

RECEIVED

Aug 07 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

No.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Tracie Mitchem-Green— PETITIONER

[aka Tracie L. Green]

vs.

Congress of the United States, United States Courts, Hon. John Roberts, Hon. Scott S. Harris, Hon. Lori Wood, Hon. Angela Jiminez, Hon. Clayton R. Higgins, Hon. Emily Walker, State of South Carolina, Westgate Resorts, Sunrun, Incorporated, Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union/Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law Firm, US Bank National Association/Hutchens Law Firm/The Foundation Legal Group, Joint Municipal Water & Sewer Commission/Davis Frawley Law Firm, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Corey Short, Emily Short, Hon. Robert Meek, United States Postal Service, John Doe, Jane Doe — RESPONDENT

AMENDED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CASE

IN ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Relief Sought

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (“FRCP”) 15, 60, and Court Rule 17, Petitioner Tracie Mitchem-Green (“Petitioner”) submits this amended motion for leave to file the attached amended pleading in the Courts original jurisdiction under Article III of the Constitution of the United States pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1251:


...and those in which a State shall be a Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction.

Reasons to Grant this Motion and Facts Relied On

The respondents in this case includes Congress of the United States, the United States Courts, judicial personnel in their personal capacity, and a state¹ yielding this Court with original jurisdiction. The case is based on clerk interference resulting in the fraudulent foreclosure of the Petitioners home and associated colluded activity purposed for creating unlawful debts. This Court is requested to determine if the elements of fraud have been satisfied in this case and grant lawful remedy in accordance to FRCP 60. This Court has jurisdiction according to 28 U.S.C.§1251 and Court Rule 17.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, this amended motion for leave to file case in this Court's original jurisdiction should be granted.


Tracie Mitchem-Green
608 SE Defender Drive
Lake City, FL 32025
(803) 361-0602
scmail12310@pm.me

August 4, 2026

¹ New York State was timely notified on the same day the complaint was received of being incorrectly listed as a Respondent in this case.

Aug 07 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Tracie Mitchem-Green— PETITIONER
[aka Tracie L. Green]

vs.

Congress of the United States, United States Courts, Hon. John Roberts, Hon. Scott S. Harris, Hon. Angela Jiminez, Hon. Clayton R. Higgins, Hon. Emily Walker, Hon. Lori Wood, State of South Carolina, Westgate Resorts, Sunrun, Incorporated, Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union/Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law Firm, US Bank National Association/Hutchens Law Firm/The Foundation Legal Group, Joint Municipal Water & Sewer Commission/Davis Frawley Law Firm, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Corey Short, Emily Short, Hon. Robert Meek, United States Postal Service, John Doe, Jane Doe — RESPONDENT

AMENDED COMPLAINT

This case involves the failure of state and federal officials to properly and timely address allegations of clerical interference and collusion to create unlawful debts. The clerical interference precipitated the fraudulent foreclosure of Tracie Mitchem-Green (“Petitioner”) home in South Carolina, located at 123 Cardinal Pines Drive, Lexington, South Carolina 29073. The collusion to create unlawful debts encompasses at least some of the same clerks and business entities who possessed an established relationship with the Petitioner.

South Carolina’s Lexington County Courthouse. In case 2022CP3200784

(initiated on March 4, 2022), the following episodes of clerical interference occurred, as indicated in the Petitioner’s Motion for Certification under Rule 204(b) submitted to the South Carolina Court of Appeals on June 12, 2026:

As indicated in the Rule, this case involves issues of significant public interest or legal principle(s) of major importance qualifying it for review by this Court. The issues are whether the final judgement order (which also encompasses preceding orders) should be overturned due to unparalleled tampering (perjury; and interfering with the docket, attorneys, and other parties) by state official(s)—specifically the Clerks of Court at Lexington County Courthouse—as well as evidence of colluded activity with other parties to secure a favored verdict. Additionally, the legal principle of major importance is whether it is presumptively prejudicial for state officials to secretly promote the advancement of certain parties during a civil trial—through acts of perjury and tampering aforementioned—ultimately skewing justice for the unfavored party... On May 7, 2026, seven previously submitted documents could not be located on the docket—with submission dates as far back as February 2026. A response was not received to the Appellant's inquiry regarding the missing documents.... Additionally, the May 18, 2026 Lexington County Courthouse docket clearly indicates the Appellants home was sold on June 2, 2025 in which a \$9,050.00 payment was recorded. The transaction is unlawful due to federal stay in place. For this cause, the Appellants home was stolen by US Bank National Association, being aided by state officials, specifically by the interference of Court Clerks. South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure 60 provides the remedy.

