunity cannot be overcome 'by allegations of bad faith or malice,' Mirales v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991)."*

**Lewis:** Does not contain this Mireles citation

**Analysis:** The Mireles citation with the "bad faith or malice" quotation appears in Windsor and Wilson but not in Lewis. This demonstrates that Wilson drew from multiple sources. Windsor extensively cites Mireles v. Waco throughout its opinion (appearing four times), including the specific point that immunity is not overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice. Wilson reproduces this principle and citation without acknowledging Windsor as the source. (Note: Wilson citation misspells the case as "Mirales.")

## B. Structural and Organizational Copying

Beyond verbatim text copying, the Wilson opinion replicates the analytical structure of Lewis:

1. Opening with absolute immunity of courts and judges (Forrester and Stump citations);

2. Extending immunity to court staff (Sindram and Jones citations);
3. Including Thomas v. Wilkins citation with identical parenthetical and subsequent history;
4. Noting immunity applies even when staff err (Sindram);
5. Application to facts of case.

This organizational parallel reveals that Wilson not only copied language but also adopted Lewis's entire analytical framework and legal research without acknowledgment.

### **C. Pattern of Multi-Source Borrowing**

The Wilson opinion's citation profile reveals systematic borrowing from two noted sources:

#### **From Lewis (Feb. 3, 2026):**

- Forrester v. White and Stump v. Sparkman (opening immunity principle)
- Sindram v. Suda framework on staff immunity
- Complete Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct. citation string with appellate history
- Thomas v. Wilkins with identical parenthetical
- Substantive footnote 2 on with-prejudice dismissals (Fournerat v. Higgins)

#### **From Windsor (April 15, 2024):**

- Mireles v. Waco citation on bad faith/malice (not present in Lewis)
- Sindram v. Suda reference at 1460 (shared with both sources)

This demonstrates that the Wilson opinion was constructed by combining legal authorities from multiple prior judicial opinions in similar cases, assembling them without attribution into what appears to be original legal analysis. Every major citation used to dismiss the Wilson case derives from one of these two published sources.

### **D. Identical Substantive Footnote**

#### **Both opinions contain:**

*Footnote 2: "Dismissals on the basis of absolute immunity are with prejudice. See Fournerat v. Higgins, No. 24-CV-2520, 2024 WL 4528973, at \*1 (D.D.C. Oct. 18, 2024)."*

**Analysis:** This footnote is substantive legal authority supporting the with-prejudice dismissal. Wilson reproduces it word-for-word, including the specific case citation, demonstrating that even supporting legal authorities were copied wholesale.

### **E. Complete Absence of Attribution to Either Source**

The Wilson opinion contains no indication that substantial portions were derived from Lewis or that key citations originated in Windsor. Standard judicial practice when borrowing from prior opinions includes phrases such as:

- "As this Court recently held in Lewis..."
- "For the reasons stated in Lewis v. United States District Court and Windsor v. Harris..."
- "See Lewis v. United States District Court, Civil Action No. 25-4533 (D.D.C. Feb. 3, 2026); Windsor v. Harris, Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-03929 (D.D.C. Apr. 15, 2024)"

- "Cf. [citation]" or parenthetical cross-references

No such attribution appears in Wilson. The opinion presents the copied material as if it were original analysis conducted specifically for the Wilson case, despite drawing its legal framework from Lewis and supplementing it with citations from Windsor.

## V. COMPARATIVE TABLE OF PLAGIARIZED PASSAGES

The following table documents specific instances of verbatim or near-verbatim copying:

Element	Lewis (Source)	Wilson (Derivative)
<b>Opening Principle</b>	<i>"As an initial matter, courts and judges are absolutely immune..."</i>	<i>"As general matter, courts and judges are absolutely immune..."</i>
<b>Case Citations</b>	<i>Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978)</i>	<i>Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978) [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Staff Immunity</b>	<i>"Absolute judicial immunity also extends to court staff in the performance of 'tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.'"</i>	<i>"This immunity extends to court staff in the performance of 'tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process.'"</i>
<b>Sindram Citation</b>	<i>Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993)</i>	<i>Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993) [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Jones Citation</b>	<i>Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct., No. 10-CV-910, 2010 WL 2363678, at *1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court staff are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the "receipt and processing of a litigant's filings")</i>	<i>Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct., No. 10-CV-910, 2010 WL 2363678, at *1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court staff are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the "receipt and processing of a litigant's filings") [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Subsequent History</b>	<i>aff'd sub nom., Jones v. Sup. Ct. of U.S., 405 F. App'x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam), aff'd, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011)</i>	<i>aff'd sub nom., Jones v. Sup. Ct. of U.S., 405 F. App'x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam), aff'd, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011) [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Thomas Citation</b>	<i>Thomas v. Wilkins, 61 F. Supp. 3d 13, 19 (D.D.C. 2014) (dismissing claims against a court employee based on her handling of court submissions), aff'd, No. 14-5197, 2015 WL 1606933 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 23, 2015)</i>	<i>Thomas v. Wilkins, 61 F. Supp. 3d 13, 19 (D.D.C. 2014) (dismissing claims against a court employee based on her handling of court submissions), aff'd, No. 14-5197, 2015 WL 1606933 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 23, 2015) [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Error Standard</b>	<i>"Court staff are immune even if they err in performing those tasks. Sindram, 986 F.2d</i>	<i>"Court staff are immune even if they err in performing those tasks, Sindram, 986 F.2d</i>

	<i>at 1461"</i>	<i>at 1461" [IDENTICAL]</i>
<b>Bad Faith/Malice (from Windsor)</b>	<i>[Citation not present in Lewis]</i>	<i>"this immunity cannot be overcome 'by allegations of bad faith or malice,' Mirales v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991)" [FROM WINDSOR, April 2024]</i>
<b>Footnote 2</b>	<i>"Dismissals on the basis of absolute immunity are with prejudice. See Fournerat v. Higgins, No. 24-CV-2520, 2024 WL 4528973, at *1 (D.D.C. Oct. 18, 2024)."</i>	<i>"Dismissals on the basis of absolute immunity are with prejudice. See Fournerat v. Higgins, No. 24-CV-2520, 2024 WL 4528973, at *1 (D.D.C. Oct. 18, 2024)."</i> [IDENTICAL]

## VI. DISCUSSION

Because judicial opinions are published when made publicly available through court systems and widely disseminated via legal research databases, the integrity of published reasoning bears on public confidence in judicial independence. The duplication documented herein is relevant to the issues raised in the accompanying Motion for Reconsideration which asserts that statutory and constitutional claims were not addressed. The duplicated analytical structure in Wilson corresponds to a framework designed to resolve claims limited to administrative processing of filings. The opinion does not contain extended analysis of criminal statutes or scope-of-employment inquiries. The structural replication of Lewis indicates that Wilson was drafted using the Lewis opinion as a template. The absence of separate functional analysis of alleged conduct is consistent with reliance on that template. This report does not opine on the merits of the underlying claims. It documents textual and structural duplication and identifies the relationship between the copied framework and the issues framed in the Motion for Reconsideration.

## VII. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

### A. Word Count Analysis

Component	Lewis	Wilson
Total Legal Analysis (excl. facts)	~290 words	~260 words
Verbatim or Near-Verbatim	N/A	~170 words
Percentage Plagiarized	N/A	~65%

### B. Analysis Methodology

The 65% figure excludes procedural language ("the court will grant"), case captions, and fact recitation specific to each case. It represents the proportion of substantive legal analysis in Wilson that is copied from Lewis. This includes the core immunity framework, case citations with parentheticals, and legal reasoning.

## VIII. LEGAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

### ***A. Distinction from Standard Legal Practice***

While judges regularly cite controlling precedent, the Wilson opinion goes far beyond standard practice by:

1. Copying entire analytical paragraphs verbatim without attribution;
2. Reproducing citation strings with identical parentheticals and subsequent history, suggesting copied legal research rather than independent verification;
3. Adopting the organizational structure and analytical framework wholesale;
4. Copying substantive footnotes supporting legal conclusions.

### ***B. Self-Plagiarism in Judicial Context***

Even when an author copies from their own prior work, proper attribution remains necessary in professional and academic contexts. This principle applies with particular force to judicial opinions because:

1. Judicial opinions are public documents contributing to the development of law;
2. Litigants and attorneys deserve to know when analysis is drawn from prior adjudication;
3. Cross-referencing prior opinions promotes transparency and allows assessment of consistency;
4. Transparency in legal research enables verification of precedential sources.

### ***C. Impact on Judicial Economy***

While efficiency in addressing recurrent legal issues is valuable, proper practice would involve either citing the prior opinion or developing template language that is explicitly identified as such. Unattributed copying creates the misleading impression of case-specific analysis.

## IX. CONCLUSION

This analysis documents substantial plagiarism in *Wilson v. Clerk*, Supreme Court of the United States. Approximately 65% of the Wilson opinion's substantive legal analysis is copied verbatim or near-verbatim from *Lewis v. United States District Court*, issued six days earlier by the same judge, with additional key citations drawn from *Windsor v. Harris* (April 2024), all without any attribution or acknowledgment.

For clarity, judicial auto-plagiarism occurs when a judge reuses their own previously issued judgment or ruling in a new document without proper citation or acknowledgment, presenting the reused material as entirely new and original analysis. While judges may rely on prior reasoning, professional norms of judicial transparency require express cross-reference when substantial portions of earlier analysis are reused.

Additionally, a judicial decision is considered "published" when it is made publicly available online and widely disseminated through platforms used to access, distribute, and republish legal materials (including official court websites, PACER, Westlaw, LexisNexis, Bloomberg Law, and similar legal research databases). Both *Lewis* and *Windsor* were publicly available judicial opinions prior to issuance of *Wilson*, and therefore fully accessible as citable sources.

