## (ORDER LIST: 598 U.S.)

# MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2022

## CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS

21-1418 SANTOS, MEDARDO Q. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit for further consideration in light of *Xiulu Ruan* v. *United States*, 597 U. S. \_\_\_ (2022).

21-1572 DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC V. CARMONA, EDMOND

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Southwest Airlines Co.* v. *Saxon*, 596 U. S. \_\_\_ (2022).

22-5061 JOSEPH, DEWAYNE V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma*pauperis and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted.

The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United

States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit for further

consideration in light of Concepcion v. United States, 597 U. S.

\_\_\_ (2022).

22-5075 ) NEWMAN, COURTNEY V. UNITED STATES
)
22-5076 ) WOMACK, HOLLI V. UNITED STATES
)
22-5077 ) CLEMONS, CYNTHIA V. UNITED STATES
)
22-5346 ) HOFSTETTER, SYLVIA V. UNITED STATES

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma* pauperis and the petitions for writs of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the cases are remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit for further consideration in light of Xiulu Ruan v. United States, 597 U. S. \_\_\_ (2022).

#### ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

221122		AMAC \/	CCHIMACHED	/ [ [ ] / A	MITTIAL	TNICHDANICE
22M22	IAKKANUHE	AIVIUS V	SCHUMACHER	/ F F V A	MILLIAI	INSHKANCE
		/ ti 1000 V I	JCHOI WICHEIN	/ I I <b>V</b> / \	1101011	THOUNTEL

22M23 KOMATSU, TOWAKI V. CUBESMART, ET AL.

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

22-22 TROPP, DAVID A. V. TRAVEL SENTRY, INC., ET AL.

The Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

22-5424 ARREOLA-OCHOA, JESUS M. V. GARLAND, ATT'Y GEN.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma* pauperis is denied. Petitioner is allowed until November 7, 2022, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

### **CERTIORARI DENIED**

21-462	JOHNSON, JOLIE, ET AL. V. BETHANY HOSPICE
21-936	U.S., EX REL. OWSLEY V. FAZZI ASSOCIATES, INC., ET AL.
21-1145	MOLINA HEALTHCARE OF IL, ET AL. V. PROSE, THOMAS
21-1394	FITISEMANU, JOHN, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
21-1464	GULLEY, EMOND S. V. KANSAS

21-8017 MEALS, STEPHEN S. V. UNITED STATES

CEJA, LUIS F. V. UNITED STATES

21-7648

- 22-44 HARRIS, WESTLEY D. V. ALABAMA
- 22-52 ARIYAN, INC., ET AL. V. SEWERAGE & WATER BD., ET AL.
- 22-122 SNYDER, PHILIP V. TENTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
- 22-145 CHEN, AIDONG V. KPMG LLP, ET AL.
- 22-151 HOUSTON, LASEAN D. V. ESTATE OF HOUSTON, ET AL.
- 22-153 BOWLING, WANDA V. DAHLHEIMER, LESTER J., ET AL.
- 22-162 ALABBASSI, TARIQ B. V. WORMUTH, SEC. OF ARMY
- 22-164 STUART, MARK E. V. GERLACH, JUDGE, ETC., ET AL.
- 22-169 LIN, JAY, ET UX. V. HUDSON CITY SAVINGS BANK, ET AL.
- 22-171 CENTRO MÉDICO DEL TURABO, INC. V. UNIÓN GENERAL DE TRABAJADORES
- 22-173 SWARTZ, ROGER V. BD. OF TRUSTEES UNIV. PA, ET AL.
- 22-183 COWAN, BRYAN, ET AL. V. NATHANIEL, WARDEN
- 22-189 LUKASHIN, IGOR V. WA DEPT. OF REVENUE
- 22-198 SEN, AYSE V. AMAZON.COM, INC.
- 22-248 TAWNEY, LARRY V. PORTAGE COUNTY, OH, ET AL.
- 22-257 ADELL, LORRAINE V. CELLCO PARTNERSHIP
- 22-262 WALKER, BERKLEY V. V. BOKF, N.A.
- 22-280 BUTTAR, RASHID A. V. REDDY, RACHAN D.
- 22-5109 SANCHEZ, TEDDY B. V. BROOMFIELD, WARDEN
- 22-5306 RIFE, MICKY V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5356 BOURGEOIS, JOSEPH M. V. TEXAS
- 22-5357 DEANNA D. V. TN DEPT. OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES
- 22-5361 BUSTOS, ERNEST V. BEXAR APPRAISAL DIST., ET AL.
- 22-5362 GARCIA, AGUSTIN V. NEW JERSEY
- 22-5369 GARDNER, MILTON L. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
- 22-5375 WAUGH, NATHANIEL V. RALPH, A., ET AL.
- 22-5383 GIOVANNI, LYNN M. V. NEW JERSEY
- 22-5385 J. S. V. TEXAS

- 22-5396 HILL, TIMOTHY J. V. OKLAHOMA
- 22-5405 SAWANO, PERRY V. COLORADO
- 22-5409 BOWMAN, JAMAL A. V. MICHIGAN
- 22-5443 DAVIS, ROBERT L. V. MOODY, ATT'Y GEN. OF FL, ET AL.
- 22-5447 SCHNEIDER, CHRISTOPHER V. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., ET AL.
- 22-5448 CASSIDY, ROGER C. V. FLORIDA
- 22-5462 IRICK, WILBUR V. NEW YORK
- 22-5537 RENDON, JOSEPH W. V. IOWA
- 22-5593 RODRIGUEZ, RICHARD A. V. CALIFORNIA
- 22-5603 SANCHEZ-LUGO, FAUSTINO V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5606 AMPARANO-TORRES, JESUS G. V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5610 THOMPSON, ANDRE V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5614 GORDON, MICHAEL L. V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5623 DAY, FREDA J. V. WINFREY, OPRAH, ET AL.
- 22-5635 BRIK, VLADIMIR V. V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5641 REED, JAY E. V. UNITED STATES
- 22-5663 RONEY, DANNY T. V. UNITED STATES

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

22-5354 NOBLE, RICARDO L. V. PENNSYLVANIA

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

- 22-5358 MILLER, JAMES L. V. KASHANI, AMIR, ET AL.
- 22-5609 WILMORE, HERVE V. UNITED STATES

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma*pauperis are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari

are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

# HABEAS CORPUS DENIED

22-5650	IN RE BOBBY D. HATHAWAY-BEY
22-5651	IN RE RANDOLPH L. CARR-EL
	The petitions for writs of habeas corpus are denied.

### MANDAMUS DENIED

22-5347	IN RE CHARLES E. JONES
22-5374	IN RE DARRIS NEWSOME
22-5384	IN RE RANDELL J. REDMOND
22-5398	IN RE DOUGLAS C. JACKSON
22-5407	IN RE JAMES R. AUSTIN
	The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.
22-5388	TN RE ROSZETTA M. McNETLI

IN RE ROSZETTA M. McNEILL 22-5388

> The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is denied, and the petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (per curiam).