Additional episodes of clerical interference include on September 16, 2025 and during the appeal process, initiated on May 14, 2026, Respondent Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission was added and removed as a case party by state Courts without Petitioner notification. Despite notification, assistance was not received from governing State officials, including South Carolina's Governor being notified on July 9, 2026.

South Carolina Court of Appeals. In case 2026-001149, as indicated in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari submitted to the Supreme Court of South Carolina on July 12, 2026:

Evidence of Fraud and/or Fraud on Court (utilized authority, courthouse, taxpayer money outside the scope of practice and/or routine court business protocol):-- Willingly displaying false information by removing defendant, Joint Municipal Water and Sewer's name from the docket.--Docket Tampering: On May 27, 2026, The initial notice of appeal was posted as

received May 18, 2026. After emergency motion to correct docket, docket only lists notice of not ordering a transcript as the only document being received on May 17, 2026 which is false.... --Attorney Tampering: John Kay ...is no longer listed on the docket, removed without a court order. ... --Respondent

Tampering: To remove Joint Municipal Water and Sewer without motion or a court order is unlawful.--Hindering a case, discrimination: A case number cannot be issued unless the filing fee has been fully paid. I submitted an inform a pauperis application on May 14, 2026...hence dismissal for a payment the Appellant cannot afford (or need) would result in discrimination and manifest injustice. Rule 203, SCACR; Civil Court Rules 3.--Document tampering, interference: On June 4, 2026, multiple documents filed before 1159pm. Specifically, the Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial was the first of five emails submitted on the said date, but the only submission with June 5, 2026 court-stamping as the received date [the factual "received" date is June 4, 2026 453p, which was the first submission (as each filing email is labelled sequentially as "Filing 1" to "Filing 5" (due to some large files)...

...More importantly, how did the Court receive payment but not the printed copies mailed along with the payment of the documents electronically submitted? ... Specifically, the docket shows no case activity between February 1, 2025 and February 5, 2025, despite submission of both electronic and mailed copies of the February 2, 2025-submitted documents...enclosed with the money order in the express mailed package with a weight of 8.70oz. Where are the documents?

A response has not been received from a South Carolina state judicial or state official resolving the clerical interference as of the filing of this amended pleading.

Supreme Court of South Carolina. In case 2025-0001796, as indicated in the Complaint submitted to the Supreme Court of South Carolina on August 31, 2025: *...In addition, the following legal documents were also submitted: July 26, 2025 1. Motion for Immediate Disbursement of Punitive Damages and Move to Inactive Roster. 2. Amended Emergency Stay ...were printed by Hon. Mona Huggins on August 28, 2025 between 8:04am and 8:06 am but not docketed until July 30, 2025 3:56pm.*

The Supreme Court of South Carolina's response is as indicated in the Motion to Amend Judgement Order submitted to the superior Court on April 26, 2026:

Pursuant to South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60, Tracie Mitchem-Green ("Petitioner") requests alteration or amendment of Court Order entered on April 22, 2026. The relief requested is for the Court to:

- 1. Redact declination to entertain this matter in this Court's original jurisdiction. 2. Correct the labeled error "Appellant" case... even the named Defendants are not the same as the lower trial court case. Under state law and Court rules, this case cannot be filed under the Court's appellant jurisdiction, thus all references to this case being an appeal case is a clear error...*

A response resolving the clerical interference was not received.

South Carolina District Court: Being removed from South Carolina Court of Appeals, the appellant case number from the 2022 case was reused. Thus, in the second case of 3:22-cv-04215-SAL, as indicated the Notice of Removal submitted to the federal South Carolina District Court on February 7, 2025:

...February 7, 2024, US Bank National Association filing for Summary Judgement without first providing this Defendant with a copy, while having knowledge of Lexington County Clerk of Court delaying this Defendant's Motion to Move to Inactive Roster...