The evidence demonstrates that the Wilson opinion was not independently drafted legal analysis but instead appears to have been assembled through a compilation process. The structure and content indicate that the legal framework and analytical core were drawn almost entirely from *Lewis*, after which limited case-specific procedural language was inserted to adapt the preexisting template to the Wilson caption. A supplemental

citation from Windsor, specifically *Mireles v. Waco* concerning bad faith and malice, was then manually added to reinforce the immunity analysis. During that insertion process, a typographical error (“Miraes”) was introduced, an error not present in Lewis but consistent with derivation from Windsor. The presence of the Mireles citation, absent from Lewis yet present in Windsor, together with the typographical variation, strongly supports the conclusion that the Wilson opinion was constructed by compiling the complete analytical structure and citation string from Lewis and augmenting it with a discrete supporting authority manually added from Windsor.

This hybridized construction process explains both the near-total identity of the Lewis-derived passages and the isolated Windsor-derived authority. It reflects not independent judicial research in Wilson, but rather a recycled analytical template supplemented with selective authority to complete the dismissal rationale.

The plagiarism extends beyond routine citation of precedent and includes:

1. Verbatim copying of analytical paragraphs and sentences from Lewis;
2. Identical citation strings with parenthetical explanations and subsequent history;
3. Reproduction of organizational structure and logical sequencing;
4. Incorporation of a Windsor-derived citation not present in Lewis;
5. Copying of a substantive footnote regarding with-prejudice dismissals;
6. Complete absence of attribution or cross-reference to either prior opinion.

Even if characterized as judicial auto-plagiarism with respect to the Lewis material (due to common authorship), the failure to acknowledge reuse violates norms of transparency and attribution fundamental to judicial writing. More critically, the borrowing of analytical elements and citations from Windsor, authored by a different jurist, constitutes unattributed use of another judge’s written work.

The Wilson opinion presents compiled material as case-specific, newly generated judicial reasoning when the record demonstrates it is largely a reconstructed composite of prior published decisions. The absence of attribution obscures the true origin of the analysis and misleads legal researchers regarding the extent of independent judicial engagement in the Wilson matter.

Report Date: February 12, 2026

*The preceding is an independent analysis conducted via comparative textual review and quantitative assessment and provided by AV Associates LLC’s IVLegal pro bono legal services. AV Associates LLC is a non-profit company headquartered in Richmond, Kentucky, and may be consulted online at <https://ivessentials.co.site>. For email inquiries: [admin@conetwork.com](mailto:admin@conetwork.com).*



International Legal Assistance

VERIFICATION

I, Allan Douglas Wilson, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Date: February 12, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Reconsideration was served on the Defendant by way of Electronic Case Filing by the Court Clerk:

Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States

Office of the Clerk,

1 First Street, NE,

Washington, DC 20543

ALLAN DOUGLAS WILSON

Pro Se Plaintiff



Date: February 12, 2026

A-3

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

ALLAN DOUGLAS WILSON,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

CLERK, SUPREME COURT OF THE  
UNITED STATES,

*Defendant*

Civil Action No. 26 - 17 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before the court is Plaintiff Allan Douglas Wilson's complaint, ECF No. 1, and motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The court will grant the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint and the complaint with prejudice for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Mr. Wilson brought this civil action for damages against the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Wilson alleges that, on April 14, 2025, the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States returned a petition for a writ of certiorari he was attempting to file "with a Notice requiring correction or amendment" of his submission. ECF No. 1, at 6.<sup>1</sup> He responded by sending eleven copies of his revised petition, exceeding 1,300 pages, by first-class mail on May 9, 2025, but received "no confirmation of receipt or filing." *Id.* Mr. Wilson later confirmed that the Supreme Court had received of one of the two boxes of documents he had sent on May 9, 2025, and he infers that the Clerk's Office had either lost or destroyed the second. *See id.* at 7. He

---

<sup>1</sup> When citing to ECF No. 1, the court uses the page numbers generated by CM/ECF, rather than any internal pagination.

argues that the unnamed clerk's alleged "failure to properly receive, process, and acknowledge [his] lawfully mailed court filings" amounted to obstruction of justice and violated his rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. *Id.* at 8-9. Mr. Wilson seeks compensatory and punitive damages. *Id.* at 10.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). Here, Mr. Wilson fails to state a claim for relief because the Clerk of the Supreme Court is immune from suit. As general matter, courts and judges are absolutely immune from suits arising from their official actions. *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988); *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 355-57 (1978). This immunity extends to court staff in the performance of "tasks that are an integral part of the judicial process." *Sindram v. Suda*, 986 F.2d 1459, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1993); see *Jones v. U.S. Sup. Ct.*, No. 10-CV-910, 2010 WL 2363678, at \*1 (D.D.C. June 9, 2010) (concluding that court staff are immune from suits for damages arising from activities such as the "receipt and processing of a litigant's filings"), *aff'd sub nom.*, *Jones v. Sup. Ct. of U.S.*, 405 F. App'x 508 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (per curiam), *aff'd*, 131 S. Ct. 1824 (2011); *Thomas v. Wilkins*, 61 F. Supp. 3d 13, 19 (D.D.C. 2014) (dismissing claims against a court employee based on her handling of court submissions), *aff'd*, No. 14-5197, 2015 WL 1606933 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 23, 2015). Court staff are immune even if they err in performing those tasks, *Sindram*, 986 F.2d at 1461, and this immunity cannot be overcome "by allegations of bad faith or malice," *Mirales v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991).

Accordingly, the court will grant Mr. Wilson's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, and dismiss the complaint with prejudice.<sup>2</sup> A contemporaneous order will issue.



---

LOREN L. ALIKHAN  
United States District Judge

Date: February 9, 2026

---

<sup>2</sup> Dismissals on the basis of absolute immunity are with prejudice. *See Fournerat v. Higgins*, No. 24-CV-2520, 2024 WL 4528973, at \*1 (D.D.C. Oct. 18, 2024).

**A-4**

## AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

I, Allan Douglas Wilson, being duly sworn, hereby depose and state as follows:

1. I am the plaintiff in this matter and am competent to testify as to the matters set forth herein.
2. On July 18, 2025, at approximately 12:38 PM, I caused to be mailed via Letterstream mailing service (<https://www.letterstream.com>) by U.S. First Class Mail, a true and correct copy of documents to the following recipient:  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Office of the Clerk  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20543
3. On May 9, 2025, at approximately 4:12 PM, I caused to be mailed via Letterstream mailing service (<https://www.letterstream.com>) by U.S. First Class Mail, a true and correct copy of documents to the following recipient:  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Office of the Clerk  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20543
4. The above-described mailings were completed through Letterstream, a professional mailing service, and the documents were properly addressed, stamped with sufficient postage, and deposited in the United States mail.
5. Based on the appended Mail Service Disruption Report, there were no reported disruptions that would have precluded the intended mail deliveries during, before, and after the specified times of mailing referenced above.
6. I declare under penalty of the laws of the District of Columbia that the foregoing is true and correct.

---



(signature)

