

WITHOUT ADJUDICATION NO COURT IN THE LAND WILL BE CREDIBLE.

IF NO COURT WILL ADJUDICATE THE RIGHT, WHAT PROTECTION DOES THE CONSTITUTION PROVIDE?

By Mitchell Vexler, October 13, 2026

SCOTUS denied the [Petition for Writ of Certiorari](#) (link) seeking reversal and remand after SCOTX and the lower Texas courts declined to adjudicate federal constitutional claims arising from the property tax fraud evidence presented in the record.

For nearly a century, when state procedural or jurisdictional mechanisms threatened to prevent adjudication of federal rights, the Supreme Court of the United States intervened. In *McKnett v. St. Louis & San Francisco Railway*, *Felder v. Casey*, *Howlett v. Rose*, *Haywood v. Drown*, and most recently *Williams v. Reed*, the Supreme Court rejected state mechanisms that prevented or materially obstructed federal rights from receiving an effective judicial remedy.

Yet, in the [case 26-179, SCOTUS refused to intervene](#) (link). Why? Under what law? Under what authority? For what reason? The constitutional question therefore remains: **what legal mechanism protects a federal constitutional right when every available tribunal declines to adjudicate it?**

[Four Texas courts left the asserted federal constitutional claims without a merits determination](#) (link), and the Supreme Court of the United States denied review in No. 26-179 without addressing those claims and that means SCOTUS is backing SCOTX. I called for the impeachment of every justice on the bench at SCOTX because they violated not just the Texas Constitution but also The Constitution of the United States of America.

Now, **SCOTUS has refused to intervene**. The result is a no-remedy architecture that remains intact and is replicable nationwide. Meaning there will be no court in the land that can be credible as there is no guiding principle (law) that being The Constitution of the United States of America. Thereby rendering the courts a casino of chance.

Supreme Court Justices are required to take two oaths of office before they can begin their duties.

Constitutional Oath	This oath pledges to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. The wording is: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."
Judicial Oath	This oath commits Justices to administer justice impartially and without respect to persons. The wording is: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as [title of office] under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God."

Importance of the Oaths

These oaths are not merely ceremonial; they are a fundamental commitment to uphold the principles of justice and the rule of law in the United States. By taking these oaths, Justices affirm their dedication to the Constitution and their role in the judicial system.

SCOTUS, just like SCOTX did not state who voted up or down. Clearly, SCOTUS violated the Constitutional rights not just of all Texans (as did SCOTX) but also violated the Constitutional rights of all Americans.

Non-adjudication and non-adherence to Constitutional would affect civil rights, criminal cases, governmental actions, forcing multiple appeals up the chain just like in the Vexler case only not to be adjudicated. [Then the participating judges and government employees in these cases claim immunity while violating the law.](#) (link)

**THIS IS A NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS
REQUIRING IMMEDIATE EXAMINATION!**