This Motion to Move to Inactive Roster was submitted on February 6, 2024, but not filed until days after the docketing of US Bank National Association's Motion for Summary Judgement. Also discussed in the Notice of Removal are the following occurrences of clerical interference:

**9/1/22, Clerk of Court filed Defendant's 8/22/22 document (10 days after being submitted). On the same day, US Bank National via Attorney Kay filled a NOTARIZED Attorney Affidavit of Fees stating "A hearing was held by the Master, who requires an order to be proposed by Plaintiff Counsel." DEFENDANT WAS NEVER NOTIFIED OF THIS HEARING...This Defendant's February 26, 2024 Defendant's Response and Rebuttal to Summary Judgement...this Defendant's Motion to Change Venue...submitted on September 13, 2022, was filing delayed by two days...*

During the original 2022 case, as indicated in the Motion to Change Venue (State to Federal Jurisdiction) And Certificate of Service filed July 15, 2022 with Lexington County Courthouse and November 28, 2022 with the South Carolina District Court:

6/8/22 Approx 0915 Clerk of Court representative denied this Defendant's right to file Response to Notice of Denial of Loss Mitigation (30 pages) due to double-sided printing (though double-sided printing was accepted previously). NOTE: This document was reviewed by "she" prior to being denied the right to file it with the Court.

In both 2022 and 2025, responses resolving the instances of clerical interference were not received.

Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit: In case 23-1176, as indicated in the Informal Brief dated February 10, 2023, clerical interference discussed with lower state Court ordering Master-in-Equity without Petitioner's consent. In case 25-

1169, as indicated in the Informal Brief dated February 21, 2025:

It is important to address that on February 18, 2025, the very day the certified mailed documents (Defendants Response to Pending Report and Recommendation, Notice of Appeal to the US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, with Proof of Service of mailing) were scheduled to arrive, this Defense received an email at 337pm from the SC Court of Appeals regarding the following: Appellate Case Number, Admonishing filings needing to be Rule 267-compliant. Reference to inclusion of personal data identifiers pursuant to Order 2014-04-15-02. Notification of 10-day grace period to correct insufficiencies in formatting of Proof of Service and Notice of Appeal.

Otherwise, case will be dismissed. In response, this Defense sent the following response ...1. This case was removed from your court on February 7, 2025 prior to the assignment of a case number...

Also in this case, as indicated in the Motion to Vacate Clerk's Order submitted to the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on July 16, 2026:

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 60 and Local Rule 27(b), Appellant Tracie Green submits this petition to vacate the July 15, 2026 clerk order (Doc.44) due to clerical error...The provisions of Local Rule 40(h) Conflicts

with Federal Law. FRCP 60 is a foundational law enacted by Congress that governs the federal judiciary practice regarding when relief from judgement is acceptable. Accordingly, the Appellant's Emergency Motion for Relief from Judgement was filed within a year of the Court's final ruling. Federal law supersedes local rules. The Clerk's Order is in Conflict with Local Rule 40(h)....This court's Local Rule 40(h) states that, except for timely petitions for rehearing en banc, cost and attorney fee matters,...” The clerk's order conflicts with Local Rule 40(h) due to the first motion filed being “Motion for Exemption of PACER Fees” (Doc. 43-1) which is associated with cost matters. To not vacate the clerk order would produce manifest injustice.

A response resolving the instances of clerical interference has not been received.

Eastern District of New York and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

In case 24-cv-04354, the Petitioner appealed Eastern District of New York's decision of the case being transferred to the District of South Carolina. An appellant case number was never issued nor was resolution received to reported incidences of harm.

Middle District of Florida. In case 3:25-cv-935, as indicated in the Petition for

Writ of Mandamus submitted to the Middle District of Florida on August 18, 2025:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 21 ...petitions...for a writ of mandamus directing Clerk Representative Richard Sewell...to submit to the Court for ruling all documents filed on and after August 1, 2025 in accordance to Rule 27(b) and FRCP 60...As discussed in the August 6, 2025, Amended Request (Motion) For Vacation of Clerk's Order: INTRODUCTION Pursuant to Local Rule 27(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 60, Appellant Tracie Green submits this amended petition for vacation of the August 1, 2025 and August 4, 2025 clerk orders “further consideration unavailable-Local Rule 40(h)” due to mistakes...Pursuant to Local Rule 27(b), a Clerks adverse order can be challenged, requiring the court to rule...”