on (date): January 1, 2026

Signed at: Cebu City, Philippines, by pro se Plaintiff: Allan Douglas Wilson

**Mail Service Disruption Report - DOMESTIC (Updates as of 9/3/2025 - 17:30 PM ET)**

**EXHIBIT 'B'**

**Legend: Resumed ALL Operations; line item will be completely removed 2 weeks from last update**

**Resumed Specified Operations; line item will remain until all operations have resumed**

**Facility permanently closed and operations relocated; line item will be completely removed after one week**

Date of Disrupt	Last Update	Post Office	Affected ZIP(s)	State	Cause	Operations Redirected to	Operations Projected Resume Date	Comments / Other (Describe)
8/17/25	8/18/25	AGUADILLA	00603	PR	HURRICANE		TBD	
8/17/25	8/18/25	BARCELONETA	00617	PR	HURRICANE		TBD	
8/17/25	8/18/25	JAYUYA	00664	PR	HURRICANE		TBD	
6/9/25	6/10/25	BALLARDVALE	01810	MA	Facility Damage	ANDOVER 10 STEVENS ST ANDOVER, MA 01810-3572	TBD	During this closure, customers' mail will be available and retail services offered at the Andover Main Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups. ANDOVER 10 STEVENS ST ANDOVER, MA 01810-3572 Mon-Fri 8:00 am-5:30 pm Sat 7:30 am-2:00 pm Sun Closed
4/30/25	5/6/25	MELROSE	02176	MA	Structural Damage	MALDEN 109 MOUNTAIN AVE MALDEN, MA 02148-9998	Anticipated Reopen Date 7/25/2025	During this closure, customers' mail will be available and retail services offered at the Malden Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups. MALDEN 109 MOUNTAIN AVE MALDEN, MA 02148-9998
07/10/2023	7/14/23	BRIDGEWATER MAIN OFFICE	05034	VT	Flood		TBD	
06/05/2025	5/6/25	THETFORD CENTER POST OFFICE	05075	VT	TEMPORARILY CLOSED DUE TO SAFETY ISSUES	THETFORD HILL POST OFFICE	TBD	During this closure, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Thetford Hill Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  *Thetford Hill Post Office 2734 Rte. 113 Thetford Hill, VT 05074  Hours of Operation:  P.O. Box and Lobby Hours: Monday-Friday 08:00AM – 05:00PM Saturday 08:00AM – 11:30AM Sunday Closed  Window Service Hours: Monday – Friday 08:00 AM – 10:00AM; 02:45PM – 04:45PM Saturday 08:30 AM – 11:00 AM Sunday Closed
07/10/2023	7/14/23	LUDLOW MAIN OFFICE	05149	VT	Flood		TBD	
07/10/2023	7/14/23	SOUTH LONDONDERRY VT M O	05155	VT	Flood		TBD	Retail transactions have been moved to the following alternate location JEFFERSONVILLE MAIN OFFICE 85 CHURCH ST JEFFERSONVILLE VT 05464
8/21/25	8/26/25	SPRINGFIELD	05156	VT	Temporarily closed due to safety concerns	Ascutney Post Office 5159 Rte. 5 Ascutney VT 05030	Operations expected to resume 12/1/2025	During this closure, all services will be transferred to the Ascutney Post Office, 5159 Rte. 5, 05030. Window service and PO Box lobby hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., 1:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m., and Saturday, 8:30 a.m. to 11 a.m. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.
07/10/2023	7/14/23	WESTON MAIN OFFICE	05161	VT	Flood		TBD	Retail transactions have been moved to the following alternate location JEFFERSONVILLE MAIN OFFICE 85 CHURCH ST JEFFERSONVILLE VT 05464
07/11/2023	7/14/23	CAMBRIDGE VT MAIN OFFICE	05444	VT	Flood		TBD	Retail transactions have been moved to the following alternate location BARRE MAIN OFFICE 3 S MAIN ST BARRE VT 05641
07/14/2023	7/14/23	CAMBRIDGE VT MAIN OFFICE	05444	VT	Flood		TBD	
07/10/2023	7/14/23	MONTPELIER MAIN OFFICE	05602	VT	Flood		TBD	Retail transactions have been moved to the following alternate location BARRE MAIN OFFICE 3 S MAIN ST BARRE VT 05641
07/11/2023	7/14/23	EAST BARRE MAIN OFFICE	05649	VT	Flood		TBD	
07/14/2023	7/14/23	EAST BARRE MAIN OFFICE	05649	VT	Flood		TBD	Retail transactions have been moved to the following alternate location HYDE PARK MAIN OFFICE 214 CHURCH ST HYDE PARK VT 05655
07/11/2023	7/14/23	JOHNSON MAIN OFFICE	05656	VT	Flood		TBD	
07/10/2023	7/14/23	WOODBURY MAIN OFFICE	05681	VT	Flood		TBD	
07/11/2023	7/14/23	GREENSBORO BEND MAIN OFFICE	05842	VT	Flood		TBD	Drop Shipments and Retail operations have been redirected to the following location: PEMBERTON MAIN OFFICE 73 ELIZABETH ST PEMBERTON NJ 08068
5/27/25	5/27/25	PLANTSVILLE	06479	CT	Facility Related Environmental	CESHIRE 210 MAPLE AVE CESHIRE, CT 06410	TBD	Drop Shipments have been redirected to the following location: CESHIRE 210 MAPLE AVE CESHIRE, CT 06410-9998
4/23/25	4/23/25	Forked River	08731	NJ	Fire		TBD	
4/23/25	4/23/25	Waretown Post Office	08758	NJ	Fire		TBD	
7/22/25	7/22/25	NEW MARKET POST OFFICE	08854	NJ	SAFETY CONCERNS		TBD	Temporarily closed due to safety reasons. During this closure, all services will be transferred to the Piscataway Post Office, 3 Skiles Ave., 08854-9998. Window service and PO Box hours are Monday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.
7/8/25	7/10/25	COLLEGE STATION	10030	NY	SAFETY ISSUE	Lincolnton Post Office 2266 5th Avenue New York NY 10037	Anticipated Reopening 7/11/2025	Temporarily closed due to a safety issue. During this closure, all services will be transferred to the Lincolnton Post Office, 2266 5th Avenue, 10037. Window service and PO Box lobby hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

								Retail and PO Box customers can visit the following office for service:  East Nassau Post Office 6466 State Route 66 East Nassau, NY 12062-9998  Hours: Mon-Fri Window Hours 7:30 AM-11:30 AM Sat Window Hours 7:15 AM-11:00 AM Mon-Fri Lobby Hours 7:00 AM-5:00 PM Sat Lobby Hours 7:00 AM – 11:15 AM
07/11/2023	7/14/23	BEAR MOUNTAIN MAIN OFFICE	10911	NY	Flood			TBD
07/10/2023	7/14/23	HIGHLAND FALLS MAIN OFFICE	10928	NY	Flood			TBD
6/30/25	7/1/25	MIDWOOD	11230	NY	OTHER			Currently the station has a Mobile unit parked in front to provide customers with PO Box Mail and all Retail services is suspended out of this LPO / Mobile unit. For Full service Retail, visit New Kirk Finance located at 1525 Newkirk Ave, Brooklyn, New York 11226.
7/1/25	7/2/25	HIGHMOUNT	12441	NY	OTHER	PINE HILL 300 MAIN ST PINE HILL, NY 12465		TBD
07/12/2023	7/14/23	HOLMES MAIN OFFICE	12531		Flood			TBD
8/30/25	9/3/25	EAST WILLIAMSON	14449	NY	FACILITY RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL	WILLIAMSON 6144 STATE ROUTE 21 WILLIAMSON, NY 14589-9998		TBD
4/15/25	4/15/25	VANDERBILT MAIN OFFICE	15486	PA	Structural Damage	DAWSON 101 RAILROAD ST DAWSON, PA 15428		TBD
2/6/25	2/6/25	REEDSVILLE MAIN OFFICE	17084	PA	FACILITY REPAIRS	LEWISTOWN 100 W MARKET ST LEWISTOWN, PA 17044		TBD
7/7/25	7/10/25	GERMANSVILLE MAIN OFFICE	18053	PA	FACILITY RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL			Anticipated Reopening 7/21/2025
06/27/2023	6/28/23	FREDERICK MAIN OFFICE	19435	PA				TBD
4/2/25	4/2/25	CEDARS MAIN OFFICE	19423	PA	Other (explain below)	SKIPPACK 3801 SKIPPACK PIKE SKIPPACK, PA 19474-9914		TBD
5/21/25	5/21/25	COLLEGE PARK POST OFFICE	20740	MD	Facility Related Environmental	NORTH COLLEGE PARK 9591 BALTIMORE AVE COLLEGE PARK, MD 20740-9996		TBD
6/25/25	6/27/25	OXFORD	21654	MD	ELECTRICAL FIRE	EASTON 116 E DOVER ST EASTON, MD 21601-9996		TBD
8/21/25	8/26/25	STEWART POST OFFICE	23221	VA	Temporarily closed due to safety concerns	West Hampton Post Office 805 Glen Burnie Road Richmond VA 23226		TBD

3/13/25	3/13/25	LOGAN MAIN	25601	WV	Facility Related Environmental	STOLLINGS 768 HANGING ROCK HWY STOLLINGS, WV 25646- 9998	TBD	Customers can pick up PO Box mail at: STOLLINGS 768 HANGING ROCK HWY STOLLINGS, WV 25646-9998
4/23/25	4/23/25	PROCTOR POST OFFICE	26055	WV	Storm Damage	Moundsville Post Office 1214 3rd St Moundsville, WV 26041- 9998	TBD	All Operations will be relocated to Moundsville Post Office.  •Moundsville Post Office 1214 3rd St Moundsville, WV 26041-9998  Retail Hours Mon-Fri 8:00 am – 4:30 pm Sat 9:00 am – 12:00 pm Closed Sunday
02/20/2025	02/20/2025	CARRBORO MAIN OFFICE	27510	NC	Non Delivery Related		TBD	
7/7/25	7/10/25	CHAPEL HILL	27514	NC	FLOOD	Timberlyne Post Office 1129 Weaver Dairy Rd Chapel Hill, NC 27514	Anticipated Reopening 8/30/2025	During this closure, Retail and Post Office Box service will be available at the Timberlyne Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  Timberlyne Post Office 1129 Weaver Dairy Rd Chapel Hill, NC 27514  Hours of Operation:  P.O. Box Hours: Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 4:30 pm Saturday Closed Sunday Closed  Window Service Hours: Monday – Friday 9:00 am – 4:30 pm Saturday Closed Sunday Closed  Drop shipments will go to the Carrboro Post Office.  Carrboro Post Office 1500 W Main St Carrboro, NC 27510 Drop Shipment Hours of Operation:
02/20/2025	02/20/2025	FRANKLIN STREET	27514	NC	Non Delivery Related		TBD	
07/19/2023	07/19/2023	ROCKY MOUNT CARRIER ANNEX STAT	27804	NC	Tornado		TBD	During this closure, customers requiring retail services are being directed to the office listed below:  •Stanley Post Office 301 Mt. Holly Road Stanley, NC 28164-9998  Hours of Operation: Window Service Hours Monday/Tues/Thurs/Fri 09:00 AM - 12:00 PM, 1:30PM – 5:00 PM Wednesday 09:00 AM - 1:00 PM Saturday 08:30 AM - 11:00 AM Closed for Lunch 12:00 PM - 1:30 PM
07/19/2023	07/19/2023	BATTLEBORO MAIN OFFICE	27809	NC	Tornado		TBD	For retail service customers may visit the following office:  Camden Main Post Office 542 E Dekalb St Camden SC 29020-9998  Retail Hours: Mon-Fri 9:00am –500pm, Sat 9:30am – 11:00am  BMEU Hours: Mon 8:00 am– 1:30 pm, Tue- Fri 8 am – 2:00 pm
8/18/25	8/18/25	AVON	27915	NC	Dare County has issued a mandatory evacuation due to Hurricane Erin		Resumed ALL Operations	
8/18/25	8/18/25	BUXTON	27920	NC	Dare County has issued a mandatory evacuation due to Hurricane Erin		Resumed ALL Operations	
8/18/25	8/18/25	FRISCO	27936	NC	Dare County has issued a mandatory evacuation due to Hurricane Erin		Resumed ALL Operations	
8/18/25	8/18/25	HATTERAS	27943	NC	Dare County has issued a mandatory evacuation due to Hurricane Erin		Resumed ALL Operations	
8/18/25	8/18/25	RODANTHE	27968	NC	Dare County has issued a mandatory evacuation due to Hurricane Erin		Resumed ALL Operations	
6/24/25	6/24/25	Casar	28020	NC	Structural Damage	SHELBY 405 S DEKALB ST SHELBY, NC 28150-5977	Anticipated Reopen Date 12/1/2025	Retail and PO Box customers can visit the following office for service: SHELBY 405 S DEKALB ST SHELBY, NC 28150-5977 Mon-Fri 8:30 am-5:00 pm  Sat 9:00 am-12:00 pm  Sun Closed
8/5/25	8/5/25	MOORESVILLE MAIN OFFICE	28115	NC	Other (explain below)		TBD	
5/27/25	5/27/25	LANGLEY	29834	SC	FACILITY DAMAGE		TBD	
6/13/25	6/13/25	MADISON POST OFFICE	30650	GA	FACILITY DAMAGE	Greensboro Post Office, 115 S Main Street, Greensboro, GA 30642	Anticipated Reopen Date 7/22/2025	EFFECTIVE Friday, June 13, 2025, Operations at the Madison Post Office will be suspended for repairs. Retail operations including PO Box Service for the Madison Post Office will be moved to the following alternate location: Buckhead Post Office 1010 Railroad Street Buckhead, GA 30625 Retail Hours of Operations: Monday-Friday 9:00 am –12:00 pm; 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm Saturday 8:00 am – 11:30 am Sunday Closed Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups. Drop shipments for the Madison Post Office should be made at the following alternate location: Greensboro Post Office 115 S Main Street Greensboro, GA 30642 Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Monday-Friday 8:30 am – 5:00 pm Saturday 8:30 am – 1:00 pm Sunday Closed
08/30/2023	08/30/2023	NAS POST OFFICE	32212	FL	Other (explain below)		TBD	

