

No. 18-223

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE CHRISTOPHER DAWSON,

Petitioner

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON,

Petitioner,

v.

LITTON LOAN SERVICING LP. (*Now Ocwen*),

OCWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION,

OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, and

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

BUREAU; CFPB,

Respondents.

FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS / PROHIBITION

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Christopher Dawson

Petitioner, Pro Se

575 Wickenden Street, #207

Providence, RI 02903

(772) 209-0455

January 25, 2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	(ii)
STATUES	(iii)
PETITION FOR REHEARING	1
REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING	1
RELIEF REQUESTED	6

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	Page
5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution	2, 3

STATUTES

Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (CFPA), 12 U.S.C. § 5491(a)	4
U.S.C. Rule 44 & 44.6	1
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)	2

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44, petitioner respectfully requests this Court for rehearing of its December 03, 2018 order dismissing his petition for writ of Mandamus / Prohibition in this case.

REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

On December 03, 2018 this Court Denied Christopher Dawson's Petition For A Writ Of Mandamus / Prohibition in *Re Christopher Dawson* No. 18-233. His Petition for Rehearing postmarked December 20, 2018 was returned on December 27, 2018 for failure to comply with Rule 44 and was received on January 10, 2019. To preserve his right to Rehear upon telephonic inquiry with the court, he was instructed, pursuant to Rule 44.6, to get his Petition for Rehearing in by January 25, 2019. **His Petition for Rehearing shall be limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.**

Since Christopher Dawson's Petition For A Writ Of Mandamus / Prohibition in *Re Christopher Dawson* No. 18-233 was filed OTHER Petitions have been filed with the Court involving the same fundamental constitutional issue,

"The duty of this Court to make its own independent examination of the record when federal constitutional deprivations are alleged is clear, resting, as it does, on our solemn responsibility for maintaining the Constitution inviolate."

Petitioner files for rehearing in timely manner on the denial of his Petition For A Writ Of Mandamus / Prohibition because he, like the petitioners in similar circumstances have sought to have the Court determine that the use of false evidence in civil proceedings violates the Petitioners' Due Process Rights guaranteed by the Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

- As the result of wrongful foreclosure on petitioner's property, state of Massachusetts has charged Forgiveness Tax & continues to charge Interest & Penalties now totaling over \$33,000. By denying his petition, the Court is allowing the continuation of irreparable damages to petitioner. *See App.1.*
- Consumer Financial Bureau (CFPB) by not acting on Petitioner's complaint has contributed in a significant manner in continued irreparable damages to the Petitioner. Court's Denial of his petition exacerbates Petitioner's suffering and

Government agencies. The public interest in the integrity of the judiciary is Superior.

"The public welfare demands that the agencies of public justice be not so impotent that they must always be mute and helpless victims of deception and fraud."

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.,
322 U.S. 238 (1944).

Absent this Court issuance of Writ Of Mandamus / Prohibition on Christopher Dawson and others' petitions and tolerating their Due Process rights violated in civil proceedings where false evidence is used by the prevailing banks & their associates, all civil proceedings will suffer. Parties who brazenly produce false & forged documents & evidence in proceedings are and will frequently prevail over homeowners who lack resources to fully deploy wholesome forensic audits. These wrongdoers through their forgeries and frauds win judgements against citizen home-owners thousands of times.

Issuance of Writ Of Mandamus / Prohibition by this court will correct the state courts proceedings which have Denied and consistently refused to grant reliefs from the production of false evidence and penalize Homeowner for attempting to expose dark veil of evidentiary falsehood in civil proceedings and is required under the Due Process Clause as the use of false evidence in such

No. 18-223

**IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States**

**IN RE CHRISTOPHER DAWSON,
*Petitioner***

**CHRISTOPHER DAWSON,
*Petitioner,***

v.


**LITTON LOAN SERVICING LP. (*Now Ocwen*),
OCWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION,
OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, and
CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU; CFPB,
*Respondents.***

CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER

I hereby certify this petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 25, 2019.


Christopher Dawson

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**