A response resolving the clerical interference has not been received. In case 3:25-cv-

01174, as indicated in the amended complaint submitted to Middle District of

Florida on November 12, 2026:

Since at least Year 2023, Respondents John Roberts, The United States [Associates Scott Harris, Robert Meek, Angela Jimenez, Lori Wood, Clayton R. Higgins], John Doe], and/or Jane Doe... though received on October 27, 2025, Petitioner received rehearing documents on November 8, 2025 with a fifteen-day deadline from the date of the October 31, 2025 Letter to respond...

Affecting three cases but reported in case 3:25-cv-964, as indicated in the Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial submitted to the Middle District of Florida on October 20, 2025:

October 14, 2025 After completion of stamping personal copies of filed documents, Petitioner proceed to Clerk's desk and handed Clerk Erin unstamped, court copies of documents Petitioner stamped seconds ago. Clerk Erin was noted reviewing the documents and initiating stamping the documents in but paused to assist Petitioner in accessing a related action on the public computer housed in the Clerks Office (Appendix A). With Clerk Erin's assistance, Petitioner located the related action and began printing out documents, including in this case and another related case. Upon completion, Petitioner returned to the Clerk's desk and requested the copies printed. Clerk Erin, politely took the note paper Petitioner was using to stay organized and indicated she was going to retrieve Petitioner's printouts. Upon return, Clerk Erin, provided Petitioner her organizing-sheet and what appeared to be Petitioner's printouts; however, Petitioner noted the order of denial from this case was missing, after review of the organizing-sheet. Clerk Erin, politely took the organizing-sheet again, and returned with additional printouts. At some point during the interaction, Clerk Erin informed Petitioner of a new endorsed order on a related case and provided applicable printouts. Petitioner attempted to pay for the printouts, but Clerk Erin graciously declined. The interaction lasted approximately 20 minutes.

In all three cases, a response resolving the instances of clerical interference have not been received.

Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) As aforementioned, since

2023, the Petitioner has sought assistance from SCOTUS for resolution in the unlawful foreclosure proceedings, only to be met with additional clerical interference. On July 31, 2025, a request for assistance was submitted (Appendix A):

Full Court review requested in the stay, not an individual justice. a. Rule 22.1. An application addressed to an individual Justice shall be fled with the Clerk, who will transmit it promptly to the Justice concerned if an individual Justice has authority to grant the sought relief... The reason stay application given to individual Justice (Chief Justice) is unclear, because Included in title, the first sentence, and the succeeding first paragraph are full court requests: Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 23, this ProSe Petitioner requests the full member court to grant an immediate stay—of all activity in lower courts, including finalizing auction/sale of the property in dispute—pending review of the writ of certiorari. [In fairness to Respondent, Petitioner requests Chief Justice Roberts to excuse himself due to petitioner's direct communication with him prior to submission of this petition.] Appendix A houses three direct communications—March 25, 2025, June 24, 2025, and May 30, 2025—of many with Chief Justice Roberts that did not always include the other parties; hence the request for excusal to ensure fairness. Again, according to the docket, the stay was presented to Chief Justice instead of the full Court which raises a conflict of interest. b. Court Rule 22.4 allows full court selection...

A resolution to the clerical interference was not received. Additional instances of clerical interference include: Denied Electronic Filing Despite Knowledge of Recurrent Mailing Concerns: Despite being informed of mail tampering concerns and/or providing evidence of the same, clerks at the Supreme Court of the United States and the Middle District of Florida continue to disallow Petitioner to file electronically, giving rise to clerical interference. On March 27, 2025, Congress was notified of the following:

...The Courts have either declined email submissions or are silent regarding the requests. I have asked for Law Enforcement to be notified of the document tampering...