08/30/2023	08/30/2023	MAYPORT NAVAL POST OFFICE	32228	FL	Hurricane			TBD	
08/30/2023	08/30/2023	LAKE JACKSON	32303	FL	Hurricane			TBD	
07/14/2023	7/14/23	NOBLES STATION	32504	FL	Flood			TBD	
									All operations for the Olympia Heights Branch, have been moved to the following alternate location:  Sunset Station 7501 SW 117th Ave Miami, FL 33183  Retail Hours: M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, Sat 7:30 AM - 2:00 PM Drop Shipment Hours: Mon 6:30 AM - 11:00 AM Tue - Sat 7:00 AM - 11:30 AM
08/30/2023	08/30/2023	WILLISTON FL	32696	FL	Hurricane			TBD	
7/1/25	7/2/25	COLONIALTOWN	32803	FL	OTHER	HERNDON 821 HERNDON AVE ORLANDO, FL 32803-5150		TBD	All Retail and PO Box operations for Colonialtown have been moved to the following alternate location, Herndon Post Office 821 HERNDON AVE ORLANDO, FL 32803-5150 Retail Mon-Fri 9:00 am-5:00 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed PO Box™ Delivery Mon-Fri 9:30 am Sat 8:30 am Sun Closed
5/3/25	5/6/25	SURFSIDE BRANCH	33154	FL	OTHER			TBD	All operations for the Surfside Branch will be temporarily suspended. Retail Operations are being offered at this alternate location: NORMANDY (525 71ST ST MIAMI BEACH, FL 33141-9998 Mon-Fri 8:30 am-5:00 pm Sat 9:30 am-1:00 pm Sun Closed
4/3/25	4/3/25	GRAND JUNCTION	38039	TN	Tornado			TBD	
08/30/2023	08/30/2023	PUNTA GORDA MAIN OFFICE	39505	FL	Hurricane Idalia			TBD	
4/7/25	4/7/25	HARRODS CREEK MAIN OFFICE	40027	KY	Flood	PROSPECT 9523 US HIGHWAY 42 PROSPECT, KY 40059-9998		TBD	Post Office Boxes have been relocated and customers will be able to pickup mail at: PROSPECT 9523 US HIGHWAY 42 PROSPECT, KY 40059-9998
1/28/25	1/28/25	FALLS OF ROUGH MAIN OFFICE	40119	KY	Other (explain below) Structural Damage - Roof	MCDANIELS 9501 S HIGHWAY 259 MC DANIELS, KY 40152-9998		TBD	Post Office Retail and Delivery Services have been relocated and customers will be able to pickup mail at: MCDANIELS 9501 S HIGHWAY 259 MC DANIELS, KY 40152-9998
4/15/25	4/15/25	WEST POINT	40177	KY	Flood	MULDRAUGH 114 S MAIN ST MULDRAUGH, KY 40155-9998		TBD	Post Office Boxes have been relocated and customers will be able to pickup mail at: MULDRAUGH 114 S MAIN ST MULDRAUGH, KY 40155-9998
2/20/25	2/20/25	PERRY PARK	40363	KY	Inaccessible due to road conditions	OWENTON 1065 HIGHWAY 127 N OWENTON, KY 40359-9998		TBD	OWENTON (Physical Address) 1065 HIGHWAY 127 N OWENTON, KY 40359-9998
07/19/2023	07/19/2023	FULTON MAIN OFFICE	42041	KY	Flood			TBD	Drop Ship & Retail operations have been redirected to the following location: NEW WASHINGTON PO 214 W MANSFIELD ST NEW WASHINGTON OH 44854
5/15/25	5/15/25	BEECH GROVE	42322	KY	Facility Related Environmental	CALHOUN 310 W 2ND ST CALHOUN, KY 42327-9998		TBD	Drop Ship & Retail operations have been redirected to the following location: CALHOUN 310 W 2ND ST CALHOUN, KY 42327-9998
4/10/25	4/10/25	SMITH MILLS	42457	KY	Other	CORYDON 120 MAIN ST CORYDON, KY 42406-9998		TBD	Drop Ship & Retail operations have been redirected to the following location: CORYDON 120 MAIN ST CORYDON, KY 42406-9998
7/9/25	7/10/25	BERKEY	43504	OH	FACILITY RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL			TBD	All operations for the Berkey Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: SYLVANIA 5745 POST OFFICE WAY SYLVANIA, OH 43560-9998 Retail Mon-Fri 8:30 am-5:30 pm Sat 8:30 am-12:30 pm Sun Closed
5/20/25	5/20/25	CLEAR CREEK	47426	IN	Facility Damage Tornado	SMITHVILLE 7390 S STRAIN RIDGE RD SMITHVILLE, IN 47458-9998		TBD	Retail and Post Office Box operations have been temporarily relocated to:  SMITHVILLE 7390 S STRAIN RIDGE RD SMITHVILLE, IN 47458-9998 Mon - Sat 7:00 am - 11:00 am
3/24/25	3/24/25	POLAND	47868	IN	OTHER	BOWLING GREEN 5181 E STATE ROAD 46 BOWLING GREEN, IN 47833-9998		TBD	Retail and Post Office Box operations have been temporarily relocated to: BOWLING GREEN 5181 E STATE ROAD 46 BOWLING GREEN, IN 47833-9998
4/2/25	4/4/25	FLINT NORTHSIDE	48505	MI	FLOOD			TBD	Retail operations have been redirected to the following location. FLINT MI S&DC 250 E BOULEVARD DR FLINT, MI 48502-9916 Mon - Fri 7:45 AM - 7:00 PM
5/22/25	5/22/25	CLAYTON POST OFFICE	49235	MI	FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	Hudson Post Office 401 W. Main Street Hudson, MI 49247-9998	PLANNED REOPEN DATE 7, 2025	JUNE	During this closure, retail and P.O. Box customers' mail will be redirected to: Hudson Post Office 401 W. Main Street Hudson MI 49247-9998 Retail and P.O. Box hours are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Saturday, 8:30 a.m. to noon.

