

BEFORE THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
SOLE JURISDICTION

Penny L. Sisson)
P. O. Box 266 (7685 Spencer Road))
Spencer, Ohio 44275)
Plaintiff)

vs.)

Brian F. Hagan,)
Administrative Law Judge)
Rocky River Municipal Court)
21012 Hilliard Blvd.)
Rocky River, Ohio 44116-3398)
Defendant)

and)

Deborah Comery, Clerk of Courts)
Rocky River Municipal Court)
21012 Hilliard Blvd., R.R., Ohio 44116)
Defendant)



and)

St. John West Shore Hospital)
P. O. Box 951073)
Cleveland, Ohio 44193)
Defendant, et. al.)

SC CASE NO. 08-1083

RR Case No. 07 CVF 2250

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
PURSUANT TO RULE XI, SECTION 2
(3) (4) AND JUDICIAL ECONOMY
AND AMENDMENT I OF THE
U. S. CONSTITUTION**



Now comes the Plaintiff, Penny Sisson, forced pro se and respectfully files this Reconsideration of the In Mandamus Entry dated September 10, 2008 pursuant to Rule XI, Section 2, Item 3 and Item 4 and Amendment I of the U. S. Constitution.

Plaintiff states that the local Rocky River Municipal Court never had original jurisdiction and In Mandamus Entry to grant Defendant's Motion to Dismiss ignores the misconduct of the Officers' of its' own court sanctioned by this body to practice law and in direct conflict and controversion to The Supreme Court of Ohio's own introduction to have original jurisdiction over cases involving questions arising under the Constitution of the United States or of Ohio, pursuant to the Introduction, Item (7). This case has not been heard on the merits pursuant to the original jurisdiction of the Introduction, Item (2). Attorney for the Defendants have been provided special protection under the law under the guise of "procedural issues" while ignoring the lower court "procedural issues" that brought the issues of misconduct to the Ohio Supreme Court's Chief Justice's attention to begin with, causing this non-attorney, forced pro se litigant into "unequal protection" of the law and holding this Plaintiff (lower court Defendant) to a higher standard than this governing Ohio Supreme Court holds its' own officers.

The failure of the Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court to investigate and hear this case on the merits rather than dismissing same on the "procedural issues" that were clearly under a Motion to Amend and ignored, ignores the evidence on file, including notarized affidavits of exhibits and attachments, and ensures future misconduct by the Officers of its' own Court and is actually a detriment to the general public, as indicated by our most very recent stock market crashes involving other Officers of the United States Government and its' corporation.

Additionally, it forces another amended original action, or possible multiple amended actions, to be filed causing an additional undue and financial and otherwise burden to this indigent, pro se litigant, leaving the courts accessible to the elite, and wealthy and fails the Constitutional right for one to redress one's government of grievances pursuant to Amendment I of the United States Constitution of America, ratified effective December 15, 1791.

Additionally, it fails to allow for correction of whatever real or imagined "deficit" that the Defendants' attorney (The Court's own officer) has alleged. If the Ohio Supreme Court has original jurisdiction and ignores the facts before it, where is one's right to redress one's government of grievances, particularly when they are indigent and forced into a pro se status into an unlevel playing field where the Players claim it takes at least seven (7) years to be qualified to play? And where the players write the rules and pick and choose which rules to follow and when it is time to follow the rules?

Why has the Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice ignored the misconduct of the Officers' of its' own court?

For all of the above reasons, this forced indigent Pro Se Plaintiff respectfully requests reconsideration of the In Mandamus Entry that was denied, citing equal protection and application of the laws and a request for this case to be heard on the merits of same, further citing judicial economy and the right to redress one's government of grievances. Plaintiff under duress, protest and without prejudice, requests the broadest leeway and interpretation of the contents within as a matter of precedence.

Certificate of Service: I certify that I have served a copy of this instrument on Judge Brian F. Hagan, Administrative Law Judge, Rocky River Municipal Court, 21012 Hilliard Blvd., Rocky River, Ohio 44116 (fax 440-356-5613), Deborah Comery Clerk of Courts for Rocky River Municipal Court, 21012 Hilliard Blvd., Rocky River, Ohio 44116 fax (440-356-5613) through their Attorney and Law Director, Andrew D. Bemer (fax 1-440-895-3381), Attorney Stanley E. Stein, Stanley E. Stein & Associates Co., L.P.A., 75 Public Square, Suite 714, Cleveland, Ohio 44113-2078, (fax 1-216-621-5633 by fax on this 18 day of Sept, 2008.

Without Prejudice and Respectfully
Submitted,


Penny Sisson
Box 266,
Spencer, Ohio 44275
(330-648-2017)