That the Petitioner can recall, only the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit indicated notifying Law Enforcement (the Marshall service); however, resolution was not received. Reported Instances of Harm Not Addressed: On multiple

occasions, motions for Preliminary Injunction/ Restraining Orders were presented to both state and federal Courts, including this Court with none processed nor assistance to eliminate further harm provided. During the construction of this amended pleading, on August 4, 2026, a 6-pound-3-ounce Priority Mail box, containing what appears to be Petitioners previously filed documents including but not limited to (Packet (Court-Stamped June 30, 2026): June 23, 2026 Amended Informa Pauperis Application, June 13, 2026 Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgement (To Reopen Closed Application)(With Full Member Court), June 13, 2026 Petitioner's Motion for Stay Pending Appeal and Freezing Assets (With Full Member Court Requested), June 13, 2026 Motion to Include Additional Defendants, and June 13, 2026 Lis Pendens. June 13, 2026 Proof of Service (with Court-stamp June 30, 2026); June 14, 2026 Proof of Service; June 15, 2026 Proof of Service (Court-stamped June 25, 2026) along with the following correspondence, dated July 31, 2026, from the US Supreme Court's Office of the Clerk (Respondent Harris and Ms. Smith) entitled "RE: 'Petitioner's Motion to Supplement Pleading for Relief USSC No. 24-7325 and 23-6591 No. 24-7325" and included was a copy of the May 8, 2026 letter from Respondent Scott S. Harris/Angela Jimenez entitled "RE: 'Petitioner's Motion to Supplement Pleading for Relief' USSC No. 24-7325 and 23-6591 No:24-7325":

Dear Ms. Green: The enclosed documents received June 22, 2026, June 25, 2026, and June 30, 2026 ... The documents are returned for the reasons previously stated in the May 8, 2026 correspondence. Subsequent filings in the Supreme Court case number 24-7325 and 23-6591 will no longer be acknowledged. [May 8, 2026 Letter] Dear Ms. Green: Returned are the enclosed documents postmarked April 30, 2026 and received May 5, 2026.

Regarding Supreme Court case No. 24-7325, the above-entitled submission received May 5, 2026, is herewith returned in light of the denial of the above-entitled petition for rehearing for the writ of certiorari on December 15, 2025. Regarding Supreme Court case No. 23-6591, the above-entitled submission received May 5, 2026, is herewith returned in light of the denial of the above-entitled petition for rehearing for the writ of certiorari on August 19, 2024. Subsequent filing ...will no longer be acknowledged.

Missing from the mail received from the Office of the Clerk are the following: (1)

Response to this case filing, received on July 24, 2026 as per the United States

Postal Service. Again, a response to this case has not yet been received nor has the

Petitioner's July 31, 2026 318pm call regarding this case been received. (2)

Response to Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgement (to Reopen Closed

Application)(With Full Member Court Requested) and the Petitioner's Motion to

Supplement Pleading for Stay Pending Appeal (with Full Member Court or Justice

Samuel Alito) postmarked December 29, 2025 (delivered January 2, 2026 as per the

Post Office. The contents will be discussed later. (3) Case 23M16 not addressed, in

which October 3, 2023 denial for being filed under seal but writ of certiorari still not

docketed when unsealed version was received.

Collusion to Create Unlawful Debts: Evidence indicates intentional violation of due process for Petitioner. Specifically: Hon. John Roberts—improper motive in denying informia pauperis application. Failed to intervene to prevent harm when informed of the unlawful behaviors of clerks under his realm of control;

Respondents Clerk's Hon. Scott S. Harris, Hon. Lori Wood, Hon. Angela Jiminez,

Hon. Clayton R. Higgins, Hon. Emily Walker, and/or Hon. Robert Meek may have

colluded with State of South Carolina, Westgate Resorts, Sunrun, Incorporated,

Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union/Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law