5/4/25	5/22/25	MANITOU BEACH PO	49253	MI		ADDISON PO 103 S. TALBOT ST ADDISON, MI 49220	Manitou Beach PO will be closed beginning May 24, 2025. Reopening date is to be determined.	During the closure, retail and P.O. Box customers' mail will be available at the Addison Post Office.  Addison Post Office 103 S. Talbot St Addison, MI 49220-9998  Retail Hours Mon-Fri 9:30 am-12:00 pm, 1:00pm-4:00pm Sat. 9:00 am-11:00 am Sun Closed  P.O. Box Hours Mon-Fri 7:00 am-5:00 pm Sat. 7:00 am-11:00 am Sun Closed
8/29/25	9/3/25	BATTLE CREEK PO	51006	IA	FACILITY DAMAGE	DANBURY 211 MAIN ST DANBURY, IA 51019-7725	TBD	During the closure, retail and P.O. Box customers' mail will be available at the Danbury Post Office, DANBURY 211 MAIN ST DANBURY, IA 51019-7725 Mon-Fri 7:30 am-11:30 am, 12:00 pm-2:00 pm Sat 7:30 am-9:30 am Sun Closed
8/8/25	9/3/25	NIELSVILLE	56568	MN	FACILITY EVACUATED DUE TO STORM DAMAGE	Climax Post Office 202 W. Broadway Climax MN 56523	TBD	All operations have been moved to Climax Post Office, 202 W. Broadway, 56523. Mailers are asked to divert all shipments to that location. Window service hours are Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to noon, and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.
2/26/25	2/27/25	MANDERSON MAIN OFFICE	57756	SD	Other		TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to Wounded Knee Main Office. Retail Hours Mon - Sat 8AM - 12PM WOUNDED KNEE 101 MAIN ST WOUNDED KNEE, SD 57794-9998
1/23/25	1/24/25	ALEXANDER PO	58831	ND	Safety Concerns		TBD	Retail and delivery operations have been relocated to the Watford City Post Office. Centralized Box Units (CBUs) will be installed at Alexander January 30, with keys becoming available January 31. Until then, PO Box mail and packages that were attempted for delivery can be picked up at the Arnegard Post Office.  Arnegard Post Office 110 Main Street S Arnegard ND 58835-9998  Mon-Fri 12:30PM-4:30PM Sat. 12:00PM-2:30PM Sun. Closed
7/19/25	7/22/25	GREYCLIFF	59033	MT	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	Big Timber Post Office 415 Walnut St. Big Timber MT 59011-9998	TBD	Temporarily closed. During this closure, customers' mail will be available and retail services offered at the Big Timber Post Office, 415 Walnut St., 59011-9998. Retail window hours are Monday through Friday, 9:30 a.m. to 4:45 p.m., and Saturday, 10 a.m. to noon. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.
6/3/25	6/5/25	BAKER PO	59313	MT	Facility Damage	EKALAKA 116 CHURCH AVE EKALAKA, MT 59324-9998	TBD	Retail and delivery operations have been relocated to the Ekalaka Post Office. EKALAKA 116 CHURCH AVE EKALAKA, MT 59324-9998 Mon-Fri 8:00 am-12:30 pm, 1:00 pm-3:45 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed
5/29/25	5/29/25	RENAULT MAIN OFFICE	62279	IL	Facility Damage		TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to: PRAIRIE DU ROCHER 211 HENRY ST PRAIRIE DU ROCHER, IL 62277-9998 Mon-Fri 7:30 am-11:30 am Sat 8:00 am-9:00 am Sun Closed
4/16/25	4/17/25	JUNCTION MAIN OFFICE	62954	IL	Flood	SHAWNEETOWN 200 N LINCOLN BLVD E SHAWNEETOWN, IL 62984-9998	TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to Shawneetown Post Office. SHAWNEETOWN 200 N LINCOLN BLVD E SHAWNEETOWN, IL 62984-9998
8/15/25	8/18/25	MIDDLETOWN	63359	MO	FACILITY DAMAGE	MONTGOMERY CITY POST OFFICE 404 N STURGEON ST. MONTGOMERY CITY, MO 63361	TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to Montgomery City Post Office. MONTGOMERY CITY POST OFFICE 404 N STURGEON ST. MONTGOMERY CITY, MO 63361
4/3/25	4/3/25	DELTA MAIN OFFICE	63744	MO	Tornado	CHAFFEE 217 S MAIN ST CHAFFEE, MO 63740-9998	TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to Chaffee Post Office. CHAFFEE 217 S MAIN ST CHAFFEE, MO 63740-9998 Mon-Fri 9:00 am-11:00 am, 12:00 pm-4:30 pm  Sat 8:30 am-10:30 am  Sun Closed
5/27/25	5/27/25	PLATO	65552	MO	FACILITY DAMAGE	ROBY 12445 CASS LN ROBY, MO 65557-9998	TBD	Retail Operations and P.O. Box mail have been moved to Roby Post Office. ROBY 12445 CASS LN ROBY, MO 65557-9998 Mon-Fri 10:00 am-2:00 pm  Sat 12:00 pm-2:00 pm  Sun Closed
01/26/2025	1/27/25	POSTAL EMPORIUM	68102	NE	Facility Related Environmental		TBD	
8/5/25	8/5/25	PERU	68421	NE	Facility Related Environmental	Auburn Main Office 1320 Courthouse Ave Auburn NE 68305-9998	TBD	PO Box and Delivery Operations are available at: Auburn Main Office, 1320 Courthouse Ave, Auburn NE 68305-9998 Mon-Fri 8:00 am-11:00 am, 12:00 pm-5:00 pm Sat 9:00 am-11:00 am Sun Closed

								Operations for the Spearsville Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: *Lillie Post Office 113 Highway 15 Lillie, LA 71256  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 8:30 am – 12:30 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 8:30 am – 12:30 pm Sat 8:30 am – 10:30 am Sun Closed
3/31/25	3/31/25	SPEARSVILLE PO	71277	LA	FACILITY DAMAGE	Lillie Post Office 113 Highway 15 Lillie, LA 71256	TBD	
07/12/2023	7/14/23	BUCKNER MAIN OFFICE	71827	AR	Flood		TBD	
								All operations including PO Box service have been moved to the following alternate location: *Glenwood Post Office 916 E Broadway Glenwood, AR 71943  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 8:00 am – 4:30 pm Sat 9:00 am – 11:00 am Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 6:00 am – 4:30 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed
01/17/2024	1/19/24	AMITY POST OFFICE	71921	AR	Facility Related Environmental	Glenwood PO 916 E Broadway Glenwood AZ, 71943	TBD	
1/30/25	1/30/25	ARKADELPHIA POST OFFICE	71923	AR	Flood		TBD	
04/01/2023	04/05/2023	PARK HILL STATION	72116	AR	Tornado		TBD	
								Operations for the Williford Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: *Ravenden Post Office 19319 Highway 90 W Ravenden Springs, AR 72460  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm Sat 11:30 am – 2:00 pm Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 1:30 pm – 3:30 am Sat 11:30 am – 2:15 am Sun Closed
4/5/25	4/10/25	WILLIFORD	72482	AR	Flood	RAVENDEN 471 HIGHWAY 63 W RAVENDEN, AR 72459-9998	TBD	
01/17/2024	1/19/24	MIDWAY MAIN OFFICE	72651	AR	Fire		TBD	
								Operations for the Boles Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: *Waldron Post Office 368 Washington St Waldron, AR 72958  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 9:00 am – 4:30 pm Sat 10:00 am – 12:00 pm Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed
4/1/25	4/1/25	BOLES PO	72926	AR	Facility Damage	Waldron Post Office 368 Washington St Waldron, AR 72958	TBD	
07/06/2023	7/14/23	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR	73117	OK	Tornado		TBD	
								Operations are temporarily suspended due to building damage. All operations, including PO Box service, have been moved to Medford Post Office, 115 W. Cherokee St., 73759. Retail hours are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 11 a.m., 12:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., Saturday, 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
7/14/25	7/15/25	POND CREEK POST OFFICE	73766	OK	BUILDING DAMAGE	Medford Post Office 115 W. Cherokee St. MEDFORD OK 73759	TBD	
								Operations for the Glencoe Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: *Pawnee Post Office 658 Illinois St Pawnee, OK 74058  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 8:30 am – 4:15 pm Sat 10:00 am – 12:00 pm Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 9:30 am – 4:00 pm Sat 9:30 am – 11:30 am Sun Closed
5/13/25	5/15/25	GLENCOE	74032	OK	Facility Related Environmental	Pawnee Post Office 658 Illinois St Pawnee, OK 74058	TBD	
1/30/25	1/30/25	GARVIN MAIN OFFICE	74736	OK	Flood		TBD	
1/30/25	1/30/25	HAWORTH MAIN OFFICE	74740	OK	Flood		TBD	
1/30/25	1/30/25	IDABEL MAIN OFFICE	74745	OK	Flood		TBD	
3/4/25	3/4/25	ADA PO	74820	OK	Tornado		TBD	
3/4/25	3/4/25	STONEWALL MAIN OFFICE	74871	OK	Tornado		TBD	
								Operations including PO Box Service for the South Bend Post Office have been moved to the following alternate location: Graham Post Office 100 Tennessee St. Graham, TX, 76450  Retail Hours of Operations: Mon-Fri 8:30 am – 4:30 pm Sat 10:00 am – 12:00 pm Sun Closed  Drop Shipment Hours of Operation: Mon-Fri 8:30 am – 4:30 pm Sat 9:00 am – 12:00 pm Sun Closed  Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.
5/28/25	5/8/25	SOUTH BEND PO	76481	TX	Safety Concerns	Graham Post Office 100 Tennessee St. Graham, TX, 76450	TBD	

								Temporarily suspended operations due to building damage. All operations, including PO Box services, have been moved to: Ingram Post Office 3190 Junction Highway Ingram TX 78025 Retail hours are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m., and 2 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
7/4/25	7/7/25	HUNT POST OFFICE	78024	TX	Building Damage	Ingram Post Office 3190 Junction Highway Ingram TX 78025	TBD	
5/23/25	6/3/25	NIWOT POST OFFICE	80544	CO	FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	Valmont Post Office 2995 55th Street Boulder, CO 80301-9998	PLANNED REOPEN DATE 29, 2025	JUNE
								During this closure, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Valmont Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  •Valmont Post Office 2995 55th Street Boulder, CO 80301-9998  Retail Window Hours Window Service Monday - Friday 09:00 AM 06:00 PM Saturday 10:00 AM 02:00 PM  Drop Shipment Hours Monday - Friday 04:00 AM 06:00 PM
5/13/25	5/15/25	GREER POST OFFICE	85927	AZ	WILDFIRE	Eagar Post Office 113 W Central Ave Eagar, AZ 85925-9719	TBD	
3/13/25	3/13/25	OATMAN MAIN OFFICE	86433	AZ	FLOOD		TBD	
6/18/25	6/20/25	HANOVER POST OFFICE	88041	NM	WILDFIRE	Bayard Post Office 810 Central Ave Bayard, NM 88023-9800	TBD	
								During these closures, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Bayard Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  • Bayard Post Office  810 Central Ave  Bayard, NM 88023-9800  Retail Window Hours Monday-Friday 08:00 AM 04:30 PM Closed for lunch 01:00 PM 01:30 PM Saturday 11:00 AM 01:00 PM Sunday Closed  Drop Shipment Hours Monday-Friday 08:00 AM 04:00 PM
6/18/25	6/20/25	MIMBRES POST OFFICE	88049	NM	WILDFIRE	Bayard Post Office 810 Central Ave Bayard, NM 88023-9800	TBD	
								During these closures, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Bayard Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  • Bayard Post Office  810 Central Ave  Bayard, NM 88023-9800  Retail Window Hours Monday-Friday 08:00 AM 04:30 PM Closed for lunch 01:00 PM 01:30 PM Saturday 11:00 AM 01:00 PM Sunday Closed  Drop Shipment Hours Monday-Friday 08:00 AM 04:00 PM
2/4/25	2/4/25	FOLSOM	88419	NM	OTHER	Des Moines Main Office 720 BROADWAY AVE DES MOINES, NM 88418-9998	TBD	
1/13/25	1/14/25	LA COSTA MALIBU	90265	CA	FIRE		TBD	
								No access due to evacuation orders. Customers can pick up PO Box mail at: Point Dume 29160 HEATHERCLIFF RD FL 1 MALIBU, CA 90265-9993 Mon-Fri 9:30 am-5:00 pm
1/13/25	1/13/25	PACIFIC PALISADES OFFICE	90272	CA	FIRE		TBD	
5/27/25	5/27/25	MONTEROSE	91020	CA	FACILITY DAMAGE		TBD	
								Post Office Retail and Delivery services have been relocated and customers will be able to pick up mail at: Rancho Park Post Office 11270 Exposition Blvd Floor 1 Los Angeles, CA 90064-9998 Mon - Fri: 9 am - 5 pm Sat: 9 am - 4 pm Extended Pickup Hours: Sun: 11 am - 5 pm (Jan 12 only)

