

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

SCOTT DOUGLAS ORA, INDIVIDUALLY, AND IN HIS DERIVATIVE CAPACITY AS
TRUSTEE OF THE LEO ROBIN TRUST, ON BEHALF OF THE LEO ROBIN TRUST,

Petitioner,

v.

HOLLYWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
HOLLYWOOD CHAMBER'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
HOLLYWOOD WALK OF FAME AND
WALK OF FAME COMMITTEE,

Respondents.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Court of Appeals of the State of California for the
Second Appellate District, Division Two**

MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING

Scott Douglas Ora
Petitioner Pro Se
4735 Sepulveda Blvd. Apt. 460
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
(818) 618-2572
SDO007@AOL.COM

MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING

To the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States

After receiving a box of returned Petitions for Rehearing from the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States which had just been filed on March 10, 2025 with the Court, the Petitioner hereby submits this Motion to Direct the Clerk to File Petition for Rehearing pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21. The returned Petitions were accompanied by a letter dated March 11, 2025 from the Clerk stating,

The petition for rehearing was received again March 10, 2025 is herewith returned. Rehearing was denied in the above-entitled case on April 29, 2024. Pursuant to Rule 44.4 consecutive petitions for rehearing will not be received.

The purpose of this Motion is to ask the Court to Direct the Clerk to File Petition for Rehearing so the Justices of the Supreme Court can make a determination as to whether the Petitioner met “the Court’s avowed standard for deciding whether to permit...’consecutive’ filing...would advance ‘the interests of justice’” and/or make a ruling on the Petition for Rehearing.

The Petitioner had previously filed the Petition for Rehearing on May 29, 2024. But then he soon received a box of returned Petitions for Rehearing accompanied by a letter dated May 30, 2025 from the Clerk of the Supreme Court stating,

The petition for rehearing received May 29, 2024 is herewith returned. Rehearing was denied in the above-entitled case on April 29, 2024. Pursuant to Rule 44.4 consecutive petitions for rehearing will not be received.

The Clerk doesn’t appear to care about process as he ignored the letter the Petitioner sent with the Petition on March 5, 2025. The silence is deafening as the Clerk also returned the letter from Petitioner back to him without answering it. The

Petitioner sat down and wrote this letter on February 2, 2025 to the Justices of the Supreme Court which he submitted with and dated March 5, 2025, the same date as the Petition, to explain the extraordinary circumstances on why he was resubmitting the Petition:

Dear Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States,

This letter is in response to the enclosed letter from the Supreme Court of the United States sent to Petitioner on May 30, 2024 accompanying the returned Second Petition for Rehearing stating “Pursuant to Rule 44.4 consecutive petitions for rehearing will not be received.”

The Petitioner has no earthly idea whether the Court read inside the petition the statement regarding consecutive petitions. As the spirit of Christmastide peaks with Epiphany and today on Candlemas stirs inside Petitioner, he is reminded by the passage in 1 Corinthians 2:11: “For who among men knows the thoughts of man, except the spirit of the man that is in him? so also the things of God no one hath known, except the Spirit of God.” Because only God knows and based on the letter from the Court, it appears that no consideration was given to the authority regarding consecutive petitions for rehearing in the original timely filed petition, which stated in part:

Even when a petition for rehearing has been denied, Supreme Court Rule 44.4, barring consecutive and out-of-time petitions for rehearing, does not preclude a rehearing to modify the Court’s original order involved in this civil case. The Court’s avowed standard for deciding whether to permit an untimely or ‘consecutive’ filing is whether doing so would advance ‘the interests of justice.’ *United States v. Ohio Power Co.*, 353 U.S. 98, 99 (1957). In the case at bar, the intervening circumstances would advance ‘the interests of justice.’

[“*In United States v. Ohio Power Co.*, the court held: “We have consistently ruled that the interest in finality of litigation must yield where the interests of justice would make unfair the strict application of our rules....” *Clark v. Manufacturers Trust Co.*, 337 U.S. 953; *Goldbaum v. United States*, 347 U.S. 1007; *Banks v. United States*, 347 U.S. 1007; *McFee v. United States*, 347 U.S. 1007; *Remmer v. United States*, 348 U.S. 904; *Florida ex rel. Hawkins v. Board of Control*, 350 U. S. 413; *Boudoin v. Lykes Bros. S.S. Co.*, 350 U.S. 811; *Cahill v. New York, N.H. & H. R. Co.*, 351 U. S. 183; *Achilli v. United*

States, 352 U.S. 1023.”] ¹

In light of this reasoning, the Petitioner is herewith resubmitting a republished original Second Petition for Rehearing which should be deemed timely since it is not a corrected petition under Sup. Ct. R. 44.6 but the same petition verbatim with the new published date.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Douglas Ora
Petitioner Pro Se

There are exceptional circumstances in the Petition here which require the Justices of the Supreme Court to exercise judgment to make legal determinations in contrast to administrative tasks routinely conducted by the Clerk. It's injustice for the Clerk to summarily return Petitions to the Petitioner twice and bypass the Justices of the Supreme Court to give consideration of whether to allow consecutive filing would advance “the interests of justice.” It is a decision for the Justices of the Supreme Court to make a determination as to whether the Petitioner met “the Court’s avowed standard for deciding whether to permit...’consecutive’ filing...would advance ‘the interests of justice’”² and/or make a ruling on the Petition for Rehearing.

¹ Cited from the original timely filed Petition for Rehearing dated May 23, 2024 which more fully explained the authority regarding consecutive petitions for rehearing but absent from the letter sent on March 5, 2025 to the Justices of the Supreme Court.

² In the determination as to whether the Petitioner met “the Court’s avowed standard for deciding whether to permit...’consecutive’ filing...would advance ‘the interests of justice’”, the Court may find it useful to have the Petition for Rehearing to evaluate whether the intervening circumstances would advance “the interests of justice.” Because the Petition for Rehearing accompanying the Motion is precluded under Rule 21.1 which provides, “No separate brief may be filed”, Petitioner will send at

With the Opening Day of baseball season a week ago, these words of wisdom from Justice Roberts (made during his confirmation hearing) should be heeded:

I have no agenda, but I do have a commitment....I will confront every case with an open mind. I will fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that are presented. I will be open to the considered views of my colleagues on the bench, and I will decide every case based on the record, according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability, and I will remember that it's my job to call balls and strikes, and not to pitch or bat.

Applying this analogy, the Plaintiff was never given his turn at bat for the Justices of the Supreme Court to make a determination as to whether the Petitioner met “the Court’s avowed standard for deciding whether to permit...‘consecutive’ filing...would advance ‘the interests of justice’”. The Petitioner deserves to be on deck for his right at bat.

The Petitioner respectfully requests that the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court to Direct the Clerk to File Petition for Rehearing so the Justices can call balls and strikes that have such high-stake consequences.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Douglas Ora
Petitioner Pro Se
4735 Sepulveda Blvd. Apt. 460
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
(818) 618-2572
sdo007@aol.com

April 2, 2025

some later date the Petition under separate cover to the Clerk to stow in case the court deems it necessary to review it to arrive at its decision.