Firm, US Bank National Association/Hutchens Law Firm/The Foundation Legal Group, Joint Municipal Water & Sewer Commission/Davis Frawley Law Firm, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Corey Short, Emily Short, United States Postal Service, other Courts, and/or others to create unlawful debts (including removal of lines of credit) to harm Petitioner. Specifics are appended. For example, delivered to this Court on January 2, 2026 was the following motion for relief from judgement:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60, and Court Rules 1, 21, and 23, Petitioner Tracie Mitchem-Green ("Petitioner") requests relief ...evidence of assisting in the creation of an unlawful debt has emerged: ...on February 17, 2023, WGR abruptly demanded \$\$3872.11 payment for delinquent HOA fees. This is evidence of collusion to collect unlawful debt as SCOTUS Clayton R. Huggins just 10 days earlier, on February 17, 2023, returned Petitioner's then-sealed writ of certiorari due to multiple stated deficiencies—this complaint included detailed WGR demands for \$1000.00 payment to surrender Petitioner's timeshare. Thereafter, WGR demand for payment was fierce, even initiating a tax lien, despite reminder of previous interactions and WGR extended silence in 2001. Here now is the most recent fraud on court occurrence, in which the rehearing application for the stay was returned despite compliance to the October 31, 2025 Letter requiring selection of an individual justice, of which Justice Samuel Alito was selected...

Recently, the Petitioner realized that the dates of Respondent Clayton R. Higgins letter, November 17, 2023 and Westgate Resorts demand for payment, February 27, 2023 occurred BEFORE the case was docketed on August 8, 2023, further underscoring clerical interference with collusion to create unlawful debt. Also, Petitioner's motion for stay was submitted as far back as March 2025 but was not docketed until around July 1, 2025 permitting additional lower court case activity to continue in the fraudulent foreclosure. Timely and in accordance to FRCP 60, motions for relief from judgement with associated stays, Motion to Include Additional Defendants, and Lis Pendens were delivered to the Court since January

2026, however, the clerk's interference prohibited processing as indicated by FRCP 60. Petitioner's Cease-and-Desist Notice to the attention of Hon. John Roberts. However, a resolution to the clerical interference was not received.

(Appendix A). Other Courts Replicating Hon. John Roberts Denial of Petitioner's Informa Pauperis Application. As indicated in the Middle District of Florida amended complaint, submitted on November 12, 2025 in response to a direct order to service Respondents (despite Informa Pauperis application being on file), multiple state and federal Courts created unlawful debt by withholding informa pauperis application approval and not responding to submitted documents:

...have used Petitioner's indigent status as a means to withhold justice ... despite clear qualification according to state and/or federal guidelines, as well as denying electronic filing...Multiple documents have been submitted to SCOTUS for processing but were never docketed in their entirety and/or a reply was not received. They are: Writ of Certiorari to United States District Court of South Carolina, dated July 11, 2023 (150 pages, mailed December 13, 2023... Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (December 20, 2023, 172 pages EMERGENCY MOTION with Relief Requested by April 3, 2024: Petitioners' Motion to Stay Return to South Carolina, with transfer of State Level Proceeding to Federal Jurisdiction for the Petitioner (March 26, 2024, 40 pages...

Courts erred from Rule 60 by not addressing the evidence relating to collusion, clerk interference, and targeting of the Petitioner. The Constitution, 28 USC 1915, and Court Rules are being violated by weaponizing informa pauperis to obstruct justice for indigent litigants. Congress and Administration of US Courts were notified of some occurrences, but sustaining resolution was not provided (Appendix A).

Amended Respondents. The State of New York was removed due to not applicable to theme of case. Since that time, the Petitioner has uncovered the

following for New York State: Although a case number was not issued, on September 18, 2025, instances of clerical interference and harm were provided to the Supreme Court of New York without resolution provided. Hon. Robert Meek and United States Postal Service are added as Respondents due to evidence of participation in clerical interference instance(s) and evidence of recurrent mail tampering indirectly contributing to creation of unlawful debt.


In the nationally televised case *State of South Carolina v. Richard Murdaugh* (No. 2024-000576), in which the Supreme Court justly overturned/vacated the ruling in due to clerical interference, a similar ruling is requested in this case. The Constitution established due process, which has been violated in this case. FRCP 60 provides the remedy this Court has the power to execute. Thereby, the Petitioner respectfully request that the Court:

1. Vacate clerk orders denying subsequent filings and grant this petition.
2. Continue informa pauperis status, ensuring compliance in all Courts.
3. File and Approve Motion to Include Additional Defendants, Lis Pendens, and Petitioner's Motion for Stay Pending Appeal and Freezing Assets appended.
4. Dissolve unlawful debts.
5. Award \$3 million in damages.
6. Approve E-system filing to minimize risk of clerical interference and eliminate mail tampering occurrences.
7. Grant additional remedies as are just and proper.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, this amended complaint pleading should be granted.