8/4/25	8/5/25	TOLUCA LAKE	91602	CA	FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	Chandler Post Office 11304 Chandler Blvd North Hollywood, CA 91601	TBD	The Toluca Lake Post Office, located at 10063 Riverside Drive, Toluca Lake, CA 91602 is temporarily closed due to owner construction.  P.O. Box customers are being directed to Chandler Post Office, located at 11304 Chandler Blvd, North Hollywood, CA 91601. Hours: Monday to Friday 10:00 am to 5:30 pm. Saturday 10:00 am to 4:00 pm.  Postal services can also be accessed 24/7 online at usps.com.  We apologize for this inconvenience.  Please bring photo ID for mail pick up.
01/25/2025	1/27/25	DULZURA MAIN OFFICE	91917	CA	Fire	Jamul PO 13961 Campo Rd Jamul, CA 91935	TBD	
6/27/25	6/27/25	THREE RIVERS	93279	CA	FIRE		TBD	
7/22/25	7/22/25	Almaden Valley Post Office	95120	CA	Wildfire	Willow Glen Post Office 1750 Meridian Ave. San Jose, CA 95125-9998	TBD	Temporarily closed due to fire damage. Mail pick-up will be available at the Willow Glen Post Office, 1750 Meridian Ave., San Jose, 95125-9998. Pick-up times are Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Retail window hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., and Saturday, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.
9/2/25	9/3/25	ANGEL CAMP	95222	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
9/2/25	9/3/25	COPPEROPOLIS	95228	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
9/2/25	9/3/25	FARMINGTON	95230	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
9/2/25	9/3/25	MURPHYS	95247	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
9/2/25	9/3/25	VALLECITO	95251	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
9/2/25	9/3/25	CHINESE CAMP	95309	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION		TBD	
1/24/25	1/24/25	HAMILTON CITY PO	95951	CA			TBD	During this closure, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Midtown Chico Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  •Midtown Chico Post Office 141 W 5Th St Chico, CA 95928-9998  Retail Window Hours Window Service M-F 10:00 AM - 05:00 PM Drop Ship
7/15/25	7/16/25	FORKS OF SALMON POST OFFICE	96031	CA	ACTIVE WILDFIRE	Etna Post Office 119 Diggles St. Etna CA 96027-9998	TBD	During this closure, retail services and customer mail will be available at the Etna Post Office, 119 Diggles St., 96027-9998. Window service hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m
9/2/25	9/2/25	SEIAD VALLEY	96086	CA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION	Happy Camp Post Office, 33 Davis Rd., Happy Camp CA 96039-9998	TBD	Temporarily closed due to wildfire evacuation orders. During this closure, customers' mail will be available and retail services will be offered at the Happy Camp Post Office, 33 Davis Rd., 96039-9998. Window service hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., closed for lunch, 11 a.m. to noon. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.
6/18/25	6/20/25	KENO POST OFFICE	97601	OR	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	Klamath Falls Post Office 317 S 7th St Klamath Falls, OR 97601-6170	TBD	During this closure, customers mail will be available and retail services offered at the Klamath Falls Post Office. Customers are reminded to bring proper photo identification for mail and package pickups.  • Klamath Falls Post Office  317 S 7th St  Klamath Falls, OR 97601-6170  Retail Window Hours Monday-Friday 09:30 AM 05:00 PM Saturday 09:00 AM 12:00 PM Sunday Closed  Drop Ship Monday-Friday 09:30 AM 02:00 PM
6/3/25	6/3/25	SPRAY MAIN PO	97874	OR	FACILITY DAMAGE		PLANNED REOPENING DATE JUNE 9, 2025	Retail and customer package pickup is available at Fossil Post Office. FOSSIL 606 MAIN ST FOSSIL, OR 97830-5000 Mon-Fri 8:30 am-12:30 pm, 1:30 pm-5:00 pm Sat Closed Sun Closed
7/22/25	7/22/25	LYLE POST OFFICE	98635	WA	WILDFIRE EVACUATION	White Salmon Post Office 185 NE Snohomish Ave. White Salmon 98672-9198	TBD	Temporarily closed due to wildfire evacuation. During this closure, customers' mail will be available and retail services offered at the White Salmon Post Office, 185 NE Snohomish Ave., 98672-9198. Retail window hours are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Closed Saturday.
3/25/25	3/31/25	CHELAN PO	98816	WA	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	Manson Post Office, 85 W Wapato Way, 98831-9800	TBD	A Mobile Retail Unit will be available. Hours for the Mobile Retail Unit are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. PO Box mail will be available for pick-up. For packages, notices, hold mail or signature required items, customers may pick them up the following business day. During this closure, full services will be offered at Manson Post Office, 85 W Wapato Way, 98831-9800. Window service hours are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Drop shipment hours are Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
<b>OFFICES RESUMED PARTIAL OR ALL OPERATIONS</b>								
8/9/23	8/21/23	DOWNTOWN LAHAINA PO	96761	HI	Wildfires		Partial operations resumed.	

“I declare under penalty of the laws of the District of Columbia that the foregoing is true and correct.”

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Allan Wilson", written in black ink on a white background.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

Signed at: Cebu City, Philippines

by pro se Plaintiff: Allan Douglas Wilson

on (date): January 1, 2026.

A-5



tello.com  
 4780 Ashford Dunwoody Rd  
 Atlanta, GA, 30338  
 United States

### Call Records

**Website:** tello.com  
**Customer Name:** Leah Joy M Sombilon  
**Mobile Number:** 17133633006

Date	Time	Plan	Source	Destination	Access Number	Rate	Duration	Total
08/25/2025	16:00:12	100 min pack	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	3:21	\$0
08/25/2025	15:46:39	100 min pack	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	10:58	\$0
08/25/2025	15:32:12	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	1:27	\$0
08/25/2025	10:03:48	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	4:14	\$0
08/24/2025	22:23:52	100 min pack	17133633006	18339874837 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	1:19	\$0
08/21/2025	10:27:08	100 min pack	17133633006	16132391054 CANADA - 613 ONTARIO	17133633006	0¢	0:47	\$0
08/21/2025	10:22:59	100 min pack	17133633006	16132391560 CANADA - 613 ONTARIO	17133633006	0¢	3:57	\$0
08/21/2025	10:22:16	100 min pack	17133633006	16132391054 CANADA - 613 ONTARIO	17133633006	0¢	0:11	\$0
08/21/2025	10:18:07	100 min pack	17133633006	14163275101 CANADA - 416 METRO TORONTO	17133633006	0¢	3:53	\$0
08/19/2025	15:06:40	100 min pack	13614018601	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:11	\$0
08/15/2025	15:48:16	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	68:07	\$0
08/15/2025	14:29:32	100 min pack	17133633006	18008291040 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	15:58	\$0
08/15/2025	14:22:04	100 min pack	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	2:50	\$0
08/15/2025	14:19:48	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	1:39	\$0
08/14/2025	18:35:23	100 min pack	17134246867	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	2:13	\$0
08/14/2025	16:05:51	100 min pack	17133633006	12162330050 UNITED STATES - OHIO	17133633006	0¢	0:47	\$0
08/14/2025	15:37:53	100 min pack	17133633006	14697930041 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:51	\$0
08/14/2025	15:07:14	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	13:12	\$0
08/14/2025	14:06:59	100 min pack	13047079492	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	53:53	\$0
08/14/2025	13:29:17	100 min pack	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	5:11	\$0
08/14/2025	09:22:49	100 min pack	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	54:58	\$0
08/14/2025	09:19:50	100 min pack	17133633006	18008293676 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	1:46	\$0
08/13/2025	15:05:42	100 min pack	17133633006	13523815200 UNITED STATES - FLORIDA	17133633006	0¢	0:15	\$0
08/13/2025	13:18:33	100 min pack	12544708022	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:11	\$0
08/13/2025	12:02:35	100 min pack	19152803149	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	5:37	\$0
08/12/2025	15:22:41	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	58:51	\$0
08/12/2025	11:21:24	100 min pack	17133633006	12024795660 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:23	\$0

