

FILED

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

AUG 09 2018

Clerk, U.S. District Court
Texas Eastern

Cause No.: 4:18-cv-567

RUSTIN P. WRIGHT,)	In a removal from the Sixth Judicial
Petitioner,)	District Court of Lamar County, Texas
)	TX state case number: 73540 (“ <i>In the</i>
v.)	<i>Interest of A.G.F.W., a Minor Child</i> ”)
)	TX Judge William Baird, presiding
STATE OF TEXAS, and)	*CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS
ASHLEY B. WOMACK,)	*INJUNCTIVE RELIEF SOUGHT
Respondents.)	*DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Notice of Constitutional Questions to Federal Statute 28 USC 1443

Comes now *removal petitioner*, Rustin P. Wright, noticing the Court and all parties in formal raising of his challenge in the alleged unconstitutionality of 28 USC § 1443, thusly:

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS:

Because out of the eight (8) different statutory authorities for removal of state court cases into the federal courts, 28 USC § 1443 also being the only one never concerned with either comity or federalism regarding whatever subject matter was filed within the state court originally, and also being wholly opposite of – indeed, even generally *mutually exclusive* of – all other seven (7) removal types in literally *all* substantive and *all* procedural respects, and existing for a wholly different purpose than all of the other seven (7) types of removal, the following questions of alleged unconstitutionality are here and now being formally raised for full briefing to follow:

- Is 28 USC § 1443 directly unconstitutional on its face for violating equal protection, class discrimination, etc., by wrongly limiting equal access of justice to only *defendant* parties?

- Is any pattern or practice of federal courts remanding 28 USC § 1443 removals, arbitrarily based on any *original state court subject matter type*, when that subject matter type is *not* one of the four (4) types excluded by 28 USC § 1445, directly unconstitutional on its face?
- Is any pattern or practice of federal courts remanding 28 USC § 1443 removals, arbitrarily based upon skin color “racial litmus test” screening, directly unconstitutional on its face?
- Is any pattern or practice of federal courts remanding 28 USC § 1443 removals, based on any ‘abstention’ or ‘avoidance’ doctrines, i.e., principles of comity and federalism, i.e., any attempts by federal courts to “*abstain*” from *intervening* within a state court matter, all directly unconstitutional on its face, when the express statutory language, the letter, the spirit, and the unambiguously clear mandate of 28 USC § 1443 are all, in fact, precisely about doing just exactly that by nature, *purposefully intervening* into a state court matter?


REQUIRED F.R.Cv.P. Rule 5.1(a)(1) LISTING:

The required listing of papers herein relevant to the discussion of this issue include at least:

- a) the filing entitled, Notice Distinguishing Between the Two Basic Types of Removal;
- b) the filing entitled, Notice of Pre-Emptive Constitutional Challenge to the Unlawful Discrimination of Separate Racial Classes via Georgia v. Rachel;
- c) the filing entitled, Memorandum of Law Clarifying Established Federal Jurisdiction;
- d) and, the filing entitled, Notice of Petition; and, Verified Petition for Warrant of Removal, and the same as may be amended.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned *removal petitioner* requests the Court now formally certify the same constitutional challenge in question to the U.S. Attorney General, pursuant to F.R.Cv.P. Rule 5.1(b) and 28 USC § 2403(a), and prays for all further relief true and just in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,



Rustin P. Wright
10603 Memphis Drive
Frisco, TX 75035
Tel: (469) 569-2435
Email: rustinwright@gmail.com
Pro Se Petitioner Party of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify: that on this 9th day of August, 2018, a true and complete copy of the above *notice of constitutional questions*, by depositing the same via first class postage prepaid mail, USPS or equivalent postal carrier, has been duly served upon the following:

(Statutory party United States)
Attorney General Jeff Sessions
c/o U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

(Respondent State of Texas)
State of Texas
c/o Attorney General Kenneth Paxton
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, TX 78711-2548

(Respondent Ashley)
Ashley B. Womack
150 Carter Road
Springtown, TX 76082-6577


(state court counsel of Respondent Ashley)
Jennifer M. Gibo, #24032343
Law Office of Jennifer Gibo
109 1st Street SE
Paris, TX 75460

(Statutory party United States)
U.S. Attorney Joseph D. Brown
Office of the U.S. Attorney
350 Magnolia Avenue, Suite 150
Beaumont, TX 77701

Linda A. Acevedo
Chief Disciplinary Counsel
State Bar of Texas
14651 N. Dallas Parkway, Suite 925
Dallas, TX 75254

State Commission on Judicial Conduct
P.O. Box 12265
Austin, TX 78711-2265

and, I further certify that the mailing sent to certain recipient listed above, U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions, was sent via certified mail with return receipt requested.



Rustin P. Wright