August 4, 2026



Tracie Mitchem-Green, ProSe Petitioner
608 SE Defender Drive, Lake City, FL 32025
(803) 361-0602, scmail12310@pm.me

Aug 07 2026**S.C. SUPREME COURT****Appendix To Amended Complaint**

1. January 19, 2025 Cease and Desist Addressed to Hon. John Roberts (Page 1)
2. March 27, 2025 Correspondence with Congress and others (Page 1)
3. July 31, 2025 Complaint (Pages 16 and 17).
4. July 22, 2026 Notice to Disregard (New York) (Page 1 each, 2 pages)
5. July 31, 2026 Letter from SCOTUS Office of the Clerk (1 page) with Copy of May 8, 2026 Letter from Office of the Clerk (1 page)
6. June 13, 2026 Partial-Packet: June 13, 2026 Petitioner's Moton for Stay Pending Appeal and Freezing Assets (With Full Member Court Requested) (18 pages), June 13, 2026 Motion to Include Additional Defendants (1 page), and June 13, 2026 Lis Pendens (4 pages).

January 19, 2025

Page 1 of 39

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
Tracie L. Green vs US Bank National Association
NO. _____; 23-6591; 23A888; 23M16
CEASE AND DESIST NOTICE

ATTENTION: CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.

In response to Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) Clerk Scott S. Harris (Robert Meek) December 6, 2024 letter received December 23, 2024; and January 2, 2025 letter received on January 11, 2025, I submit the following...

CEASE AND DESIST

[PRELIMINARY Criminal Complaint, Charges Requested with Certificate of Service]

Clerk Scott Harris December 6, 2024 letter:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

December 6, 2024

Tracie L. Green
PO Box 521
Yonkers, NY 10710

RE: Green v. US Bank National Association/ Petition for Rehearing
"Emergency Motion to Vacate Judgments"
No: 23-6591

Dear Ms. Green:

Your application that was received December 6, 2024 is herewith returned for the following reason(s):

Your petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by the Court on May 20, 2024, with rehearing denied on August 19, 2024, therefore this Court no longer has jurisdiction over your case.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:

Robert Meek
(202) 479-3027

Enclosures

Follow Up

From: Dr. Green (drgreen@myyahoo.com)

To: drgreen@myyahoo.com

Date: Thursday, March 27, 2025 at 07:12 PM EDT

3/27/25

Dear Congress, The White House, and Law Enforcement:

1. Attached is the updated Order to Show Cause/Restraining Orders as it includes members of SCOTUS. Please advise if this should be sent to 4th Circuit. If I do not receive a response then I will know the answer is yes.
2. The scene at my workplace is intense. The longer help delays the more innocent people the unlawful group will harm. I repeat, the domestic terrorists do NOT care about the American people.
3. It appears the domestic terrorists has also infiltrated the Shelter system, which has been occurring for some time now. Hindering in leaving persists.
4. The Courts have either declined email submissions or are silent regarding the requests. I have asked for Law Enforcement to be notified of the document tampering because as per SCOTUS, documents are considered filed upon mailing, thus recurrent tampering of filed court documents have occurred.
5. Packages mailed to both SCOTUS and 4th Circuit appear to have arrived on time. NOTE: Washington package was over 11 lbs not 4 lbs as noted on the preprinted label.