08/12/2025	11:15:02	100 min pack	19152803033	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	3:28	\$0
08/12/2025	11:01:52	100 min pack	17133633006	18664207157 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	0:05	\$0
08/12/2025	11:00:50	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	0:53	\$0
08/12/2025	10:58:40	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:55	\$0
08/12/2025	10:56:54	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:36	\$0
08/12/2025	10:55:03	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:29	\$0
08/12/2025	10:50:09	100 min pack	17133531772	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:11	\$0
08/11/2025	14:25:23	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793000 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	2:51	\$0
08/11/2025	12:14:47	100 min pack	17133633006	18002758777 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	4:09	\$0
08/11/2025	11:47:42	100 min pack	17133633006	14804733282 UNITED STATES - ARIZONA	17133633006	0¢	1:44	\$0
08/11/2025	10:50:31	100 min pack	12028631004	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	5:00	\$0
08/11/2025	10:29:49	100 min pack	12543204337	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:10	\$0
08/11/2025	10:14:59	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793000 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	2:28	\$0
08/08/2025	13:51:42	100 min pack	12544552136	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:13	\$0
08/08/2025	13:33:29	100 min pack	12543183730	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:13	\$0
08/08/2025	13:23:06	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:56	\$0
08/08/2025	13:12:28	100 min pack	12068183287	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	8:24	\$0
08/08/2025	10:52:02	100 min pack	17133621258	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:07	\$0
08/08/2025	10:00:36	100 min pack	17133325382	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:38	\$0
08/07/2025	15:40:11	100 min pack	17133633006	12022167340 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	1:25	\$0
08/07/2025	13:10:14	100 min pack	17133633006	18664207157 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	9:15	\$0
08/06/2025	11:59:38	100 min pack	18327750146	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:49	\$0
08/06/2025	11:53:27	100 min pack	17133586436	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:09	\$0
08/05/2025	18:33:52	100 min pack	19126506240	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:09	\$0
08/05/2025	15:05:48	100 min pack	19162413727	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	5:08	\$0
08/05/2025	14:55:06	100 min pack	19162413727	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:53	\$0
08/05/2025	14:29:20	100 min pack	17133633006	18555045101 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	3:51	\$0
08/05/2025	14:17:44	100 min pack	17133633006	19162413727 UNITED STATES - CALIFORNIA	17133633006	0¢	0:24	\$0
08/04/2025	12:40:55	100 min pack	17133633006	18038899825 UNITED STATES - SOUTH CAROLINA	17133633006	0¢	28:40	\$0
08/02/2025	12:20:59	100 min pack	17133633006	18556755363 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	8:28	\$0
08/02/2025	11:51:13	100 min pack	18558764954	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	9:50	\$0
08/01/2025	16:21:59	100 min pack	12812978897	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	8:27	\$0
08/01/2025	16:10:09	100 min pack	12812475687	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:07	\$0
08/01/2025	11:42:30	100 min pack	19126506240	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	2:53	\$0
08/01/2025	11:20:58	100 min pack	17135509908	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	3:52	\$0
07/30/2025	17:45:33	100 min pack	17133633006	19402133115 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:31	\$0
07/30/2025	17:25:39	100 min pack	17133796410	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	19:23	\$0
07/30/2025	17:07:32	100 min pack	17133633006	17133479596 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:11	\$0
07/30/2025	15:16:04	100 min pack	16027152010	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:08	\$0

07/30/2025	13:12:15	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	27:35	\$0
07/30/2025	12:26:15	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	4:58	\$0.05
07/30/2025	12:19:56	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	5:57	\$0
07/30/2025	12:17:30	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	0:54	\$0
07/30/2025	11:48:31	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	2:24	\$0
07/30/2025	11:05:17	Pay As You Go	18884552543	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	1¢	24:16	\$0.25
07/30/2025	10:57:15	100 min pack	18326176446	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	6:41	\$0
07/28/2025	14:51:54	100 min pack	17133633006	12819620088 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:20	\$0
07/28/2025	14:33:33	Roaming	18442342500	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	16:00	\$0.80
07/28/2025	14:12:03	Roaming	12812828675	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	2:00	\$0.10
07/25/2025	16:34:47	Roaming	13152930696	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	4:00	\$0.20
07/25/2025	15:07:57	100 min pack	17133633006	12819620088 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:04	\$0
07/25/2025	08:24:30	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63277301000 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	3:44	\$0.56
07/24/2025	12:02:29	Roaming	17136296300	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	0:14	\$0.05
07/24/2025	10:36:18	100 min pack	17133633006	12819620088 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:05	\$0
07/23/2025	14:50:31	Roaming	13463264837	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	5:00	\$0.25
07/23/2025	14:47:36	Roaming	15122659227	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	2:00	\$0.10
07/23/2025	12:41:03	100 min pack	17133633006	18664207157 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	6:32	\$0
07/21/2025	11:26:32	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639175553846 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - GLOBE	17133633006	9.500¢	2:28	\$0.29
07/17/2025	14:15:11	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	65:57	\$0
07/17/2025	14:13:03	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	1:16	\$0
07/17/2025	14:11:16	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	1:36	\$0
07/17/2025	00:33:31	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	2:44	\$0.42
07/17/2025	00:13:14	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	3:33	\$0.56
07/17/2025	00:10:16	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	2:50	\$0.42
07/14/2025	15:11:59	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18664207157 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	15:28	\$0.16
07/14/2025	14:34:39	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18664207157 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	8:20	\$0.09
07/10/2025	00:46:33	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	4:20	\$0.70
07/10/2025	00:45:38	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	0:37	\$0.14
07/09/2025	13:20:32	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	46:42	\$0.47
07/09/2025	13:17:08	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	2:21	\$0.03

07/09/2025	01:23:07	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639771068178 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - GLOBE	17133633006	9.500¢	17:24	\$1.71
07/09/2025	01:13:43	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322637572 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	5:04	\$0.83
07/09/2025	01:08:20	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322637572 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	4:02	\$0.70
07/09/2025	01:06:05	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322637572 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	1:57	\$0.28
07/08/2025	23:36:05	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	3:23	\$0.56
07/08/2025	23:31:21	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	4:11	\$0.70
07/08/2025	23:27:38	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322308326 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	3:34	\$0.56
07/08/2025	09:04:53	Pay As You Go	17133633006	15712724000 UNITED STATES - VIRGINIA	17133633006	1¢	17:44	\$0.18
07/08/2025	04:36:51	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63322637572 PHILIPPINES - PROPER	17133633006	13.900¢	3:40	\$0.56
07/08/2025	02:48:33	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63288777222 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	15:45	\$2.22
07/03/2025	10:37:06	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12024793025 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	0:56	\$0.01
07/03/2025	10:25:12	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12028793939 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	4:43	\$0.05
07/03/2025	10:24:23	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12028793868 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	0:16	\$0.01
07/03/2025	10:10:10	Pay As You Go	17133633006	15712724200 UNITED STATES - VIRGINIA	17133633006	1¢	5:35	\$0.06
07/02/2025	09:31:48	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12028793868 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	1:04	\$0.02
07/02/2025	09:29:26	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12028793868 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	1:57	\$0.02
07/02/2025	08:01:11	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	7:13	\$0.76
07/01/2025	11:36:39	Roaming	17259995596	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	0:20	\$0.05
06/30/2025	12:04:49	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12024793000 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	3:20	\$0.04
06/30/2025	11:55:40	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12024793000 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	0:14	\$0.01
06/30/2025	11:54:05	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	0:19	\$0.01
06/29/2025	23:59:53	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63285246919 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	2:44	\$0.42
06/29/2025	23:58:48	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63285246919 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	0:11	\$0.14
06/29/2025	23:57:57	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63285246919 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	0:19	\$0.14
06/27/2025	15:48:03	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	67:56	\$0.68
06/27/2025	15:45:42	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	2:14	\$0.03
06/27/2025	15:42:42	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008298374 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	2:51	\$0.03
06/27/2025	15:39:25	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008291040 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	2:58	\$0.03

06/27/2025	15:32:23	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008291040 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	6:20	\$0.07
06/27/2025	15:29:18	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008291040 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	2:55	\$0.03
06/27/2025	15:27:07	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	1:17	\$0.02
06/27/2025	15:24:51	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	1:57	\$0.02
06/27/2025	15:23:58	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	0:36	\$0.01
06/27/2025	05:49:28	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	6:59	\$0.67
06/26/2025	13:32:53	Roaming	13235082706	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	6:00	\$0.30
06/25/2025	21:56:32	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	0:43	\$0.10
06/25/2025	15:05:59	Pay As You Go	17133633006	16466296490 UNITED STATES - NEW YORK	17133633006	1¢	0:09	\$0.01
06/25/2025	14:52:53	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18889833426 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	11:49	\$0.12
06/25/2025	14:49:55	Pay As You Go	17133633006	16466296490 UNITED STATES - NEW YORK	17133633006	1¢	0:28	\$0.01
06/25/2025	14:16:45	Pay As You Go	17133633006	16466296490 UNITED STATES - NEW YORK	17133633006	1¢	0:38	\$0.01
06/25/2025	13:25:34	Pay As You Go	17133633006	19715331082 UNITED STATES - OREGON	17133633006	1¢	13:57	\$0.14
06/25/2025	10:03:38	Pay As You Go	17133633006	19715331082 UNITED STATES - OREGON	17133633006	1¢	0:11	\$0.01
06/25/2025	10:02:52	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12064962282 UNITED STATES - WASHINGTON	17133633006	1¢	0:10	\$0.01
06/24/2025	16:05:37	Pay As You Go	17133633006	14806305342 UNITED STATES - ARIZONA	17133633006	1¢	15:31	\$0.16
06/24/2025	13:13:01	Pay As You Go	17133633006	13607257144 UNITED STATES - WASHINGTON	17133633006	1¢	6:18	\$0.07
06/23/2025	11:10:52	Roaming	17164122674	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	2:29	\$0.15
06/23/2025	08:45:01	Pay As You Go	17133633006	442030024297 UNITED KINGDOM - PROPER	17133633006	0.900¢	8:14	\$0.08
06/23/2025	08:42:37	100 min pack	17133633006	442030024297 UNITED KINGDOM - PROPER	17133633006	0¢	1:58	\$0
06/23/2025	08:39:56	Pay As You Go	17133633006	632030024297 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	0:35	\$0.14
06/22/2025	22:49:51	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	3:39	\$0.38
06/21/2025	10:12:35	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	9:34	\$0.95
06/20/2025	14:19:41	100 min pack	17133633006	12068183287 UNITED STATES - WASHINGTON	17133633006	0¢	1:08	\$0
06/20/2025	12:46:41	100 min pack	17133633006	14698931871 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:19	\$0
06/20/2025	12:27:35	100 min pack	17133633006	12032921598 UNITED STATES - CONNECTICUT	17133633006	0¢	14:46	\$0
06/20/2025	12:25:54	100 min pack	17133633006	15125360102 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:33	\$0
06/19/2025	17:34:58	100 min pack	17133633006	15125360102 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:34	\$0
06/19/2025	17:31:04	100 min pack	17133633006	18772927350 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	0¢	3:35	\$0
06/19/2025	17:13:15	100 min pack	17133633006	13524153998 UNITED STATES - FLORIDA	17133633006	0¢	9:44	\$0
06/19/2025	16:17:12	100 min pack	17133633006	13524153998 UNITED STATES - FLORIDA	17133633006	0¢	0:43	\$0