**CRIMINAL COMPLAINT: SUSPECTED INTENT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND AIDE IN FRAUDULENT FORECLOSURE:
CLERK OF COURT OFFICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

			option. Additionally, your renewal letter may not contain additional argument or facts, you may only use the letter to designate the individual Justice. “
July 17, 2025 Amended Emergency Application for Stay Pending Review of Writ of Certiorari [11 copies] Petition for Rehearing [11 copies]	July 28, 2025 USPS #9405509109375504917287 #9405509109375003901541	In route	n/a

As discussed in the June 24, 2025 Letter mailed to Supreme Court of the United States,

a. Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) timeline:

- i. December 6, 2024 (Court responded same day motion received): SCOTUS Letter from Robert Meek, denying Emergency Motion to Vacate Judgements for case 23-6591 due to lack of jurisdiction because writ of certiorari denied May 20, 2024 and rehearing denied August 19, 2024.
- ii. January 2, 2025 (Court responded same day motion received): SCOTUS Letter from Robert Meek, denying Emergency Motion to Vacate Judgements for case 23-6591 due to case being closed and additional filings not authorized.
- iii. February 4, 2025 (Court responded same day petition received): SCOTUS Letter from Angela Jimenez returning petition to extend time to file writ of certiorari, stating “You are informed you may not file an

**CRIMINAL COMPLAINT: SUSPECTED INTENT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND AIDE IN FRAUDULENT FORECLOSURE:
CLERK OF COURT OFFICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

extension for time to file a petition for writ of certiorari for a case that has not been reviewed by a court of appeals or by the highest state court in which a decision could be had. 28 USC 1254 and 1257.”

- iv. March 18, 2025 (Court responded same day petition received): SCOTUS Letter from Angela Jimenez returning emergency motion before judgment, stating “You may seek review of a decision only by timely filing a writ of certiorari...”. Also, giving direction how and where to invoke Rule 11, informing me the petition still was still pending in the 4th Circuit.*
- v. April 23, 2025: (Court responded three days after motion received): SCOTUS Letter from Robert Meek returning emergency motion for stay before judgment, citing Rule 23.3 “requires that you first seek the same relief in the appropriate lower courts and attach copies of the orders from the lower courts to your application filed in this Court...”*
- vi. May 19, 2025: I called SCOTUS. SCOTUS responds with specific requirements needed to correct the writ of certiorari and the emergency stay. Lower court order requirement was not mentioned.*
- vii. May 23, 2025: I called SCOTUS to review requested corrections and request to e-file. SCOTUS responded that e-filing is only available for attorneys that are members of the Supreme Court bar. I mailed a corrected emergency stay pending appeal mailed (one-copy).*
- viii. May 27, 2025: I called 3 times for follow up information; but unable to receive information regarding if the corrections made were acceptable, as told by Angela Jimenez it would take 2 days for writ and emergency stay to reach her. As per USPS, emergency stay received by SCOTUS but stay not docketed online.*
- ix. May 29, 2025: 1219am, Writ of Certiorari and Emergency stay pending appeal hand-delivered (11 copies) as still not docketed online. Later that day, writ of certiorari received 2 days prior docketed and made available online.*
- x. June 3, 2025: 139pm, I called SCOTUS. No response was received. (NOTE: The property was sold on June 2, 2025).*
- xi. June 11, 2025: I called SCOTUS. SCOTUS responds writ of certiorari docketed but no information regarding the stay provided.*
- xii. June 18, 2025: I called 4 separate SCOTUS numbers provided requesting information. Two calls from SCOTUS responds regarding the stay, requests I contact the clerk whose name and number are on the letter mailed without providing clerks name, number, or status of the stay.*


NOTICE TO DISREGARD

July 22, 2026

Dear New York State (Governor Hochul):

Please disregard the documents mailed to your attention to 28 Liberty Street, New York, NY 10001 10005-1400, set to arrive on July 24, 2026. Here is the tracking number: USPS 9400109109375004684303. New York State should not be listed as a Respondent in this matter.

Respectfully,


Tracie Mitchem-Green
608 SE Defender Drive
Lake City, FL 32025
(803) 361-0602


NOTICE TO DISREGARD

July 22, 2026

Dear New York State (Attorney General Letitia James):

Please disregard the documents mailed to your attention to 28 Liberty Street, New York, NY 10005-1400, set to arrive on July 24, 2026. Here is the tracking number: 9400109109375004684013. New York State should not be listed as a Respondent in this matter.

Respectfully,



Tracie Mitchem-Green
608 SE Defender Drive
Lake City, FL 32025
(803) 361-0602