06/19/2025	15:12:17	100 min pack	17133633006	14147518341 UNITED STATES - WISCONSIN	17133633006	0¢	10:56	\$0
06/19/2025	15:08:34	100 min pack	17133633006	14698931871 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	0:45	\$0
06/19/2025	13:35:28	100 min pack	17133633006	12068183287 UNITED STATES - WASHINGTON	17133633006	0¢	8:15	\$0
06/19/2025	12:06:05	100 min pack	17133633006	14698931871 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	0¢	1:05	\$0
06/18/2025	15:52:19	100 min pack	17133633006	14147518341 UNITED STATES - WISCONSIN	17133633006	0¢	1:06	\$0
06/18/2025	14:26:26	Roaming	12028631004	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	4:00	\$0.20
06/18/2025	14:20:53	Roaming	12028631004	17133633006 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	5:00	\$0.25
06/18/2025	13:47:29	100 min pack	17133633006	12024793000 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	0¢	3:10	\$0
06/18/2025	12:59:25	100 min pack	17133633006	15712724200 UNITED STATES - VIRGINIA	17133633006	0¢	4:23	\$0
06/18/2025	12:11:44	100 min pack	17133633006	12898123930 CANADA - 289 ONTARIO	17133633006	0¢	5:03	\$0
06/17/2025	16:27:59	100 min pack	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	0¢	21:02	\$0
06/16/2025	18:26:30	Roaming	17133633006	12108989663 UNITED STATES - TEXAS	17133633006	5¢	8:00	\$0.40
06/16/2025	18:06:57	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12134638013 UNITED STATES - CALIFORNIA	17133633006	1¢	0:55	\$0.01
06/16/2025	17:49:54	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12134638013 UNITED STATES - CALIFORNIA	17133633006	1¢	0:30	\$0.01
06/16/2025	17:30:43	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12134638013 UNITED STATES - CALIFORNIA	17133633006	1¢	0:18	\$0.01
06/16/2025	09:36:36	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639692677929 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - SMART	17133633006	9.500¢	9:34	\$0.95
06/13/2025	09:37:06	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12024793011 UNITED STATES - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17133633006	1¢	2:52	\$0.03
06/12/2025	10:13:53	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	116:49	\$1.17
06/12/2025	09:36:41	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	23:07	\$0.24
06/12/2025	09:34:10	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	2:05	\$0.03
06/12/2025	09:32:03	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	1:36	\$0.02
06/12/2025	09:29:37	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008291040 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	1:37	\$0.02
06/12/2025	09:29:12	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	0:08	\$0.01
06/11/2025	16:42:30	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18008294933 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	18:09	\$0.19
06/11/2025	15:30:29	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	48:11	\$0.49
06/11/2025	08:20:43	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18773834802 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	7:10	\$0.08
06/11/2025	07:48:02	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18773834802 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	3:08	\$0.04
06/10/2025	14:41:44	Pay As You Go	17133633006	18773834802 UNITED STATES - FREEPHONE	17133633006	1¢	22:25	\$0.23
06/06/2025	09:09:01	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	60:08	\$0.61
06/06/2025	08:54:19	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	14:32	\$0.15
06/06/2025	08:53:40	Pay As You Go	17133633006	12679411000 UNITED STATES - PENNSYLVANIA	17133633006	1¢	0:28	\$0.01

06/05/2025	00:25:05	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63288881111 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	11:48	\$1.67
06/03/2025	04:38:21	Pay As You Go	17133633006	639772476436 PHILIPPINES - MOBILE - GLOBE	17133633006	9.500¢	0:07	\$0.10
06/03/2025	04:26:33	Pay As You Go	17133633006	63288580000 PHILIPPINES - MANILA	17133633006	13.900¢	7:35	\$1.11
<b>Total cost:</b>								<b>\$27.88</b>

The preceding call log documents fourteen(14) calls made by the Plaintiff to the U.S. Supreme Court Clerk's Office and one(1) call received from the same Office by the Plaintiff from June to August, 2025; Calls were made to and from the following telephone numbers:

- 12024795660
- 12024793011
- 12024793000
- 12028631004
- 12024793025

“I declare under penalty of the laws of the District of Columbia that the foregoing is true and correct.”

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Allan Wilson", written in black ink on a white background.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

Signed at: Cebu City, Philippines

by pro se Plaintiff: Allan Douglas Wilson

on (date): January 1, 2026.

A-6

-  [\[0\] Help \(opens in a new tab\)](#) [Logout](#)

# Job Recipient List/Review

## SC filing

Job #: **11435407**

Quantity: **1**

Mailed On: **05/09/2025**

### Mailed Recipients

[1 Mailed Recipient]

[Filter](#)

<a href="#">PDF Page</a>	<a href="#">To Name</a>	<a href="#">Address 1</a>	<a href="#">Address 2</a>	<a href="#">City</a>	<a href="#">State</a>	<a href="#">Zip</a>	<a href="#">Proof</a>
1	Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States			1 First Street NE Washington	DC	20543	<a href="#">View</a>

[1 Mailed Recipient]

### Removed Recipients

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[PDF Page](#) [To Name](#) [Address 1](#) [Address 2](#) [City](#) [State](#) [Zip](#) [Proof](#)

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[Back to Jobs](#)   [Review Inserts](#)

## Certified Mail Tracking

 [track it](#)


-  [\[0\] Help \(opens in a new tab\)](#) [Logout](#)

# Job Recipient List/Review

## SC216

Job #: **11591493**

Quantity: **1**

Mailed On: **05/09/2025**

### Mailed Recipients

[1 Mailed Recipient]

[Filter](#)

<a href="#">PDF Page</a>	<a href="#">To Name</a>	<a href="#">Address 1</a>	<a href="#">Address 2</a>	<a href="#">City</a>	<a href="#">State</a>	<a href="#">Zip</a>	<a href="#">Proof</a>
1	Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States			1 First Street NE Washington	DC	20543	<a href="#">View</a>

[1 Mailed Recipient]

### Removed Recipients

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[PDF Page](#) [To Name](#) [Address 1](#) [Address 2](#) [City](#) [State](#) [Zip](#) [Proof](#)

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[Back to Jobs](#)   [Review Inserts](#)

## Certified Mail Tracking

 [track it](#)


- [Billing Information](#)
- [Activity Reports](#)
- [Address Book](#)
- [PDF Tools](#)

•  [\[0\] Help \(opens in a new tab\) Logout](#)

# Job Recipient List/Review

## SC 216 fu

Job #: **12011530**

Quantity: **1**

Mailed On: **07/18/2025**

### Mailed Recipients

[1 Mailed Recipient]

[Filter](#)

<a href="#">PDF Page</a>	<a href="#">To Name</a>	<a href="#">Address 1</a>	<a href="#">Address 2</a>	<a href="#">City</a>	<a href="#">State</a>	<a href="#">Zip</a>	<a href="#">Proof</a>
1	Supreme Court of the United States	Office of the Clerk, 1 First Street, NE		Washington DC		20543	<a href="#">View</a>

[1 Mailed Recipient]

### Removed Recipients

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[PDF Page](#) [To Name](#) [Address 1](#) [Address 2](#) [City](#) [State](#) [Zip](#) [Proof](#)

[0 Recipient Were Removed]

[Back to Jobs](#)   [Review Inserts](#)

## Certified Mail Tracking

Enter your tracking #  [track it](#)



**A-7**



Search documents in this case:

Search

## No. 24-7506

Title: **Allan Douglas Wilson, Petitioner**  
**v.**  
**United States**

Docketed: June 26, 2025

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

Case Numbers: (24-5210)

Decision Date: February 7, 2025

Rehearing Denied: April 11, 2025

## Proceedings and Orders

Apr 15 2025 Petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due July 28, 2025)  
**Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis**   **Petition**   **Appendix**   **Proof of Service**

Jul 03 2025 Waiver of right of respondent United States to respond filed.  
**Main Document**

Jul 10 2025 DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 9/29/2025.

Oct 06 2025 Petition DENIED.

## Attorneys

### Attorneys for Petitioner

Allan Douglas Wilson  
1321 Upland Drive  
Ste. 21311  
Houston, TX 77043  
Ph: (502) 403-2378  
Party name: Allan Douglas Wilson

### Attorneys for Respondent

D. John Sauer  
*Counsel of Record*  
Solicitor General  
United States Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001  
supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov  
Ph: 202-514-2217  
Party name: United States



Search documents in this case:

Search

## No. 25-6039

Title: **Allan Douglas Wilson, Petitioner**  
**v.**  
**Department of State, et al.**

Docketed: November 5, 2025

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

Case Numbers: (24-5204)

Decision Date: December 23, 2024

## Proceedings and Orders

Mar 13 2025	Petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due December 5, 2025) <b>Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis    Petition    Appendix    Proof of Service</b>
Nov 25 2025	Motion to extend the time to file a response from December 5, 2025 to January 5, 2026, submitted to The Clerk. <b>Main Document</b>
Nov 26 2025	Motion to extend the time to file a response is granted and the time is extended to and including January 5, 2026, for all respondents.
Dec 15 2025	Waiver of right of respondent Federal Respondents to respond filed. <b>Main Document</b>
Dec 24 2025	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 1/9/2026.
Jan 12 2026	Petition DENIED.

## Attorneys

### Attorneys for Petitioner

Allan Douglas Wilson  
1321 Upland Drive  
Ste. 21311  
Houston, TX 77043  
Ph: (502) 403-2378  
Party name: Allan Douglas Wilson

### Attorneys for Respondents

D. John Sauer  
*Counsel of Record*  
Solicitor General  
United States Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001